

From Guided Practice to Independent Reading The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model in EFL Reading Comprehension

Nidhal Ali shammrin

Prof. Elaf Riyadh Khalil ph.D

**Department of English / College of Education/Ibn Rushd for
Human Sciences / University Of Baghdad**

nidal.ali2407@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

elaf.riyadh@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract

The current study aims at finding out the effect of the Gradual Release of Responsibility model on Iraqi EFL students' reading comprehension . It hypothesizes that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group taught reading comprehension by using the Gradual release of responsibility model and the control group taught according to the conventional method recommended in the Teacher's Guide in both the reading comprehension test .The sample of the study consists of (70) female Iraqi EFL preparatory school students from AL-Diwaniyah Governorate. To achieve the aims of the current study , a quasi ,pre-posttest experimental design is employed. The experiment lasts for 15weeks.The instrument used in this study :A reading comprehension test , the instrument is administered to the experimental and control groups by the researcher herself .After establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument ,the study data are collected and analyzed by using appropriate statistical procedures. The study findings reveal a statistically significant difference between the EG and CG in the post-test of reading comprehension in favor of the experimental group taught by using the GRR model compared with the control group taught by the conventional method (recommended by teacher's guide).The GRR model have a positive impact on student' RC through its four phases which gradually shifted responsibility from teacher to student ,as students engaged in collaborative and independent practices ,which strengthened their ability to understand reading texts.

In light of the results obtained ,a number of conclusions ,recommendations, and suggestions are presented.

Keywords: (impact, gradual release model, responsibility).

من الممارسة الموجهة الى القراءة المستقلة انموذج التدريس القائم على الانتقال التدريجي للمسؤولية في تنمية الاستيعاب القرائي لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

نضال علي شمران

أ.د. ايلاف رياض خليل

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية / جامعة بغداد

nidal.ali2407@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

elaf.riyadh@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

المخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى الكشف عن أثر انموذج التدريس القائم على الانتقال التدريجي للمسؤولية، في تنمية مهارة الاستيعاب القرائي لدى الطلبة دارسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق. وتفترض الدراسة عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات المجموعة التجريبية التي دُرست الفهم القرائي باستخدام انموذج التدريس القائم على الانتقال التدريجي للمسؤولية، ومتوسط درجات المجموعة الضابطة التي دُرست وفق الطريقة التقليدية الموصى بها في دليل المعلم، وذلك في اختبار الاستيعاب القرائي. تتكون عينة الدراسة من (٧٠) طالبة عراقية من طلبة المرحلة الإعدادية في محافظة الديوانية. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، تم اعتماد تصميم شبه تجريبي قائم على الاختبارين القبلي والبعدي. وقد استمرت التجربة لمدة (١٥) أسبوعاً. أما أداة الدراسة، فهي اختبار في الاستيعاب القرائي، قامت الباحثة نفسها بتطبيقه على كل من المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة. وبعد التحقق من صدق الأداة وثباتها، تم جمع بيانات الدراسة وتحليلها باستخدام الإجراءات الإحصائية المناسبة. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة وجود فرق ذي دلالة إحصائية بين المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة في الاختبار البعدي للاستيعاب القرائي، ولصالح المجموعة التجريبية التي دُرست باستخدام انموذج التدريس القائم على الانتقال التدريجي للمسؤولية، مقارنة بالمجموعة الضابطة التي دُرست بالطريقة التقليدية (الموصى بها في دليل المعلم). كما بينت النتائج أن انموذج التدريس القائم على الانتقال التدريجي للمسؤولية له أثر إيجابي في تنمية الفهم القرائي لدى الطلبة، من خلال مراحله الأربع التي تتقل المسؤولية تدريجياً من المعلم إلى المتعلم، عبر إشراك الطلبة في أنشطة تعاونية ومستقلة، مما يعزز قدرتهم على فهم النصوص المقروءة. وفي ضوء النتائج التي تم التوصل إليها، تم تقديم عدد من الاستنتاجات والتوصيات والمقترحات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (التأثير، نموذج الإفراج التدريجي، المسؤولية).

Introduction

The problem and its significance

For a long time ,Reading comprehension is widely regarded as the ultimate objective of the reading skill , Many studies emphasize the importance of reading comprehension in learning reading and consider it the essence of the process as it is enables learners to understand written texts ,analyze ideas ,and construct meaning effectively .The ultimate purpose of reading is comprehension, which includes both grasping and interpreting the text. EFL students typically work to accurately understand the author's intended message. This comprehension process involves forming a coherent mental picture of the text by combining the reader's prior knowledge with the new information provided (Pressley, 2000). nevertheless ,many Iraqi students continue to face challenges in comprehending texts and maintaining confidence in their reading abilities. Many studies revealed that many students do not comprehend what they read. Iraqi EFL students have problems in comprehending the texts and they only answer questions at literal comprehension level students typically struggle to answer questions about a reading passage on an exam or to participate in reading -related class discussions (Asma'a, 2013).Additionally, it has been noted that Iraqi EFL students struggle with word recognition and decoding, which can hinder comprehension and slow down reading. Furthermore, they typically struggle to comprehend English texts due to their inadequate mastery of vocabulary and grammar (Al-Saadi, 2019).

Gradual release of Responsibility teaching model, is an instructional model which assume that the responsibility of learning shifts gradually from teacher instruction to student independent learning through four phases modeling (focused lesson) ,guided instruction, collaborative learning ,and independent practice (Fisher & Frey 2006).

Aims of study

The present study aims at Finding out the effect of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model on Iraqi EFL preparatory school students' reading comprehension.

Hypothesis of the Study

It is hypothesized that: There are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group, which is taught reading comprehension by using the (GRR) Model and that of the control group which is taught by using conventional method (recommended by the Teacher's Guide) in the reading comprehension test.

Limits

The current study is limited to Iraqi EFL fourth-grade preparatory school students except for Kurdistan Region, during the academic year (2025-2026).

The Value of the study

The current study is hoped that:

1. This study will be of value to preparatory school students to get benefit from the (GRR) model for enhancing their mastery of reading comprehension.
2. The study will be useful for EFL Educators, Academics, Researchers and Teachers who are interested in developing and teaching reading comprehension .
3. The study findings and recommendations will be beneficial for curriculum designers as it may provide them with possible opportunities to make changes related to teaching RC and to enrich their textbooks with activities that can be carried out using the experimental model .

Literature review

1. Reading comprehension

Reading comprehension is main purpose of reading skill and it is the ability of a reader to successfully interpret a text and relate the ideas in the text to their prior knowledge. "Comprehension is the essence of the reading act," (Caldwell et al. 2010, p. 17). Reading comprehension is defined as "the process of construction of meaning through the dynamic interaction between the reader's existing knowledge, the information suggested by written language, and the context of the reading situation" (Anthony, Pearson & Raphael, 1993,p. 284) .

Reading comprehension is the process of simultaneously generating and deriving meaning through interaction and involvement with written language (Snow and Sweet, 2002). According to Veeravagu et al. (2010), the process by which a reader selects: facts, information, or ideas from printed materials, determines the meanings the author intended to convey, evaluates how they relate to prior knowledge, and determines whether they are appropriate and valuable for accomplishing their own goals.

Reading is the process of recognizing, interpreting, and experiencing written or printed material. Comprehension involves both the intentional strategies that lead to comprehension and an understanding of the meaning of written material. Reading itself deals with language form, whereas comprehension, the end result, deals with language content (Day and Bamford, 1998). According to McKee (2012), reading comprehension is the ability to understand a text, assess the information, and correctly interpret the author's meaning.

Reading Comprehension Models

Theorists have introduced three fundamental models—bottom-up, top-down, and interactive to explain how meaning is understood during reading (Rayner and Pollatsek, 1989).

The eye-movement experiment, which aims to achieve automatic word recognition and rapid reading rate, has demonstrated the effectiveness of the bottom-up teaching approach. In particular, readers are passive recipients of textual information, and the emphasis is always on specific linguistic forms—from phonemes to lexical and syntactic levels—rather than the overall meaning of the text (Grabe, 2007). On the other hand, the top-down model adopts the opposite stance, viewing the reader's interests, world knowledge, and reading abilities as what promotes reading comprehension. Goals, expectations, and strategic processing guide the reader's active control over the comprehension process (Gascoigne, 2005). The schema theory, which describes how readers take in, store, and apply knowledge in the form of schemata—structures for organizing knowledge in the mind—is the foundation of the interactive model. This method's goal is to teach students techniques that will enable them to become autonomous readers who can keep an eye on their own thoughts while reading and make connections between the new information in their text and what they already know (Donoghue, 2009).

Levels of reading comprehension

The degree to which a reader can be classified as good, poor, or proficient is known as their level of comprehension. It refers to the extent to which students comprehend the information they have learned from the text and the levels they have attained (Ilustre, 2011). According to Brown (2004). There are four comprehension levels,

Literal comprehension, Interpretive comprehension, Critical comprehension, Creative comprehension.

Literal comprehension

The literal level is the most accessible level of reading comprehension because a reader is not required to go beyond what is said; in this level, the reader knows the meaning or recalls it directly in their word . Literal comprehension includes explicitly understanding the ideas and information in the passage. The foundation of literal comprehension states the main idea, details, cause, effect, and sequence. Basic literal comprehension can be mastered by understanding the vocabulary, sentence meaning, and paragraph meaning Brown (2007).

Interpretive comprehension

According to Brown (2004), interpretative comprehension can be defined as the capacity to deduce or imply meaning from the text, comprehend concepts and information not explicitly stated in the passage, and go beyond what is stated directly to understand what the research means by searching for the inside meaning. Readers can identify and derive ideas and meaning from a text that they explicitly stated.

Critical comprehension

The capacity to examine, assess, and respond to the concepts or data the researcher presents in a passage is known as critical comprehension. Active reading, questioning, fact-finding, and holding off on passing judgment until students have taken into account all the information are all necessary for critical comprehension Brown (2004).

Creative comprehension

The ability of the reader to use their imagination while reading the passage is referred to as creative comprehension. Understanding the

cause-and-effect relationship in a story, resolving issues, and creating the creation are all skills for creative reading comprehension. Therefore, it is necessary to support readers at all four levels of reading comprehension Brown (2004).

2.The gradual release of responsibility model (GRR)

The gradual release of responsibility model is a pedagogical model that emphasizes a gradual transfer of responsibility from the teacher to the student. The aim of GRR is to assist students in becoming more independent in completing the task. To put it another way, it suggests that cognitive work should progressively and deliberately move from teacher modeling to student-teacher responsibility sharing to learner independent practice and application (Pearson and Gallagher ,1983).

This instructional model needs that the teachers by design transition from taking "all the responsibility for performing a task... to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility" (Duke & Pearson, 200٢, p. 211).

The results of Durkin's (1978) study, which revealed that students were completing tasks like question-responsive activities rather than receiving much explicit instruction in reading comprehension in the classroom, led to the initial theory and development of the GRR framework. As a result, reading comprehension training at the time placed more emphasis on students' capacity to respond to questions than on their comprehension of texts. Under the pretense of teaching reading comprehension, Durkin's research (1978, 1979) demonstrated that the activities being carried out in schools were neither successful nor instructive. The comprehension study by Durkin (1978). Research on comprehension began with instruction; this generation of instructional research was carried out to improve student learning.

comprehend texts that they couldn't understand on their own. The GRR was a key advancement in the movement for comprehension instruction from the late 1970s to the present. Instead of allowing students to complete formal and informal "tests" of what they had read on their own, the GRR concentrated on what teachers could and should do at various stages of instruction to help students learn how, when, and why to use RC strategies to help them understand challenging texts (Pearson et.al, 2019).

The stages of the gradual release of responsibility (GRR) model

The GRR model has been modified by numerous scholars and professionals. A widely used version of the GRR model was developed by which Fisher and Frey (2014). Four stages of the GRR model were identified by Fisher and Frey (2014) in their adaptation: "I do it" for focused instruction, "we do it" for guided instruction, "you do it together" for collaborative learning, and "you do it alone" for independent learning.

1.Focused lesson (I do it)

The first phase of the GRR model, according to Fisher & Frey (2008), allows teachers to act as active readers and models their own metacognitive processes. The goal of modeled strategies is to enhance content-area text comprehension. Focus lessons are usually brief and provide students with motivation to read while also hinting at important learning objectives. This component allows the teacher to show the students how they think, approach and understand the main ideas and details of the reading passage . Focus lessons, which are usually short, provide students with hints about the standards they are studying while also setting the objective or desired learning outcome. In addition to the goal and the teacher model, the phase allows teachers to build and/or activate students prior knowledge.

2. Guided Instruction (we do it)

In the second phase of instruction, teachers lead, assist, question, or prompt students to complete tasks that enhance their understanding of a particular text. Depending on the needs of the groups, teachers meet with them. For guided instruction, small, deliberate groups or pairs of students are almost always used; these groups are created based on how well the students do on formative assessments. A range of teaching techniques can be used during guided instruction. For guided instruction to be effective, planning is crucial. These student groups are not randomly meeting with the teacher. Instead, the teacher can address a shared educational need among the students in the groups. Fisher and Frey (2008).

3. Learning Collaboratively (You Do It Together)

The collaborative learning component of the GRR model, according to Fisher & Frey (2008), helps students strengthen their understanding of the subject matter and explore opportunities for discussion, debate, compromise, and critical thinking with their peers. Independent results from this group work are necessary for collaborative learning. A single product is produced in many group learning scenarios, which is not the case with this approach. The fact that one student finished all of the work while the others talked is a common concern of teachers. The findings of the study show that when collaborative learning is carried out effectively, students consolidate their ideas and comprehension during this instructional phase.

4. Independent learning (you do it alone)

According to Fisher and Frey (2008), this element addresses the main goal of model instruction, which is to provide students with opportunities to apply their knowledge and reading skills and strategies. As they apply what they have learned to subsequent

assignments, students synthesize information, modify concepts, and solidify their understanding. They grow up to be competent learners and readers. The ultimate goal of GRR model is for students to be able to independently apply their knowledge, concepts, content, skills, and strategies in a variety of situations. Making students who depend on others for information and ideas is not the model's goal. Students need to practice completing assignments independently as a result. Students use what they have learned in targeted lessons and guided instruction when they engage in inquiry with others, negotiate with peers, or discuss ideas and facts.

Methodology

The design of experiment

The current study employed a quasi-experimental design known as the Nonrandomized , pre-posttest design that has been chosen in order to meet its objectives and test its hypothesis. In this design, the groups of the study are randomly selected and assigned into two groups: an experimental group and a control group. individuals are not randomly chosen or assigned to groups; rather, they are naturally part of either group (Tavakoli, 2012) .

Population and Sample

Alvi (2016) states that " a population refers to all members who meet the particular criterion specified for a research investigation". The population of the present study includes fourth EFL Iraqi preparatory students in Al Diwaniyah Governorate .While the sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher intends to study in order to make generalizations about the target population (Creswell 2012).The sample of this study consists of (70) students who is chosen from the fourth grade at Al-Ghad Al-Mushriq preparatory school for

girls in Al Diwaniyah Governorate during the academic year (2025-2026).

Table 1 : The experimental design and sample of the study

Groups	NO	Pre-testing	Independent variable	Post-testing
Control	35	Reading comprehension	The gradual release of responsibility	Reading comprehension
Experimental	35			

Equalization

To ensure that the two groups are comparable on equal variables except for the independent variable, their equivalence was verified in this study. The equalization checking includes three variables :RC 's pre-test scores, age, and parental academic achievement. The data obtained from the instruments are statistically analyzed using t-test for two independent samples for continuous variables and the Chi-Square test for parental academic attainment. The T-test results demonstrate no statistically significant difference between the two groups, since the computed values for all variables are less than the Tabulated values of 2.00 at (0.05) level of significance with (68) degree of freedom. In addition ,the Chi-square values for father's academic achievement (1.141) and mother's education (1.056) were much less than the tabulated value of (7.81).

The findings explain no statistically difference between the experimental and control groups. Thus, their equivalence was confirmed before they are exposed to the treatment.

Table 2: Checking the equalization of the experimental and control groups in the reading comprehension pre-test, age.

Variable	Groups	NO.	M	SD	Calculated value	Tabulated value	Sig.
RC pre-test	EG	35	11.40	5.91	0.216	2.00	No
	CG	35	11.65	5.16			
Age	EG	35	199.97	5.17	0.259	2.00	No
	CG	35	200.25	3.96			

Table 3: Equalization of groups in parents' academic achievement

Parents	Groups	No	Prim.	Sec.	Inter.	High	x ² value	Tabulated value	Sig.
Father	EG	35	12	7	8	8	1.141	7.81	No
	CG	35	13	10	6	6			
Mother	EG	35	13	7	9	6	1.056	7.81	No
	CG	35	10	10	8	7			

Teaching Material

Five reading passages were chosen from the required textbook English for the fourth preparatory classes to be the material for the present study.

Instruments

The instrument is employed to accomplish the current study's aims; Reading comprehension test .

Reading comprehension test

To collect data regarding the variable of RC in the present study, a reading comprehension passage is adopted from (classroomsecrets.co.uk) and the test items is constructed by the researcher. The researcher constructed an test to evaluate learners' RC.

Designing two versions a pre-posttest .Each version includes a mix of short answer question, matching, multiple choice, and cloze test.

The test consists of four questions The first question is short answer questions the second question is multiple choice question (MCQs), and the third one is cloze test, and the fourth question is matching each question consists of five items that are administered to both the EG and CG. The post-test is conducted at the end of the experiment to assess the effect of the independent variable on students' R C posttest.

Face Validity

Face validity refers to the extent to which a test looks right, and appears to measure the knowledge or abilities it claims to measure, based on the subjective judgment of the examinees who take it, the administrative personnel who decide on its use and other psychometrically unsophisticated observers (Cumming & Berwick 1996).To insure face validity of the instrument of the study , The instruments is subjected to a jury of experts in ELT, Applied Linguistics, and the majority of jurors agree that the RC items are acceptable and appropriate for the study.

Pilot Administration of the Instruments

Before conducting the final version of the study instrument, it is important to conduct a pilot study to check the appropriateness of instrument items to the sample of the study and whether there is any ambiguity in items so that appropriate alternations can be made (Clark-Carter, 2004) .The pilot study aims to allow the researcher to obtain information about how the instrument works and to specify the estimated time required to answer all the items of instrument. Therefore, the RC test is conducted on (100) Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory students randomly selected. The results proved that the items are appropriate, acceptable practical for implementation. In

addition, it is determined that EFL preparatory students require 30 minutes to respond the test .

Construct validity

Construct validity is one of the most complex types of validity, in part because it is a composite of multiple validity approaches that are occurring simultaneously" (Tavakoli, 2012 p. 101). construct validity evaluates whether the underlying construct of a variable is accurately being measured. The construct validity of the study instrument is confirmed by statistical analysis which include the item difficulty level, item discrimination power, item distractors efficiency and items-total Correlation of the instrument of the study.

Difficulty level of RC test items

The difficulty level of a test items refers to how easy or difficult it is to answer the item (Erford, 2013).The difficulty level of test items of the current study is found to range between (0.35 - 0.60). Ebel and Frisbie (1972) suggest that the recommended, acceptable difficulty levels typically fall between (0.20) and (0.80) ,thus the test items are considered acceptable, and their difficulty coefficient is suitable.

Discrimination Power of RC test items

The discriminatory power for each item of the RC test, the discrimination coefficients of items ranged from (0.630 - 0.70). If the discriminatory power of items is greater than (0.30), then the items are considered acceptable (Ebel, 1972)Thus, the test items and its discrimination power are considered acceptable.

Items-Total Correlation of the test

The test is randomly administered to a sample of (100)students . after students' answers is scored. For the objective items, the researcher employed the Point-Biserial Correlation Coefficient; for the essay items, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. The computed correlation

coefficient values between each item and the total score of the test are higher than the correlation coefficient's tabulated value of 0.196, at a significance level of 0.05 and a degree of freedom of 98. As a result, the correlation coefficients are statistically significant, indicating that the test items are acceptable and internally consistent.

Distractors Efficiency of RC test

Distractors efficiency is a vital measure of the quality of multiple - choice items in a test. and is related to item discrimination .It refers to how effectively distractor attract test-takers ,especially low-ability students ,and ensure that these incorrect choices are fairly spread across all the distractors.(Brown,2004).After applying the distractor efficiency formula to the MCQ items of the RC test ,the results indicate that all distractors are effective .Their values ranged from (),thus ,no distractor is removed.

Reliability

The researcher uses the Cronbach's alpha equation to calculate the reliability of the RC test by taking the answers of the sample of (100) individuals, as the reliability coefficient reached (0.93), which indicates that the test has a good reliability coefficient. Such high reliability is considered acceptable since it is above value (0.67) (Nunnaly, 1972). Thus, the test in its final form consists of (20) items, which are appropriate and ready for application.

The Experiment

Beginning on September 28, 2025, and ending on January 15, 2026, was the duration of the experiment. Taking five days a week, that's fifteen weeks of it.

In order to carry out the present experiment, a set of lesson plans with comprehensive instructions on the methods and strategies used to instruct the two groups must be created. Concerning the experimental

group, the purpose of the first session was to familiarize the students with the GRR Model. Additionally introduced are the roles of the teacher and the students as well as the steps for implementing this model. RC is taught using the four phases of the GRR model, which was previously covered. On the other hand, the Teacher's Book instructions for the four preparatory classes are applied to teach the control group using the conventional method of teaching RC as it recommended by teacher's guide.

Final Administration of the instrument

After the experiment is over, the experimental group and the control group take the RC post-test on January 15, 2026. For the test and scale, 45 minutes are allocated for answering items.

Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

To achieve the aims of the current study, After calculating the two groups' mean scores on the RC test, the t-test for independent samples is employed to determine whether or not the mean differences are statistically significant. According to the study's hypotheses, the findings are discussed below.

Results Related to the hypothesis

As illustrated in table, the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the Reading comprehension test are (20.200) and (15.629) with standard deviations (2.459) and (3.531) respectively. Computed t-test value is found (6.168) which is found to be higher than the tabulated t-value (2.00) at the (0.05) significance level with (68) degrees of freedom.

The Mean, Standard Deviation and t-value of the two Independents Samples in Reading comprehension Post-Test for the EG and CG

Table 4

Group s	NO. of student s	Mean	SD	D.F	Comput ed t-value	Tabulate d t-value	Level of significan t	Finding
EG	35	20.200	2.459	68	6.168	2.00	0.05	Significan t to EG group
CG	35	15.629	3.531					

These results indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups in the Reading comprehension test and this difference is in favor of the experimental group as its mean score is higher than that of the control group. The first null hypothesis which suggests no difference between the groups ,is rejected and the alternative one which indicates a difference between the groups in RC test, is accepted.

Effect Size

Effect size is a method used to assess the practical significance of the findings in terms of group differences or the relationship between variables in the study (Creswell 2012). The researcher used the ETA-squared formula to evaluate the degree to which the observed differences were attributable to the study's independent variable in order to calculate the effect size using ETA-squared (N2). The researcher computed the ETA-squared value and then compared it to the accepted the established standards as in Table .

Table 5. The Established standards for Determining Effect Size Criteria .

Method Used	Effect Size		
	Small	Medium	Large
N2	0.01	0.06	0.14

The ETA-Squared(N2) value ,which represents the effect size of the teaching model on the RC variable , has been calculated. The table () shows the N2 value and the magnitude of the effect .

Table 6 .The N2 value and the Effect Size of the Teaching Model on RC :

Independent variable	dependent variable	Computed t-value	N2 value	Effect Size
GRR Model	RC	6.168	0.36	large

After employing the effect size formula the findings showed how the teaching model influenced the reading comprehension of the students in the experimental group. The effect size of the model was significant, as the n2 value (0.36) exceeded the established standard .This finding demonstrate the effect of the teaching model on the reading comprehension of the experimental group students.

Conclusions

Depending on the findings of the present study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The results of the current study reveal that using the Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) Model is effective in improving Iraqi EFL students 'reading comprehension performance.
2. students get better engagement in their reading comprehension performance throughout the experiment in which they continuously

practice gradual responsibility especially through the guided instruction and collaborative learning phases.

3.Students taught by using the GRR model demonstrate better engagement with reading tasks and activities compared with those taught through conventional method recommended by teacher's guide.

4.The guided and collaborative phases of the GRR model create a supportive and friendly learning environment in which students work together and exchange information and questions related to the texts and they get a teacher guidance and feedback ,such learning seemed to reduce learners' anxiety and fear of making mistakes.

.^٥ The GRR model also encourages active participation. It promotes an interest in developing instructional practices that engage the learner within meaningful interactions ;interactions in which students become more active rather than as passive participants .

Recommendations

In the light of the result and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are set foreword:

1. It is recommended that English teachers in Iraqi classrooms use the GRR model as an efficient teaching model to teach reading comprehension texts. "academic performance and affective factors," which are frequently overlooked in traditional instruction.
2. EFL teachers have to be aware of the GRR model's advantages in fostering a friendly and effective learning environment.
3. It is recommended that curriculum developers and syllabus designers base their curricula on the GRR model, creating learning objectives and instructional materials that correspond with its phases.
4. To improve the reading comprehension, a few steps must be taken. Such as students should master reading comprehension-related skills

like scanning and skimming. Additionally, they must increase their vocabulary because it is crucial to comprehending texts.

5. Teachers must teach students how to use reading strategies. Additionally, they are encouraged to provide students with a collaborative reading comprehension environment and to employ interactive teaching methods and models.

6. Teachers should be trained on how to help students in different phases of the GRR model reading process ,with special references to independent reading ,which is noticed to be more challenging phases to students than the other phases.

References

1. AL-Saadi, Z, M, H.(2019) The Effect of SQ3R Strategy on Iraqi EFL Preparatory School Students' Reading Comperhension.(Un puplished M. A Thesis). Iraq. College of Education. University of Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In What research has to say about reading instruction A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels, 205-242. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
2. Alvi M. H. (2016). A Manual for Selecting Sampling Techniques in Research (MPRA Paper, 70218, 1-56.) <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/70218/>.
3. Anthony, H. M., Pearson, P. D., & Raphael, T. E. (1993). Reading comprehension: A selected review. In L. M. Cleary & M. D. Linn (Eds.), Linguistics for teachers pp. (282-307). New York, McGraw Hill.
4. Asmaa' Hussain Jabir .(2013) .The Effect of Using Discovery learning by scaffolding on Iraqi EFL learner's Performance in Reading comprehension(Unpublished M.A. Thesis). University of AL-Mustansiriyah. College of Basic Education, Iraq

5. Brown, H. D.(2004). Language Assessment : Principle and Classroom Practices . Longman. (p.221-222).
6. Brown, H.D.(2007) .Teaching by Principle. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (3rd ed.). San Francisco State University.
7. Caldwell, J., Jennings, J., & Lerner, J. (2010). Reading Problems: Assessment and Teaching Strategies. Allyn & Bacon.
8. Clark-Carter, D. (2004). Quantitative psychological research: A students' handbook. Psychology Press.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
10. Cumming, A. H., & Berwick, R. (1996). Validation in language testing (Vol. 2):Multilingual Matters
11. Cumming, A. H., & Berwick, R. (1996). Validation in language testing (Vol. 2): Multilingual Matters.
12. Day, R.R. and Bamford, J. (1998) Extensive reading in the second language classroom. Cambridge University Press.
13. Donoghue ,M.(2009). language arts:integrating skills for classroom teaching .Sage Publications.
14. Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In What research has to say about reading instruction A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels, 205-242. Newark, DE: International Reading Association
15. Durkin, D. (1978-1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 481-533.
16. Ebel, R. L. (1972). Essentials of Educational Measurement. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

17. Ebel, R. L., and Frisbie, D. A. (1972). Essentials of Educational Measurement: Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ
18. Erford, B.T. (2013). Assessment for counselors (2nded.). Cengage Learning.
19. Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Homework and the gradual release of responsibility: Making "responsibility possible. English Journal, 98(2), 40-45
20. Fisher, D., & N. Frey, N. (2014). Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility (2nd ed.). ASCD.
21. Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2006). Language arts workshop: Purposeful reading and writing instruction. Merrill Education.
22. Gascoigne, C. (2005) .Toward an understanding of the relationship between L2 RC and grammar competence. The Reading Matrix, Vol. 5, 1–14.
23. Grab, W.(2009) .Reassessing the Term Interactivell. In P. Carrell, J. Devine, and D. Eskey (Eds.). Interactive Approaches To Second Language Reading. Cambridge University press.
24. Grabe, W.(2007).Reading in a second language :moving from theory to practice. Cambridge University press.
25. Ilustre, C. A.(2011). beliefs about reading , metacognitive reading strategies, and text comprehension among college students in a private university .Philippine ESL journal, 7, 28_47.
26. Mckee, S. (2012). Reading Comprehension, What We Know: A Review of Research 1995 to 2011. Language Testing in Asia 2, (45) Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-2-1-45>.
27. Nunnally, Jan C. (1972). Educational Measurement and Evaluation. (2nd ed.) McCraw-Hill.

28. Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 317-344
29. Pearson, P. D., McVee, M. B., & Shanahan, L. E. (2019) 'In the beginning: The conceptual and historical genesis of the gradual release of responsibility, in M. B. McVee, E. Ortlieb, J. S. Reichenberg. & P. D. Pearson eds., *The gradual release of responsibility in literacy research and practice* (pp. 1-21), Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited. doi:10.1108/S2048-045820190000010001
30. Pressley, M.(2000). What Should Comprehension Instruction Be the Instruction of? In: M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 545-561). Lawrence Erlbaum..
31. Rayner, K. & Pollatesk, A. (1989) *The psychology of reading*. Pretice - Hall. Reading Association
32. Sweet, A. P. and Snow, C., 2002. Reconceptualizing reading comprehension. In: C. C. Block, L. B. Gambrell, and M. Pressley, eds. *Improving comprehension instruction*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley. pp. 17-53.
33. Tavakoli, H. (2012). *A dictionary of research methodology and statistics in applied linguistics*. Rahnama
34. Veeravagu, J. V. J., Muthusamy, C., Marimuthu, R., & Michael, A. S. (2010). Using Bloom's taxonomy to gauge students' reading comprehension performance. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(3), 205-212.