



## STRATEGIES IDENTIFICATION IN AN EXPERIMENTAL READING COMPREHENSION TASK

*Sanda Stanković\**

Medical College “Milutin Milanković”, Belgrade

*Dejan Lalović*

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade

*Abstract.* Standardized reading comprehension tests (RCTs) usually consist of a small number of texts each accompanied by several multiple-choice questions, with texts and questions simultaneously presented. The score the common measure of reading comprehension ability in RCTs is the score. Literature review suggests that strategies subjects employ may influence their performance on RCT, however the score itself provides no information on the specific strategy employed. Knowledge of test-taking strategies could have impact on understanding of the actual purpose and benefits of using RCTs in pedagogical and psychological practice. With the ultimate objective of constructing a first standard RCT in Serbian language, the preliminary step we took was to conduct an experimental reading comprehension task (ERCT) consisting of 27 short texts displayed in succession, each followed by a single multiple-choice question. Using qualitative analysis of subjects' responses in semi-structured post-experimental interview, we identified four overall strategies used on ERCT. Our results show that groups of students who used specific strategies differed significantly from one another in text reading time, with no differences found regarding the question reading and answering time. More importantly, there were no significant between-group differences found in terms of ERCT score. These findings suggest that choice of strategy is a way to optimize the relation between one's own potential and ERCT task requirements. RCT based on ERCT principles would allow for a flexible choice of strategy which would not influence the final score.

*Keywords:* reading strategies, reading comprehension, construct validity, qualitative-quantitative approach.

Reading comprehension tests (hereinafter referred to as RCT) are important instruments in psychological-pedagogical practice. Different versions of RCT are part of admission or placement exams in a number of educational institutions, and are often used in assessment of results of educational process in native and foreign languages, as well as effects of schooling in general. Nevertheless, there is no standard RCT in Serbian, although different

---

\* E-mail: sanda.stankovic@gmail.com

reading comprehension tasks have been used for research purposes. (e.g. Pavlović, 1990; Pavlović-Babić & Baucal, 2009).

RCTs have been frequently criticized regarding basic, fundamental test assumptions (e.g. Katz *et al.*, 1990). Criticism mainly questions construct validity of RCT, that is, what these tests in fact measure. What ability, or abilities, do measures we get by administering RCTs inform us on? The purpose and benefits of RCT usage in pedagogical and psychological practice shall depend on the answer to this question. To be able to answer it, we consider it crucial to gain insight into how subjects approach the RCT, and what kind of processing, that is, which overall strategies, they use to complete RCT.

Standard RCT format is mostly paper-pencil one and consists of a few longer texts accompanied with several multiple-choice questions each, with text and accompanying questions available to the subject at the same time (see the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Riverside Publishing 1999 Education Catalog). The almost exclusive measure of RCT performance, meaning also measure of reading comprehension ability, is the number of correct answers. However, the format of these tests, as shown by several studies, encourages the “searching for answers in the text” strategy, which implies that subjects do not even have to read the text integrally in order to answer questions that are assessing text’s comprehension (Cordón & Day, 1996). Research of subjects’ general approaches to standard RCTs confirm these findings and roughly specify overall strategies that subjects use to actually evade the cognitive action that is the core objective of assessment with RCT – reading comprehension. They do it by first skimming the whole article or its part, then reading the accompanying questions, and after that returning to the text to find the answers, or by going directly to questions and then searching the text for answers (Cerdan *et al.*, 2009; Farr *et al.*, 1990). Should we accept the definition that “comprehension is defined as the forming of a coherent cognitive model of the text meaning” (Johnston, 1984: 236), then a fair number of standard RCTs could not be considered completely construct valid, because it endorses task strategies that are not directly related to reading and comprehending of what was read.

As a preliminary step towards the construction and standardization of RCT in Serbian, we conducted a research using an experimental reading comprehension task (ERCT). ERCT was constructed with the intention to prevent above mentioned problems of standard RCTs (Lalović & Stanković, 2008). ERCT reading material consisted of brief newspaper articles, while understanding of each text was tested with a single multiple choice question,

containing also the alternative “none of the above”<sup>1</sup>. We chose to present the texts and accompanying questions in succession, not simultaneously. Our basic assumption was that such choice of material, the number and form of questions, as well the way of presenting, was going to lower the probability of or even preclude strategies that compromise construct validity of RCT, primarily guessing the answer or searching for answers in the text after the question has been read.

Bearing in mind the key features of ERCT, the fact that ERCT is significantly and in several aspects different from standard RCT in foreign languages and that the same may well be the case with the paper-pencil RCT in Serbian to be composed according to ERCT principles, we posed following questions as objectives of the study:

- would the subjects use strategies for solving ERCT?
- if yes, what kind of strategies, and
- what would the relation between strategy use and ERCT performance measures be?

In an attempt to answer these questions, we conducted the ERCT and then applied a semi-structured post-experimental interview in order to identify overall task-taking strategies used by the subjects. We employed qualitative method for identification of strategies, and opted for semi-structured interview due to exploratory nature of the study, which required laying emphasis on authenticity and exhaustiveness of data obtained. Therefore, subjects first reported on their approach to the task, as broader as possible, with the minimum of researcher’s interference. Afterwards, researcher would use specific questions to direct them to certain aspects of their work process (see the Appendix).

### *Method*

*Participants.* The experiment involved 82 students of psychology at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, with Serbian being their mother-tongue. The sample consisted of 70 females and 12 males. All participants had normal eyesight or eyesight corrected to normal. Participation in the experiment was one way of fulfilling a course requirement the subjects were made clear that gaining the assigned number of credits was only related to their test taking, and would not in any way be related to their performance in the ERCT.

---

<sup>1</sup> Principles and procedures of text- selection can be found in Lalović and Stanković, 2008.

*Procedure*<sup>2</sup>. ERCT was performed by using a PC which enabled both presentation of stimuli and measuring test-taking time. The reading comprehension task consisted of 29 texts each followed by a multiple-choice question. The first two texts were sample texts intended for practice. Texts and the accompanying questions were displayed successively, the text first, and then the question with the answers offered. The reading task was preceded by an exercise of providing the responses via numeric keypad. The reading task instructions equally emphasized the importance of speed, as well as the accuracy of responding. Subjects were informed that the working pace, that is the text and question reading time, would be their own, but that the total time for work is limited to 20 minutes. Experimenter used a stopwatch for this purpose. After the expiry of the 20 minute period, he would inform the subjects on this, but also state that this did not mean they were to stop working and that the task was to be completed. Thus, although the actual time limit for the completion of the work did not exist, it was falsely introduced at the beginning of the task so as to minimize the attempts of memorizing texts literally, which would take long period of time. The actual time needed to finish the task was measured and registered. Subjects were told that they would be provided with notification on the screen after having done one and two-thirds of the task. In addition to that, they had the possibility to ask the researcher at any point about the time they had left. Information on the accuracy of answers was not given, except in two text samples for practice. ERCT was done individually, and the average duration of experimental sessions was 30 minutes (ranging from 17 to 45 minutes). Subjects' performance measures were recorded: text reading time, question reading and answering time, and accuracy of answers, both for 20 minute period, and the entire working period of each participant.

Immediately after completing the ERCT, a semi-structured interview was conducted with each of the students. The average duration of the interview sessions was 13 minutes, ranging from 5 to 20 minutes. Interviews were voice-recorded, then transcribed, and the transcripts were qualitatively analyzed.

### *Results*

Table 1 shows the ERCT performance measures of participants treated as a homogenous group.

---

<sup>2</sup> Detailed description of structure and technical aspects of the ERCT procedure can be found in Lalović and Stanković (Lalović i Stanković, 2008).

Table 1: Means, standard deviations and distribution normality tests for all ERCT performance measures (N=82)

Variable	Mean [SD]	Kolmogorov- Smirnov test	
		Statistic	p
<b>Performance measures related to speed</b>			
Total time of ERCT completion in seconds (TT)	1 428 [352]	.110	.016
Total reading time of texts in s (TTT)	1 071 [274]	.120	.005
Total reading and answering time of questions in s (TTQ)	311 [88]	.083	.200
Total time of reading texts and reading and answering questions in s (TTR)	1 383 [342]	.097	.053
Average reading time of texts in s (ATT)	40 [10]	.090	.096
Average reading and answering time of questions in s (ATQ)	12 [3]	.087	.196
Number of questions answered in 20 min (NQ20)	22.35 [4.16]	.177	.000
<b>Performance measures concerning accuracy</b>			
Score in 20 min (S20)	13.69 [3.33]	.091	.090
Total score (TS)	16.54 [4.07]	.088	.187

Table 1 overview suggests that the apparent time limit of 20 minutes for ERCT completion did not significantly change the performance data obtained without time limit. Total time for ERCT completion (TT) was 23 minutes on average, and the difference between total scores (TS) and scores obtained in 20 minute period (S20) was less than 3 correct answers. Both total ERCT scores (TS), as well as 20 minute scores (S20) were distributed normally, which indicates good discriminability of ERCT, in limited time condition and in an unlimited time condition.

*Identified overall strategies in ERCT.* Using qualitative analyses of interview transcripts, we identified four general approaches spontaneously used by the subjects in ERCT. The strategies below represent exclusive and exhaustive categories.

*Strategy 1* may be termed as “reading to comprehend” or formulated in words of one of the participants: “I’m just reading normally and whatever stays in my mind – stays”. Participants who used it read the texts the same way they read newspapers or literature and did not put any additional effort in memorizing information. All they did was trying to comprehend what they were reading, the essence of the text. What they remembered was what was spontaneously left after having read the text as well as what made an impression on them for any reason. Most often, that was the essence of the text together with some striking details. The subjects mostly did not anticipate questions. They gave advantage to speed (finishing the task in 20 minutes), over accuracy. Out of reading strategies in most narrow sense these students only used rereading of whole text or parts of the text, and that occasionally. As for the reasons for using the overall strategy “reading to compre-

hend”, one part of the subjects stated that the questions suggested this kind of approach, because the questions required comprehension of the essence of the text. Another part of participants claimed that the time limit was the reason for their choice, while others assigned this work method to fatigue or poor motivation. Subjects who were governed by the time limit stated that they would have done the tasks differently in case of unlimited time; they would read the text several times and try to memorize some information.

*Strategy 2: “memorizing relevant information”.* Subjects who used this strategy selected relevant information and put effort into memorizing them. Important information for them most often included striking details, interesting and ambiguous parts – “key points”. The participants were often not able to specify criteria for determining relevant information. They mostly referred to it as something specific to the text itself, and claimed that questions referring to previous texts provided a useful guideline for selecting information in following texts. This was confirmed by the fact that most subjects who used this strategy stated that they tried to predict content of questions. All subjects in this group used some of the specific memorizing techniques – repeating, rereading of certain pieces of information presented in the text, quick skimming of text after the first reading, visualizing, summary making, text retelling. Using memorizing techniques is what undeniably distinguishes them from the first group. The majority of subjects in this group, in contrast to the previous one, favored accuracy rather than speed and reported they would have worked in the same way even in the case of unlimited time. However, a smaller number of subjects in this group who were more concerned with speed, would, in case of unlimited time, be trying to memorize more information.

*Strategy 3: “Memorizing as much information as possible”.* This strategy involved significant effort to memorize as much information as possible from each text. Subjects from this group did not make the selection of information based on their relevance. Ideally, if the task was not time limited, they would memorize each text in detail. What is specific about these subjects is that they tried to memorize a variety of information and details, as many as possible. For this purpose, they used specific memorizing techniques, such as: subsequent focus of attention to details, use of associations, categorising information in groups, connecting them with their own experience, visual memorizing of the text. The details memorized were, for example: proper names, names of cities and states, names of organizations and companies, numbers, dates. These subjects anticipated questions throughout the task, and what is striking is that they kept expecting questions that would ask for specific details, which was in no way explicitly suggested neither

by instructions nor previous questions. Interestingly, a number of subjects from this group said this was the same strategy they used when learning for their studies – not making a selection, but attaching the same importance to every piece of information, and “learning by heart”. Most of the subjects who used this strategy, agreed that their preoccupation with every detail frequently reduced their ability to grasp the essence of the text that was actually required, as well as that texts full of details inhibited them. They also reported on increased anxiety (even panic, in the words one subject), due to time limit pressure and inability to memorize everything.

*Strategy 4: “Changing strategies”.* Subjects in this group altered strategies during work. The criterion for inclusion in this group was at least one alteration of strategy. This is the most diversified category, due to differences in the way strategies were shifted, the shift frequency and factors that caused the change. Two different lines of changing strategies are distinguished. One line represents the alteration of three previously described strategies, as the result of practicing, limited time effect or content of questions. Subjects said that, due to practice effect, they shifted from first strategy to second one (from reading to comprehend to memorizing relevant information) or, from second to third (from memorizing relevant information to memorizing as much information as possible), or that they shifted in opposite direction due to time constraints (from memorizing as much information as possible to reading to comprehend). The frequency of such strategy shifts was usually two or three times for the entire test-taking period, with some subjects shifting strategies in both directions. Most frequent signals for this kind of strategy shift was the information on the completion of first or second third of the task. The second line of change represents frequent changes of previously described strategies from one text to another, depending on texts’ saturation with information, style and length, as well as subjects judgement on how interesting the texts were. These subjects also altered memorizing techniques, types of information they were focused on, as well as the number of times they read texts. While some subjects employed only one line of strategy changing, others employed both. With all subjects from this group however, it was obvious that question content, as well as inability to provide answers were one of the causes for strategy change. Unlike subjects using other three strategies, all subjects from this group were more susceptible to influences of either external factors (questions, types of text, time limit) or internal factors (practicing, the feeling of not being successful, not being able to answer a question etc). Also, subjects in this group were more likely to self-question themselves - if their method was a proper one, if they had enough time, what was the best way to approach the text etc.

The subjects were almost evenly distributed in relation to strategy usage (Table 2).

Table 2: Number of participants using specific strategies

Strat	Name	Frequency
1	Read to comprehend (RC)	22
2	Memorizing relevant information (MR)	20
3	Memorizing as much information as possible (MM)	17
4	Changing strategies (CS)	23
Total		82

Analysis of performance measures in groups of subjects using specific strategies in ERCT. Table 3 shows the average values of performance measures for each of the subsample according to strategy employed.

Table 3: Performance measures of subjects using specific strategies

Variable*	Subsamples of subjects using specific strategies*			
	RFU Mean [SD]	MR Mean [SD]	MM Mean [SD]	CS Mean [SD]
TT in s	1 284 [296]	1 418 [257]	1 678 [447]	1 391 [317]
TTT in s	944 [211]	1 066 [217]	1 283 [340]	1 041 [242]
TTQ in s	296 [95]	310 [76]	339 [89]	309 [92]
TTR in s	1 240 [291]	1 375 [254]	1 623 [421]	1 350 [316]
ATT in s	36 [8]	40 [8]	48 [13]	39 [9]
ATQ in s	11 [4]	12 [3]	13 [3]	12 [3]
NQ20	23.82 [3.54]	22.40 [3.55]	19.65 [5.02]	22.91 [3.79]
S20	14.09 [4.03]	13.25 [3.52]	13.00 [4.54]	14.23 [4.35]
TS	15.91 [3.25]	16.15 [3.00]	17.41 [3.62]	16.82 [3.50]

\* Full names of variables and strategies, together with measure-labeling are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

One way analysis of variance with type of strategy as factor shows that five of all the obtained differences are significant (Table 4).

Table 4: One way ANOVA of average performance measures with used ERCT strategy as factor

Measure	F (3, 79)	p	$\eta^2$
TT	3.541	.018	.120
TTT	4.784	.004	.155
TTQ	.796	.500	.030
TTR	3.394	.022	.115
ATT	5.463	.002	.174
ATQ	.660	.579	.025
NQ20	3.255	.026	.113
TS	.430	.732	.016
S20	.793	.501	.030



Subjects who used different strategies differ significantly in time of ERCT completion – both in “gross” time (TT), as well as in “net” time (TTR), which included only reading of texts along with reading and answering questions, without breaks made between task items. Differences are also evident in total (TTT), and in average reading time of texts (ATT), as well as in the number of questions answered in 20 minutes (NQ20). If we look at values in Table 3, having in mind that no significant differences in reading and answering questions were noted, it can be concluded that all significant differences come down to the one crucial difference – *reading time of texts*. We put a special emphasis on the fact that the differences between groups in terms of score were insignificant - neither for 20 minutes of work (S20), nor after completion of work (TS). By knowing the strategy used by the subject, we can explain 11.3 to 17.4 per cent variance of performance measures (see  $\eta^2$  in Table 4).

Table 5 presents the results of subsequent multiple comparisons, that reached the required level of statistical significance. Scheffe’s test showed that in all presented measures, the groups that significantly differ from each other are subjects who read to comprehend (group 1) and those who memorize as much information as possible (group 3). Concerning the average text reading time, the subjects that change strategies (group 4) and those who try to memorize as much information as possible, significantly differ as well.

*Table 5: Post hoc comparison tests between groups of subjects using different strategies*

Measure	Groups (strategies) that significantly differed from each other	Scheffe’s test ( <i>p</i> )*
TT	RFU and MM	.020
TTT	RFU and MM	.004
TTR	RFU and MM	.023
ATR	RFU and MM	.002
	RFU and CS	.045
NQ20	RFU and MM	.032

\* Average measure differences can be seen in Table 3.

### *Discussion*

The objective of this research was to investigate whether different strategies would emerge in ERCT, which we considered to be a crucial preliminary step in constructing a RCT in Serbian. Other objectives were to identify these strategies and to investigate the relation of identified strategies to per-

formance measures. Our main finding is that, using the qualitative analysis of post-experimental semi-structured interviews, we distinguished four basic overall strategies in ERCT. We identified them as: reading to comprehend, memorizing relevant information, memorizing as much information as possible, and changing of strategies. The first strategy corresponds to the cognitive activity that we usually regard as reading comprehension in narrow sense. According to a classification of approaches and strategies of reading material for different purposes, it would be most similar to reading of one's own choice (Lorch *et al.*, 1993). Other strategies are more focused on successful solving of the task and match the strategies used for learning and mastering materials for various academic purposes.

Data on distribution of time needed to complete the ERCT correspond with the content of strategies, that was identified by qualitative analysis of subjects' reports. These quantitative performance data suggest that differences between groups that used different strategies are to be found primarily in the time devoted to reading of texts. Groups of subjects differ in direct measure of total text reading time (TTT), as well as in terms of other measures related to speed, which, in absence of differences in time dedicated to reading and answering questions, practically depend exclusively on the TTT. Differences consistently appear between groups of subjects who read to comprehend and those who memorize as much information as possible, which could be expected based on insights in how they approached the task and techniques they used in solving the ERCT.

Although subjects using different strategies differ in total scores and 20 minute scores, these differences did not reach levels of statistic significance. While acknowledging the average size of our sample, we still claim that even if these differences were statistically significant, they would not be substantial in size. Given the similar scores distribution, the maximum differences between groups of approximately 1 point for 20 minutes, or 1,5 point in total time are not the values that would dramatically change relative position of subjects from different strategies groups, the position that would be established in analysis with subject sample treated as homogenous. And this is exactly what we do when administering standard RCTs. First significant implication of these data for the construction of paper-pencil RCT is that the choice of overall test taking strategy would not impact the main RCT performance measure – the score. Another implication is that the limiting test-taking would not have significant negative impact on scores, regardless of strategy employed. In other words, RCT based on ERCT principles and content could be regarded as speeded test – as all existing standard RCTs – without favorizing or disfavorizing students using any of the identi-

fied strategies. Somewhat more flexible explanation of the obtained relation between strategies and performance measures in ERCT, is that this task, because of its content and format, allows subjects to choose the strategy that optimizes use of their cognitive potentials and reading and learning habits, with the purpose of getting the best possible score. In situations when score is the only measure obtained, this characteristic of ERCT and subsequent RCT could be regarded as beneficial.

There are, however, several possible limitations to present study. ERCT was constructed in such a way that it represents only one type of reading situations, specifically the one that has success/performance as the final goal. In addition to this, our sample consisted of university students who typically read bearing in mind that what they read would be somehow checked and evaluated afterwards. ERCT, which was performed at the university, thus resembled an exam situation, although we tried to avoid attributing particular importance to success in the task, both via instructions and implicitly. Reading is defined as a purposeful activity that requires the reader to engage in a series of interactive processes and strategies associated with the purpose of this activity (Hall, 1989). No matter how we define the reading situation from the outside - from our perspective of experimenter or test administrator, credible insight into strategies in RCTs are difficult to obtain without knowing how the subject perceives the situation of the text reading task, how he/she subjectively defines the reading task, as well as what kind of results or consequences he/she expects - because administering RCTs often burries very specific consequences for him/her. Therefore, in further research of reading comprehension process and strategies, we pledge for further combining of qualitative with quantitative data which has already become a distinctive form of so-called mixed-methodological research design (Ševkušić, 2009). Principles of combining these two sources of data would depend on the priority of specific study (for example, obtaining normative data in contrast to the analysis of individual and group results), as well as on specific research questions posed. Such principles have been, to our knowledge, developed and successfully implemented more than once (Morgan, 1998; Borland, 2001).

## APPENDIX

### *Postexperimental, semi-structured interview*

*Instructions to the subject.* Now that you have completed the experiment, the interview follows. What interests us is the way you were solving/doing the task. In this regard, there are several questions on this sheet of pa-

per. Please, read them first and think about them briefly and then, we shall talk.

*The question sheet given to the subject contained the following questions:*

Were you using any specific way of solving or strategy during the task?

- Is it just one or more strategies?
- Describe the strategies used.
- Were you using the same strategies for each text or you altered them while working?
- If you altered them, describe in what way (what caused the strategy shift: type of text, content of the question, the length of text or something else).
- Were you altering strategies as the task was progressing (remember the information about the end of the first or the second third of the task)?
- If yes, how?
- How often were you altering strategies, switching from one to another?
- Do you consider these strategies successful, did they provide you with correct answers? Were some of them more successful than others?
- Proportionally, how much attention did you pay to the texts, or questions, in proportion to their volume?

The question sheet in front of the experimenter contained all of the previous questions, together with the additional ones:

- If the subject says that he separated relevant from irrelevant information, ask him what were the criteria.
- How many times did he read the texts, what was the difference between the first and the second time, did he read each text the same number of times?
- Did he anticipate questions?
- Did he feel tired at some point and how did it reflect on his way of work?
- When the subject could not provide the answer to a question, did it cause a change in his way of work concerning the following text or texts?
- Did he try to memorize certain information and in what way (e.g. repeating, mental representation)?
- How did the time limit affect the work? Would the subject work differently if there was no time limit?

- What was more important to the subject: to manage to complete the entire task in the prescribed period or to give correct answers, at his own pace?
- How did the subject answer the questions? (Did the answer immediately occur to him, so he sought it among the offered or he read the answers and go for recognition? Did he read the answers offered to the very end or stop as soon as he sees the correct answer?)
- What does the subject see as the cause of his good/bad performance?

### References

- Borland, K. (2001): Qualitative and quantitative research: a complementary balance, *New Directions for Institutional Research*, Vol. 112, 5-13.
- Bråten, I. & S.M. Samuelsten (2004): Does the influence of reading purpose on reports of strategic text processing depend on students' topic knowledge? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 96, No. 2, 324-336.
- Cerdán, R., E. Vidal-Abarca, T. Martínez, R. Gilabert & L. Gil (2009): Impact of question-answering tasks on search processes and reading comprehension, *Learning and Instruction*, Vol. 19, 13-27.
- Cordón, L.A. & D.J. Day (1996): Strategy use on standardized reading comprehension tests, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 88, No. 2, 288-295.
- Education Catalog* (1999). Itaca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Farr, R., R. Pritchard & B. Smitten (1990): What happens when an examinee takes a multiple-choice reading comprehension test, *Journal of Educational Measurement*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 209-226.
- Hall, S.W. (1989): Reading comprehension, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 44, No. 2, 157-161.
- Johnston, P. (1984): Prior knowledge and reading comprehension test bias, *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 219-239.
- Katz, S., G. Lautenschlager, A. Blackburn & F. Harns (1990): Answering reading comprehension items without passages on the SAT, *Psychological Science*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 122-127.
- Lalović, D. i S. Stanković (2008): Pouke jednog zadatka čitanja sa razumevanjem, *Psihologija*, Vol. 41, No. 4, 507-522.
- Lorch, R.F., E.P. Lorch & M.A. Klusewitz (1993): College students' conditional knowledge about reading, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 239-252.
- Morgan, D. (1998): Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: applications to health research, *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 362-376.
- Pavlović, D. (1990): Osnovna jezička pismenost; u N. Havelka i D. Pavlović (prir.): *Efekte osnovnog školovanja* (101-114). Beograd: Institut za psihologiju.
- Pavlović-Babić, D. i A. Baucal (2009): *Razumevanje pročitano PISA 2003 i PISA 2007*. Beograd: Ministarstvo prosvete Republike Srbije, Zavod za vrednovanje kvaliteta obrazovanja i vaspitanja i Institut za psihologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Ševkušić, S. (2009): Kombinovanje kvalitativnih i kvantitativnih metoda u proučavanju obrazovanja i vaspitanja, *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, God. 41, Br. 1 (45-60). Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.

Санда Станковић и Дејан Лаловић  
ИСПИТАНИКА У ЕКСПЕРИМЕНТАЛНОМ ЗАДАТКУ  
ЧИТАЊА СА РАЗУМЕВАЊЕМ

*Резиме*

Стандардизовани тестови способности читања са разумевањем (ТЧР) обично се састоје од мањег броја текстова праћених са по неколико питања типа вишеструког избора једновремено доступних испитаницима. Уобичајену меру способности читања са разумевањем представља скор у ТЧР. Литература сугерише да стратегије које испитаници примењују могу имати утицаја на успешност у ТЧР изражену скором, који пак не даје информацију о примењеној стратегији. Од познавања стратегија решавања може зависити сврха и корист од примене ТЧР у педагошко-психолошкој пракси. У циљу конструкције стандардног ТЧР који на српском језику не постоји, као почетни корак извели смо експериментални задатак читања са разумевањем (ЕЗЧР) сачињен од 27 сукцесивно приказаних кратких текстова и по једног питања вишеструког избора. Квалитативном анализом одговора у полуструктурисаном постексперименталном интервјуу, идентификовали смо четири уопштене стратегије решавања ЕЗЧР. Групе студената, које су користиле различите стратегије, разликовале су се у погледу брзине којом су читале текстове. Међутим, није било разлике у погледу питања приказаних након текста. Значајније, групе се нису разликовале у погледу скорa у ЕЗЧР. Ови подаци сугеришу да избор стратегије представља начин да се оптимализује однос властитих потенцијала и захтева ЕЗЧР. ТЧР сачињен на принципима ЕЗЧР допуштао би релативно флексибилан избор стратегије, који се не би очитовао на скору.

*Кључне речи:* стратегије читања, читање са разумевањем, хипотетичка ваљаност, квалитативно-квантитативни приступ.

Санда Станкович и Деян Лалович  
ВЫЯВЛЕНИЕ И СОДЕРЖАНИЕ СТРАТЕГИЙ ИСПЫТУЕМЫХ  
В ЭКСПЕРИМЕНТАЛЬНОЙ ЗАДАЧЕ ЧТЕНИЯ С ПОНИМАНИЕМ СМЫСЛА

*Резюме*

Стандартизированные тесты способностей чтения с пониманием смысла прочитанного (ТЧП) обычно состоят из небольшого числа текстов, сопровождаемых несколькими вопросами типа выбора одной из предложенных возможностей, одновременно доступных испытуемым. Обычной мерой способности чтения с пониманием смысла прочитанного считается результат на ТЧП. В литературе высказывается мнение, что стратегии, применяемые испытуемыми, могут влиять на успеваемость в ТЧП, выказанную в баллах, которые, однако, не дают информации о примененной стратегии. От ознакомленности со стратегиями решения могут зависеть назначение и польза от применения ТЧП на практике педагогической и психологической деятельности. В целях конструирования стандартного ТЧП, еще не имеющегося на сербском языке, мы провели экспериментальную задачу чтения с пониманием смысла (ЭЗЧП), составленную из 27 коротких текстов, представленных в порядке преемственности, и сопровождаемыми 27 вопросами типа выбора одной из предложенных возможностей.

На основании качественного анализа ответов в полуструктурированном пост-экспериментальном интервью, нами выявлены четыре обобщенных стратегии решения ЭЗЧП. Группы студентов, использовавшие разные стратегии, различались по критерию скорости прочтения текстов. Однако, различий в отношении точности ответов на вопросы после текста не оказалось. Между группами не было также заметных различий в результатах ЭЗЧП. Приведенные данные указывают на то, что выбор стратегии является способом оптимизации своих потенциалов и требований ЭЗЧП. ТЧП, составленный по принципам ЭЗЧП, допускает сравнительно гибкий выбор стратегии, который не воздействует на итоговый результат в баллах.

*Ключевые слова:* стратегии чтения, чтение с пониманием смысла, гипотетическая правильность, качественно-количественный подход.