



La instrucción en skimming y scanning para la comprensión lectora en inglés como lengua extranjera: un estudio de aula

Skimming and Scanning Instruction for EFL Reading Comprehension: A Classroom Study

Carlos Lenin Alvarez Llerena

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7263-2611>

carloso@student.elte.hu

Eötvös Loránd University
Hungria – Budapest

Juan Javier Navarro Macias

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5069-4595>

juan.navarrom@ube.edu.ec

Universidad Bolivariana del Ecuador
Ecuador - Durán

Article received: (10/06/2026) - Accepted for publication: 25/07/2026

Conflicts of interest: None to declare.

*Corresponding author

Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Alvarez Llerena, C., Navarro Macias, J. (2026). Skimming and scanning instruction for EFL reading comprehension: A classroom study. *Linguattech*, 2(2), pages 16-31.

RESUMEN

La lectura con un propósito exige que los estudiantes adapten su enfoque al texto y a la tarea. Este estudio de acción de aula, de métodos mixtos, examinó una secuencia de cuatro semanas de instrucción explícita en skimming y scanning para estudiantes de secundaria superior de inglés como lengua extranjera con niveles aproximados A1-A2. Treinta y ocho estudiantes completaron evaluaciones de lectura en el aula antes y después de ocho sesiones de 45 minutos; un registro de encuesta de referencia independiente contenía 40 respuestas. Las lecciones combinaron predicción, modelado docente, búsquedas cronometradas, identificación de la idea principal, verificación colaborativa y razonamiento posterior a la lectura. El compuesto de seis partes aumentó descriptivamente de 19.92 a 26.76 sobre 55, una ganancia de 6.84 puntos (34.3% en relación con la línea base). Los mayores incrementos por componente se registraron en pensamiento crítico (+3.29) e idea principal/detalles de apoyo (+2.84); el vocabulario (+1.37), la inferencia (+0.60) y el reconocimiento de palabras (+0.29) también aumentaron, mientras que la fluidez disminuyó (-1.55). Los temas de las entrevistas sugirieron una mayor conciencia estratégica, confianza y transferencia percibida a otras asignaturas, aunque los estudiantes también reportaron que la lectura rápida podía omitir detalles relevantes y que el scanning requería tiempo. Los hallazgos respaldan la viabilidad de la instrucción explícita en estrategias con un propósito definido, no un efecto causal. No se dispuso de grupo de control, puntajes a nivel de participante, estimaciones de dispersión, medida diferida ni tamaño de la muestra de entrevistas; los denominadores de la encuesta y de la evaluación también difirieron. La investigación futura debería emplear pruebas paralelas, un modelo de puntuación preregistrado, datos pareados, calificación independiente y una condición de comparación.



Palabras clave: skimming, scanning, comprensión lectora, inglés como lengua extranjera, instrucción en estrategias, investigación-acción

ABSTRACT

Purposeful reading requires learners to match their approach to a text and task. This mixed-methods classroom action study examined a four-week sequence of explicit skimming and scanning instruction for upper-secondary EFL learners working around CEFR A1-A2. Thirty-eight students completed classroom reading assessments before and after eight 45-minute sessions; a separate baseline survey record contained 40 responses. Lessons combined prediction, teacher modeling, timed searches, main-idea identification, collaborative checking, and post-reading reasoning. The six-part composite increased descriptively from 19.92 to 26.76 out of 55, a gain of 6.84 points (34.3% relative to baseline). The largest component increases were recorded for critical thinking (+3.29) and main idea/supporting details (+2.84); vocabulary (+1.37), inference (+0.60), and word recognition (+0.29) also rose, whereas fluency decreased (-1.55). Interview themes suggested greater strategic awareness, confidence, and perceived transfer to other subjects, but learners also reported that rapid reading could omit relevant details and that scanning required time. The findings support the feasibility of explicit, purpose-driven strategy instruction, not a causal effect. No control group, participant-level scores, dispersion estimates, delayed measure, or interview sample size was available; survey and assessment denominators also differed. Future research should use parallel tests, a preregistered scoring model, paired data, independent rating, and a comparison condition. **Keywords:** skimming, scanning, reading comprehension, EFL, strategy instruction, action research

INTRODUCTION

Reading in an additional language is not a single operation. Readers identify written words, activate linguistic and topic knowledge, connect propositions, monitor understanding, infer information that is not explicit, and regulate attention according to a purpose. Contemporary accounts therefore treat comprehension as an interaction among word recognition, language comprehension, knowledge, executive processes, motivation, and the demands of a particular text and task (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). A learner may decode a sentence accurately yet fail to integrate its meaning, or may understand a familiar topic while reading too slowly to complete a time-limited task.



The challenge is intensified in English as a foreign language (EFL). Limited vocabulary and grammatical knowledge place pressure on working memory, while unfamiliar spelling-sound relationships can slow word recognition. Beginning readers frequently respond by translating word by word or stopping at every unknown item. These behaviors may be useful in a narrowly focused language-analysis task, but they are inefficient when the purpose is to obtain an overview or locate a date, name, definition, or supporting detail. Effective instruction should help learners decide what level of attention a reading purpose requires.

Skimming and scanning are rapid, purpose-specific reading processes. Scanning directs visual attention toward a target form or information category, such as a number, name, location, or keyword. Skimming samples a text to construct a provisional understanding of its topic, organization, or central message. Grabe and Yamashita (2022) distinguish reading to search for information, quick understanding, learning, synthesis, evaluation, and general comprehension. Skimming and scanning are appropriate for the first two purposes, but neither replaces close reading when evidence must be interpreted, evaluated, or remembered in depth.

This distinction is pedagogically important. A strategy is a deliberate, goal-directed action selected and monitored by a reader; with practice, some strategic actions may become more fluent skills (Afflerbach et al., 2008). Teaching learners simply to read faster can therefore be counterproductive. Speed is useful only when paired with a clear target, a suitable text, and a verification step. If learners skim without checking, they may miss qualifications or confuse a striking detail with the main idea. If they scan without understanding the task, they may locate a matching word but select the wrong information.

At CEFR A2, readers are expected to understand short, simple texts on familiar, concrete matters and to locate specific, predictable information in everyday material (Council of Europe, 2020). A2 descriptors also recognize the value of exploiting layout, numbers, dates, names, and typographic features to identify a text or topic. These abilities align naturally with scanning and guided skimming, provided texts contain accessible language and tasks do not demand proficiency beyond the learners' level. Strategy instruction must therefore control both linguistic difficulty and cognitive purpose.

Research on comprehension instruction favors an integrated approach. Explicit strategy teaching can improve comprehension, but instruction should also develop word reading, vocabulary, knowledge, text-structure awareness, discussion, writing about



texts, and motivation (Duke et al., 2021). Word knowledge is especially central because efficient lexical access supports the integration of meanings across sentences (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). A short intervention centered on skimming and scanning should thus be understood as one component of a balanced reading program rather than a complete theory of reading development.

Metacognition provides a second rationale. Skilled readers set a goal, select an approach, notice when meaning breaks down, and change tactics. Self-report instruments such as the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory organize these actions into global, problem-solving, and support strategies (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). In instruction, the corresponding sequence is concrete: state the purpose, preview the text, predict likely content, search or sample selectively, compare the result with the task, and reread closely when confidence is low. Teacher modeling can make normally invisible decisions available for observation and practice.

Classroom action research is useful for examining whether such instruction can be implemented within an ordinary timetable and what learners appear to gain from it (Burns, 2010). Its local and iterative character allows a teacher to diagnose a problem, act, observe, and refine practice. The same characteristics limit causal inference. In a one-group pretest-posttest design, improvement may reflect ordinary instruction, familiarity with the assessment, maturation, teacher expectations, or contextual events as well as the intervention. Transparent reporting must therefore separate observed change from proof of effectiveness.

The present study evaluated an eight-session sequence that taught skimming and scanning to upper-secondary EFL learners with basic proficiency. It addressed three questions: (1) How did aggregate and component reading scores differ before and after instruction? (2) What baseline habits and perceptions characterized the learners' reading? and (3) How did learners describe the usefulness and limitations of the two strategies? The analysis prioritizes internally consistent values, identifies unresolved data limitations, and frames conclusions at the level supported by the design.

METHODS

Design

The study used a classroom action-research design with quantitative pretest-posttest summaries and qualitative evidence from a baseline survey and open-ended interviews. One intact class received the instructional sequence; no control or active-comparison



condition was available. The design was therefore treated as a single-group mixed-methods evaluation of feasibility and descriptive change.

Quantitative and qualitative strands were integrated during interpretation. Assessment means described performance before and after the program, survey responses characterized the context in which instruction was introduced, and interview themes helped explain how learners understood the strategies. Qualitative reports were used to illuminate the numerical pattern, not to validate it independently or establish causality.

Context and participants

The project was conducted in an urban public upper-secondary school with limited digital access. English was scheduled for three 45-minute periods per week. The instructional class initially contained 42 learners; four were no longer available for the final analytic cohort, leaving 38 students aged approximately 16-17. Their English reading proficiency was described as ranging from CEFR A1 to A2. Convenience sampling was used because the class was directly accessible to the teacher-researcher.

The baseline survey tables contained frequency totals corresponding to 40 respondents, whereas the pretest-posttest cohort was reported as 38. No record linked the two additional survey responses to later attrition. Survey values are therefore reported with $N = 40$ as contextual evidence and are not merged with the assessment data. The participant count for the interview subset was not specified; qualitative findings are consequently presented as themes without prevalence claims.

Table 1

Study components and analytic status

Component	Documented information	Use in the present analysis
Pretest-posttest cohort	38 upper-secondary learners; approximately 16-17 years; CEFR A1-A2	Principal descriptive outcome cohort
Baseline survey	14 items; tabulated frequencies sum to 40	Reported separately as $N = 40$ contextual evidence
Instruction	Eight 45-minute sessions across four weeks; approximately six hours	Retained as the intervention dosage
Interview	Nine open-ended questions; participant count not stated	Themes reported without percentages or saturation claims
Outcome record	Six component means; no individual scores, SDs, or confidence intervals	Descriptive differences only; no inferential test or effect size

Note. Different denominators were preserved rather than forced into a single sample. This separation limits cross-source comparisons but avoids false precision.



Instructional sequence

The intervention comprised eight reading sessions delivered over four weeks, for approximately six hours of contact time. Lessons were organized around pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading phases. Topics and text types were selected from learners' stated interests, including stories, current issues, sports, and familiar school subjects. Printed worksheets, visual prompts, board work, and occasional offline digital resources were used to accommodate restricted internet access.

Before reading, the teacher introduced the task purpose, elicited relevant prior knowledge, previewed titles and images, and activated key vocabulary. During reading, the teacher modeled how to skim headings, opening and closing sentences, repeated lexical items, and paragraph structure to propose a topic or main idea. Scanning tasks required learners to identify a target category, predict its likely graphic form and location, move through the text selectively, and verify the surrounding sentence. Pair work and peer checking distributed participation and made strategy choices discussable.

After reading, learners answered literal questions, justified a selected main idea, connected supporting details, made inferences, and responded to a short critical-thinking prompt. The teacher used questions and temporary scaffolds when learners defaulted to word-by-word translation. A recurring instructional message was that rapid reading is a first pass rather than a complete substitute for close reading: learners were expected to return to relevant passages when the task required evidence.

Table 2

Instructional routine for skimming and scanning

Phase	Teacher support	Learner action	Evidence of performance
Set the purpose	Specify whether the task requires gist, a target detail, or close understanding	Restate the reading goal	Chosen approach matches the task
Preview	Model use of title, images, layout, headings, and familiar words	Predict topic and activate prior knowledge	Brief prediction with a textual cue
Skim	Think aloud while sampling informative locations	Propose topic or main idea without reading every word	Main-idea statement and selected support
Scan	Define target type and likely visual form	Search selectively for names, dates, terms, or facts	Correct location plus surrounding context



Phase	Teacher support	Learner action	Evidence of performance
Verify	Prompt rereading and comparison of alternatives	Read the relevant passage closely	Answer supported by text evidence
Reflect	Ask which strategy was used and why	Explain, revise, and transfer the procedure	Metacognitive explanation or peer feedback

Note. The routine treats skimming and scanning as purposeful first-pass processes followed by verification, not as indiscriminate speed reading.

Instruments

The classroom reading assessment contained six components: vocabulary, fluency, word recognition, inference, main idea and supporting details, and critical thinking. The component maxima were reported as 22, 7, 5, 5, 6, and 10 points, respectively, yielding a 55-point composite. Items were assembled from basic-level practice materials and curriculum texts. The critical-thinking task used an analytic classroom rubric. The assessment package was reviewed by a subject specialist and piloted with three A2 learners outside the target class.

The pretest and posttest were described as similar, but formal parallel-form evidence was not reported. The available record did not include item-level responses, individual total scores, reliability coefficients, reading-rate data, administration equivalence, or independent scoring. Fluency was represented as a scored section rather than a direct words-per-minute measure with comprehension accuracy. All six component means should therefore be interpreted as locally defined classroom indicators.

A 14-item baseline survey asked about reading frequency, purpose, weekly reading time, preferred texts, use of prior knowledge, perceived ease of identifying ideas and details, word-meaning recognition, word-by-word translation, and prediction. A nine-question open-ended interview examined learners' definitions of the strategies, useful activities, transfer, feelings, engagement, and perceived positive and negative aspects. Interview responses were organized thematically into strategic knowledge, perceived benefits, affective responses, and constraints.

Data analysis and integrity checks

Survey percentages were recalculated or checked against their frequencies using $N = 40$. Assessment change was calculated as posttest mean minus pretest mean for each component. The composite means were reconstructed by summing the six component



means. Relative change was calculated as the mean difference divided by the pretest mean and is reported only as a descriptive ratio.

The component sum yielded a pretest composite of 19.92 and a posttest composite of 26.76. A separate summary value of 26.15 was not used because it did not equal the reported component means. Likewise, summing percentage changes across components was rejected because percentages with different denominators and score maxima are not additive. No paired-samples test, standardized effect size, or confidence interval was calculated because participant-level paired scores and dispersion estimates were unavailable.

Interview excerpts were paraphrased and grouped by the recurring ideas reported in the thematic summary. Because the number of interviewees, selection process, coding audit, and frequency of each theme were not specified, the analysis avoids terms such as most or all. Qualitative findings are used to identify possible mechanisms and cautions rather than to estimate prevalence.

Ethical considerations

Learners were informed about the purpose and procedures, participation was described as voluntary, and withdrawal was permitted without academic penalty. Institutional and family authorization was obtained, and identities were protected in the study records. The present report contains only aggregated data and removes personal, institutional, geographic, and contact identifiers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Baseline reading profile

The baseline survey suggested limited sustained reading. Sixteen of 40 respondents (40.0%) reported reading only sometimes, eight (20.0%) rarely, and one (2.5%) never. Twenty-three respondents (57.5%) reported less than one hour of reading per week, while 12 (30.0%) reported one to two hours. These figures describe exposure, not comprehension ability, but they indicate that the intervention was introduced in a context with relatively little voluntary reading time.

Reading also appeared to be driven substantially by external demands. Seventeen respondents (42.5%) selected homework as their reason for reading, four (10.0%) described it as mandatory, and three (7.5%) referred to classmates, while 14 (35.0%) selected enjoyment and two (5.0%) selected another reason. A short strategy program can



make tasks more manageable, but durable development also requires a larger volume of accessible reading and reasons to read beyond compliance (Nation, 2009).

Several responses revealed a gap between perceived ease and measured performance. Thirty-two of 40 respondents (80.0%) described identifying a general idea as easy or very easy, yet 63% of the assessment cohort fell in the lowest category for main idea and supporting details at pretest. Similarly, 80.0% reported needing word-by-word translation at least sometimes, and 85.0% reported identifying word meanings only usually or sometimes. Self-report reflects awareness and confidence, not demonstrated performance; the mismatch supports the use of behavioral tasks alongside questionnaires (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002).

Table 3

Selected baseline survey indicators

Indicator	Response grouping	n / 40	%
Reading frequency	Sometimes, rarely, or never	25	62.5
Weekly reading time	Less than one hour	23	57.5
Reason for reading	Homework, mandatory, or classmates	24	60.0
Use of prior knowledge	Always or usually	25	62.5
Identifying a general idea	Easy or very easy	32	80.0
Word-by-word translation	Always, usually, or sometimes	32	80.0
Importance of prediction	Always or usually	21	52.5

Note. N = 40 survey records. Grouped percentages were recalculated from frequencies. The survey denominator differs from the N = 38 assessment cohort.

Composite and component outcomes

The reconstructed 55-point composite increased from 19.92 at pretest to 26.76 at posttest. The absolute difference was 6.84 points, equivalent to 12.4 percentage points of the full scale. Relative to the pretest mean, the change was 34.3%. Because individual paired scores and variability were unavailable, this is a cohort-level descriptive change rather than an inferential estimate.

The component pattern was uneven. Main idea and supporting details increased from 2.45 to 5.29 out of 6, and critical thinking increased from 3.10 to 6.39 out of 10. Vocabulary increased from 7.21 to 8.58 out of 22. Smaller increases appeared in inference and word recognition. Fluency decreased from 4.08 to 2.53 out of 7. The total gain



therefore coexisted with a substantial decline in one component, which argues against a broad claim that every aspect of reading improved.

Table 4

Pretest and posttest component means

Component	Maximum	Pretest M	Posttest M	Change	Change as % of maximum
Vocabulary	22	7.21	8.58	+1.37	+6.2
Fluency	7	4.08	2.53	-1.55	-22.1
Word recognition	5	2.00	2.29	+0.29	+5.8
Inference	5	1.08	1.68	+0.60	+12.0
Main idea and supporting details	6	2.45	5.29	+2.84	+47.3
Critical thinking	10	3.10	6.39	+3.29	+32.9
Composite	55	19.92	26.76	+6.84	+12.4

Note. N = 38. Component changes were recalculated directly from the reported means. Percent-of-maximum change provides a common descriptive scale; it is not an effect size.

Main idea, supporting details, and critical response

The largest proportional change occurred in main idea and supporting details. This result is aligned with the intervention's strongest instructional emphasis: learners repeatedly previewed texts, sampled informative positions, proposed a central statement, and located details that supported or contradicted it. The gain is also consistent with a task-specific practice effect. When teaching and assessment repeatedly target the same procedure, improved performance may reflect both strategy learning and familiarity with the response format.

Critical-thinking scores also increased. Post-reading questions required learners to justify an answer, connect information, and respond to a problem after locating relevant text. This sequence is instructionally plausible because strategic search can reduce the effort required to find evidence, leaving more attention for reasoning. Nevertheless, skimming and scanning do not themselves produce critical thinking. Evaluation depends on vocabulary, background knowledge, inference, task understanding, and opportunities to discuss competing interpretations (Duke et al., 2021).



Vocabulary, word recognition, and inference

Vocabulary improved by 1.37 points on a 22-point component, a modest 6.2% of the component maximum. Preview activities and keyword searches may have increased attention to recurring lexical items, but scanning for a word is not equivalent to knowing its meaning. High-quality lexical knowledge includes form, meaning, grammatical use, and integration with the sentence and discourse context (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). A longer program should include deliberate vocabulary review, morphology, context comparison, and retrieval across multiple texts.

Word recognition increased only 0.29 points, and inference increased 0.60. Both outcomes are credible in light of the short dosage. Efficient word recognition develops through substantial exposure and accurate mapping of orthographic, phonological, and semantic information; it is not likely to change markedly after six hours of strategy practice. Inference likewise requires readers to combine textual cues with knowledge while monitoring coherence. Skimming may help identify the topic, but learners still need close reading when the evidence for an inference is distributed or implicit.

The fluency decline

Fluency decreased by 1.55 points, the only negative component change and the largest loss relative to a component maximum. Contextual distractions and learner fatigue were noted during the posttest, but these observations cannot determine the cause. Other explanations include non-equivalent passages, a speed-comprehension tradeoff, unstable scoring, or a mismatch between the taught strategies and the fluency task.

This result exposes a conceptual problem in equating skimming with general reading fluency. Skimming is rapid because it samples information for a limited purpose; fluent comprehension requires efficient word recognition, appropriate pacing, phrasing, and meaning construction. A learner can skim successfully while reading connected prose aloud with limited fluency, and faster reading can reduce comprehension when the task demands detailed integration. Future assessment should report words correct per minute together with comprehension accuracy and should use equated passages administered under consistent conditions.

Learner perceptions

Interview themes indicated that learners could distinguish the general purposes of the two strategies. They associated skimming with obtaining a central idea and scanning with locating specific details such as dates, places, or keywords. They also described



applications to homework and text-heavy subjects beyond English. These reports suggest emerging metacognitive knowledge: learners were beginning to name a strategy, connect it to a purpose, and imagine transfer.

Positive affective themes included satisfaction after completing a difficult task, greater confidence in approaching longer texts, and pride when relevant information was found. Such responses matter because motivation and engagement influence whether learners persist with texts and practice beyond a single lesson. However, the interview design did not include a comparison or a validated motivation measure, so perceived confidence should not be treated as evidence of durable achievement.

Learners also articulated boundaries that strengthen the interpretation. Rapid skimming could cause important details to be overlooked, reading too quickly sometimes reduced understanding, and careful scanning could take more time than expected. These cautions reflect appropriate strategic awareness rather than failure. A reader who knows when a strategy is insufficient is better positioned to slow down, reread, or switch to close reading.

Table 5
Qualitative themes and instructional implications

Theme	Paraphrased learner perspective	Instructional implication
Strategic knowledge	Skimming identifies an overall idea; scanning locates targeted information	Require learners to name the purpose before choosing a procedure
Transfer	The strategies may help with homework and reading in other subjects	Use varied text types and ask learners to explain transfer conditions
Confidence and satisfaction	Locating information made longer texts feel more manageable	Preserve achievable challenge and visible evidence of progress
Loss of detail	A fast first pass may omit information that later proves important	Build in verification and close rereading of relevant passages
Time and comprehension	Scanning can be detailed and slow; speed can reduce understanding	Assess accuracy with speed and teach flexible pacing

Note. The interview sample size and theme frequencies were not reported; themes should not be interpreted as prevalence estimates.

Integrated interpretation

Across strands, the most defensible conclusion is that the instructional sequence was feasible and followed by higher performance on the locally defined composite, especially on tasks involving main ideas, supporting details, and text-based responses. Baseline



evidence showed limited reading time, frequent translation, and a mismatch between confidence and demonstrated performance. Learner comments suggested that explicit naming and modeling helped them understand when each strategy could be useful.

The pattern is consistent with a purpose-driven account of reading. Skimming and scanning reduce the amount of text that must receive immediate close attention, but they do not eliminate the need for vocabulary, word recognition, inference, or comprehension monitoring. This explains why gains concentrated in the skills practiced most directly, while foundational components changed little and fluency declined. Strategy instruction appears most useful when it helps learners allocate attention and then directs them back to evidence.

The dosage also matters. Eight lessons can introduce a routine and provide early practice, but reading development requires sustained encounters with varied texts. Nation (2009) argues for a balanced program that includes meaning-focused input, language-focused learning, fluency development, and substantial reading. Within such a program, skimming and scanning can support navigation and task completion while extensive and intensive reading build the knowledge and automaticity that rapid processing depends on.

Teacher modeling should make decision points explicit. A concise think-aloud can demonstrate how a title changes a prediction, why a date is easier to scan than an abstract idea, how a candidate main idea is checked against multiple paragraphs, and when an initial answer must be revised. Gradual release should move from teacher demonstration to guided pairs, independent practice, and explanation of strategy choice. The objective is flexible regulation, not compliance with a fixed sequence.

Assessment should mirror this flexibility without conflating constructs. Separate tasks can measure search accuracy, gist comprehension, detailed comprehension, inference, and reading rate. Each task needs a clear maximum, scoring key, administration time, and evidence of equivalence across occasions. When a critical response is scored, at least two trained raters should use an operational rubric and report agreement. A single composite may be convenient, but it can conceal opposite movements such as the gains and fluency decline observed here.

The study's main limitation is the one-group design. Without a comparison condition, the 6.84-point gain cannot be attributed uniquely to skimming and scanning instruction. Test familiarity, ordinary English lessons, changes in effort, and contextual events remain plausible explanations. A short implementation and convenience sample also limit transfer to other classes, ages, proficiency levels, and text types.



Measurement limitations are equally consequential. Participant-level scores, standard deviations, missing-data records, and a delayed assessment were unavailable. The pretest and posttest were only described as similar, and the fluency measure lacked a reported rate-and-comprehension definition. Survey and assessment denominators differed, and the interview sample was unspecified. These conditions prevent paired inference, standardized effects, reliability analysis, and estimates of how consistently learners changed.

A stronger study could compare two intact classes receiving equal reading time: one with explicit skimming and scanning instruction and one with an active alternative such as conventional comprehension practice. Parallel forms should be counterbalanced, all outcomes should be scored from one participant-level dataset, and assessors should be blinded when feasible. A delayed test with unfamiliar texts would determine whether learners retain the procedures and transfer them beyond rehearsed topics.

For classroom use, the sequence can be implemented with low-cost materials. Teachers can select short, level-appropriate texts, state a precise purpose, model one decision, time a search only when speed is relevant, and require evidence after the first pass. Cooperative roles can prevent faster readers from dominating: one learner proposes a target, another locates it, a third verifies the sentence, and a fourth explains the strategy. Rotation turns speed into shared reasoning rather than competition.

Most importantly, learners should hear that strategic reading includes slowing down. Skimming and scanning are not shortcuts around comprehension; they are ways to decide where comprehension effort should be concentrated. The interview cautions about omitted details and time provide a productive endpoint for instruction: effective readers vary their pace, check their confidence, and return to the text when the first pass is not enough.

CONCLUSIONS

A four-week program of explicit skimming and scanning instruction was followed by a higher aggregate reading-comprehension score in an upper-secondary EFL classroom. The reconstructed composite increased from 19.92 to 26.76 out of 55. Gains were concentrated in main idea and supporting details and in the critical-response task, while vocabulary, inference, and word recognition increased modestly and fluency declined.



The findings support classroom feasibility and strategic awareness, not causal effectiveness. Learners described clearer distinctions between reading for gist and searching for details, possible transfer to other subjects, and greater confidence. They also recognized that rapid reading can omit relevant information and that scanning may be time-consuming. These cautions reinforce a flexible model in which skimming and scanning are followed by verification and close reading when required.

Instructionally, teachers should align each strategy with a specific purpose, model the decision process, use accessible texts, distribute participation, and ask learners to justify answers with textual evidence. Strategy work should be embedded in a balanced reading program that also develops vocabulary, word recognition, inference, fluency, knowledge, and sustained reading volume.

Future evaluation should maintain one clearly defined analytic cohort, preserve paired participant-level data, use parallel assessment forms, define fluency directly, report reliability and rater agreement, include an active comparison condition, and measure delayed transfer. These safeguards would determine whether the promising classroom pattern represents durable improvement attributable to instruction.

REFERENCES

- Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(5), 364-373. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.5.1>
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203863466>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment - Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S25-S44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411>
- Duke, N. K., Ward, A. E., & Pearson, P. D. (2021). The science of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(6), 663-672. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1993>
- Grabe, W., & Yamashita, J. (2022). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.



- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891643>
- Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 22-37.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.827687>