

## Summaries in English

*Piet Mooren*

### **Reduction of reading? About measurement and effects of free reading and usefulness of reading promotion**

The frequency of free reading of both adults (Knulst et al) and primary-school children (Otter) seems to have diminished strongly. Besides, some recent studies seem to indicate that the frequency of reading at home has no influence at all on reading for comprehension at school (Otter, Otter and Schoonen). In this article it is argued that the way of operationalizing (frequency of) free reading has much to do with the outcomes of the studies of Knulst and Otter, especially because only reading for pleasure (in the case of adults) or only reading of 'real books' (children) is actually measured. Some other studies indicate that free reading - both at home or at school - does seem to have enough influence on achievements to prolong investments of local and national authorities.

*Erik van Schooten & Ron Oostdam*

### **Literary education in the first three years of secondary schools: teachers' attitudes and curriculum design**

The article reports on the results of an empirical study aiming to answer the question as to how the new Education Acts concerning the first three years of secondary education affect the literary education. Firstly, the design of literary education in the first three years of secondary education is described and the changes that stem from the new Education Acts are presented. Secondly, models concerning the educational goals teachers pursue in their literary education are empirically tested as well as models concerning the attitudes of teachers towards different aspects of fiction. Thirdly, through regression and covariance analysis the educational goals teachers pursue are predicted using different background variables (e.g. attitudes, age, educational level, etc.).

*Korrie van Helvert & Judith ter Hofstede*

### **Text revision by Dutch first and second language users in secondary education**

In spite of the fact that the position of DSL pupils who have Dutch as a second language (DSL) in secondary education is becoming an increasingly important object of empirical research in the Netherlands, there are still some blind spots. Linguistic research on DSL proficiency of pupils between 12 and 18 is rare and mostly focussed on reading-skills and DSL across the curriculum. Oral proficiency and writing-skills are hardly being studied. In this paper empirical data on writing skills,

more specifically on text revision, are presented. This study focuses on revising a manipulated text by 131 pupils (25 of whom are DSL pupils) in the third and fourth group of secondary education. All pupils were asked to spot and correct micro-level violations in a text. The main research questions are:

1. To what extent do pupils spot and correct violations in a given text and do pupils who have Dutch as a first language (DFL) and DSL pupils differ in this respect?
2. What type of violation is easier/harder to spot and correct: lexical/idiomatic or morpho/syntactic violations?
3. To what extent do pupils tend to overcorrect non-violations in the text and do DFL and DSL pupils differ in this respect?

The data of this study show that especially lexical/idiomatic violations at the micro level of the text are significantly more difficult for DSL pupils to spot and correct, as compared to DFL pupils. Also overcorrections, especially correct→incorrect changes, were made significantly more frequently by DSL pupils as compared to DFL pupils. The discussion focuses on the implications of these results for L1 and L2 writing curricula and the way in which Bereiter & Scardamelia's (1987) CDO-model can be useful as a strategic tool for text revision.

*Patricia de Rooij & Cor Aarnoutse*

### **Is a spelling list an effective means for learning to spell?**

The goal of this feasibility study was to determine whether it was possible to teach students from grade 2 to work with a spelling list. This list enables students to look up the spelling of words and to solve a number of spelling problems independently. The students of the treatment group received twenty lessons. In the first ten lessons they were taught how to look up words in the spelling list. During the next ten lessons the spelling list was used as a means to solve spelling problems. The results indicated that the lessons had a positive effect on looking up the words in the list. Furthermore, it appeared that the lessons had a slightly positive effect on a spelling test. The students of the treatment group scored significantly higher than the students of the non-treatment group. Finally, the teachers, in general, were rather positive about the lessons, although several improvements could still be made.