

Effects of CDA Instruction on EFL Analytical Reading Practices

Abduljalil Nasr HAZAEA¹&Ali Abbas ALZUBI²

¹Assist., Prof., Department of English, Najran University, Saudi Arabia,
agaleel@gmail.com

²Lecturer, Department of English, Najran University, Saudi Arabia,
aliyarmouk2004@gmail.com

Article information

Submission	19/03/2017
Revision received	13/06/2017
Acceptance	12/09/2017

Keywords

CDA, EFL reading,
description,
interpretation,
explanation.

Abstract: Discourse-based approaches to EFL reading have shifted the students' passive role to become 'text resistant'. This paper examines the extent to which Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) enhances analytical reading practices in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) reading context among Preparatory Year students at Najran University. The paper operationalizes CDA levels of analysis (namely, text analysis, discourse analysis, and critical discourse analysis) in an EFL reading classroom. In this quasi-experimental design, a questionnaire and a test were used to collect data from a reading class before and after the interventional program. Prior to the treatment, the class was taught reading through traditional methods, whereas in the treatment stage, the class was conducted using CDA instruction. The data collected from both the questionnaire and the test were analyzed using the paired sample t-test. The results showed statistical significance in each analytical practice: text analysis (description), discourse analysis (interpretation), and critical discourse analysis (explanation). The correlation analysis of the pre- and post- tests and questionnaires showed a statistical significance in the critical discourse analysis (.019). Further research on the role of CDA in fostering critical intercultural awareness in an EFL reading classroom is suggested.

Anahtar sözcükler

CDA, EFL okuma,
tanımlama,
yorumlama,
açıklama.

Eleştirel Söylem Analizi Talimatlarının Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Analitik Okuma Uygulamaları Üzerine Etkileri

Öz: Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce okumasına yönelik söylem tabanlı yaklaşımlar, öğrencilerin pasif rollerini 'metinlere karşı dayanıklı' hale getirmektedir. Bu makale, Najran Üniversitesi Hazırlık Sınıfı erkek öğrencilerinde Eleştirel Söylem Analizinin Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce analitik okuma uygulamalarını ne derecede geliştirdiğini incelemektedir. Bu çalışma, bir Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce sınıfında Eleştirel Söylem Analizi analiz düzeylerini (metin analizi, söylem analizi ve eleştirel söylem analizi) kullanmaktadır. Bu yarı deneysel çalışma tasarımında, bir okuma sınıftan veri toplamak için uygulama öncesinde ve sonrasında bir anket ve bir test kullanılmıştır. Uygulama öncesinde, sınıfta okuma geleneksel yöntemlerle öğretilirken, uygulama sırasında sınıfta Eleştirel Söylem Analizi talimatları kullanılmıştır. Hem anket hem de testten toplanan veriler eşleştirilmiş örnek t-testi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar her analitik uygulamada, yani metin analizinde (tanımlama), söylem analizinde (yorumlama) ve eleştirel söylem analizinde (açıklama), istatistiksel anlamlılık göstermektedir. Ön ve son testlerin ve anketlerin korelasyon analizi eleştirel söylem analizinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlılık göstermektedir (.019). Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce okuma sınıflarında eleştirel kültürlerarası farkındalığı geliştirmek için Eleştirel Söylem Analizinin rolü hakkında daha fazla araştırma yapılması önerilmektedir.

1. Introduction

A vital feature of traditional teaching approaches is teacher-dominated interaction; hence, they are characterized as teacher-centered. Students are passive readers that decode linguistic meaning instead of questioning and resisting the text. In a traditional reading classroom, non-critical traditional teaching strategies are used, such as the grammar translation method (Yuhui, Li-rong, & Yue, 2010), the schema approach, the top down approach, the bottom up approach (Alderson, 2000; Winch, Johnston, March, Ljungdahl, & Holliday, 2006), and the interactive approach (Grabe, 1991).

On the contrary, discourse analysis has shifted language teaching and learning from the traditional grammar approach to a discourse approach (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Discourse-based approaches to EFL reading have changed the student's passive role to be that of an active reader. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an approach which provides EFL teachers and learners with three levels of analysis (text analysis, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis) to better equip EFL readers with critical thinking and critical language skills (Fairclough, 1995). According to the same author, text analysis 'describes' lexicon, grammar, morphology, phonology and semantics. Discourse analysis 'interprets' the text production, consumption and intertextuality. Critical discourse analysis 'explains' the writer's point of view and sociocultural background of the text. In fact, meaning is embedded in texts; something that reflects the author's worldview and the reader's background (Dellinger, 1995).

Critical discourse analysis has not been introduced to the undergraduate classroom in the Saudi context. The current teaching of EFL reading is traditional in its nature where the focus is on linguistic skills and cognitive skills (ur Rahman & Alhaisoni, 2013). Historically, in the Saudi high schools, English has been taught through grammar-translation with a focus on receptive, rather than productive language skills (Al-Musallam, 2009). Questions, based on grammatical knowledge, translation and reading comprehension, form the basis of university entrance exams (Jdetawy, 2011). Students and teachers alike are experiencing numerous problems in the learning and teaching of EFL reading in the Saudi context (Al-Musallam, 2009; Alshumaimeri, 2011; Nezami, 2012). Besides, the current practices are inadequate because these practices are not taking the new developments of the 21st century into account (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009; Azman, Bhooth, & Ismail, 2013).

Therefore, there is a dire need for change so as to equip students with analytical reading practices, thereby creating active readers who can question and resist texts. As a response to this issue, the current study employs the three dimensions of the CDA approach (Cots, 2006; Fairclough, 1995) to the teaching of EFL reading, as it considers the three dimensions to be text analysis (description), discourse analysis (interpretation) and critical discourse analysis (explanation).

2. Aim of Study

The study tries to answer this question: *To what extent does the use of CDA three levels of analysis improve the analytical reading practices among EFL undergraduates in Saudi Arabia?*

3. Review of Literature

3.1. Non-critical Language Learning

In an EFL reading context, non-critical traditional tools are used such as the grammar translation method, schema approach, top down approach, bottom up approach, and

interactive approach. The grammar-Translation Method (GTM) deals with grammatical competence, which is the highest priority. In view of this approach, grammar teaching is 'deductive': students are explicitly taught the grammar rules and then given opportunities to practice them. The GTM regards language as a set of rules and words combined according to grammar. Similarly, content schema, part of schema theory, functions in three phases: pre-reading, while-reading and post-reading (Yu-hui et al., 2010, pp. 62-64).

A bottom-up approach to reading is known as a skills-based approach (Alderson, 2000; Winch et al., 2006). Carell (1988, p. 101) defines the bottom-up processing approach as "decoding individual linguistic units". This approach also involves the reader's ability to understand the text based on its small units such as words, sounds, grammar etc. and then move to larger sentences. On the contrary, Kang (2007) states that a reader in the top-down processing model first brings its personal and cultural background and experiences to the text. Rajabi (2009) further mentions that the top-down as a strategic model includes macro reading strategies such as previewing, predicting, guessing and inferences.

Interactive approaches to reading focus on the interaction of two types of cognitive skills: identification and interpretation (Grabe, 1991). A vital feature of traditional teaching approaches is teacher-dominated interaction; hence, they are characterized as teacher-centered. Students are passive readers that decode linguistic meaning rather than question and resist the text.

3.2. Critical Language Learning

Practitioners of Critical Discourse Analysis and the New Literacy Studies have shifted the passive role of EFL readers into an active resistance to the text. Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) introduced a three-dimensional framework of the analysis of (media) texts. These dimensions of analysis are textual analysis, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. Wallace (Wallace, 1992) points out that CDA can be used to develop a reading methodology, which addresses ideological assumptions as well as develops general reading comprehension. Cots (2006) presented a CDA model that can be used to analyze educational texts and develop language learning activities. He introduced three categories of questions in light of the three levels of CDA analysis as a framework to approach language use with a 'critical' attitude.

Educational and learning systems employ CDA in order to promote the learners' capacities to question, reflect on, and change the world (Amari, 2015). Such kind of questioning is not achieved in many EFL classrooms (Amari, 2015; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Hammond, 2006; Pennycook, 1999; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005) even though the introduction of CDA in EFL context does not require a change of the teaching methods. Instead, CDA provides a new lens on language; something that questions language use, and reflects and affects sociocultural processes. (Pennycook, 2001; Van Dijk, 1997).

Pennycook (1999) points out that critical approaches to TESOL would do well to retain a constant questioning about the types of knowledge, theory, practice, or praxis they operate within. Moreover, in their extensive review of CDA in education, Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph (2005) recommend further research that bridges the existing gap between theories of learning and "critical" discourse theory. Hammond (2006) employed CDA framework in the Japanese EFL context where students reflect on their writings an awareness towards racism and inequality. Furthermore, CDA was used to promote critical

language awareness in the Iranian educational context as reported by Dar, Shams, and Rahimi (2010), Rahimi (2013) and Hashemi and Ghanizadeh (2012).

In EFL contexts, reading is an important academic language skill. It receives special focus for two reasons: it is an important academic goal, and written texts serve various pedagogical purposes, which helps reading to receive this special focus (Richards & Renandya, 2002). According to CDA, an EFL reading lesson is a communicative event, and reading is social practice manifested in discourses. Fairclough (1989) states that in seeing language as a discourse and social practice, the analyst (critical reader) has to move within three levels of analysis in order to identify a discourse: text analysis (description), discourse analysis (interpretation) and critical discourse analysis (explanation) (Fairclough, 1992). Critical readers interact with the text by employing their background knowledge and other information sources in order to understand it. To promote critical analysis in an EFL classroom, teachers need to encourage various interpretations instead of finding one point of view. Thus, CDA's three levels of analysis need to be operationalized in an EFL reading classroom. Each level of analysis reveals one layer of meaning of the text. Subsequently, the present study operationalizes these levels of discourse analysis in an EFL reading classroom.

4. Method

This study introduces CDA levels of analysis to examine their effect on the participants' analytical reading practices in a reading classroom in Najran University. A quasi-experimental design was used. As the purpose of this study is to test any differences in students' analytical reading practices upon introducing CDA instruction, quantitative research methods were selected. Before the treatment, the class was taught reading through traditional non-critical approaches, then through critical discourse analysis. The data was collected through pre- and post- tests and questionnaires. Then the data was analyzed using a paired sample t-test, and the results were compared to investigate the improvement of the analytical reading practices after introducing CDA instruction.

4.1. Participants and Setting

The Preparatory Year is compulsory for all high school students in the science stream who wish to join the medical, engineering, computer, or administration sciences departments at Najran University. Reading (Eng.140) is a four hour per week English language course in the Preparatory Year program. Each year, around 800 students are enrolled in the program. These students share similar characteristics: gender, age, linguistic and cultural background. A class of 43 students was conveniently selected. All participants are males as the education system in Saudi Arabia is gender-based; their ages are between 18 and 20. While Arabic is their first language (L1), they learn English as a foreign language (L2).

The reading textbook is Kirn and Hartmann's (2012) *Interactions 1, Middle East Diamond Edition*. The training program is composed of 14 weeks of four contact hours a week. Before the treatment, the teacher taught students texts using the traditional teaching method for six weeks as follows: after students read each paragraph, they translate it into Arabic with the focus on the areas of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation, and then, in the post reading part, the focus was on doing the exercises one by one.

4.2. CDA Instruction in EFL Classroom

During 'treatment,' students were divided into three groups equipped with CDA levels of analysis (text analysis, discourse analysis, and critical discourse analysis) to question and resist the reading texts. These levels of analysis can be simultaneously operationalized in an

EFL reading classroom as three overlapping stages. Accordingly, students can be divided into three groups where each group addresses one stage of analysis. Then an overall discussion of the three groups integrates the three layers of meaning embedded in reading texts.

For text analysis, group (A) asks questions regarding the meaning of the new vocabulary and the structure of the sentences. Teachers help them extract the meaning of new words based on context. After that, students have a quick look at the grammatical points of the text. For discourse analysis, group (B) shares ideas about the text. They are asked to write about the topic of the text. This stage puts these students in the position of writers rather than readers. Teachers can encourage broader use of context. The context of the text starts from students' background knowledge. Finally, group (C) analyzes the text using a list of questions. Students bring their ideologies, belief systems and worldviews of the text. To reveal the hidden ideologies and power of the text, students are encouraged to resist the text; that is, to read against rather than with the text (Janks, 1997). Students are required to practice critical reading on the text with the use of a list of questions

Then, the three groups work together. Teachers ask representatives of each group to present the results of their understanding of the text. While group A describes the linguistic aspects of the text, group B interprets the text, and group C explains the sociocultural dimension of the text. Finally, an integrated analysis of the text is presented to all students, and a discussion is held on what role social context plays in readers' personal understandings of the text and its writer's ideology.

4.3. Instruments

This study employed two quantitative instruments: pre- and post- questionnaires and tests. Before the treatment, the pre-questionnaire and test were distributed to the students. After the treatment, the same questionnaire and test were re-distributed to the students. It is hypothesized that if students are trained on how to employ CDA using the three levels of analysis, they will enhance their analytical reading practices of description, interpretation, and explanation. Therefore, the effect of the CDA on the analytical reading practices are measured before and after the treatment.

A questionnaire was adapted and validated in this study. The questionnaire consisted of 39 items to examine the participants' analytical reading practices. The items were adapted from CDA's framework by Cots (2006) and from the questionnaire of reading practices (30 items) developed by Azman et al. (2013) in their study entitled "Reading Practices of EFL Yemeni Students: Recommendations for the 21st Century." The items were adopted to reveal the three analytical reading practices, namely description practices through text analysis (14 items), interpretation practices through discourse analysis (14 items) and explanation practices through critical discourse analysis (11 items). The EFL students responded on a 5- point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree). The researchers also explained the instructions to the participants to ensure that they understood the questionnaire's items. Table 1 displays the items' distribution on subscales.

Table 1

The distribution of items on analytical reading practices

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Statements</i>
<i>Textual Analysis (Description)</i>	<i>1.2.3.5.7.12.14.21.22.23.25.37.38 and 39</i>
<i>Discourse Analysis (Interpretation)</i>	<i>4.6.10.13.15.16.17.18.19.20.27.32.33 and 36</i>
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis</i>	<i>8.9.11.24.26.28.29.30.31.34 and 35</i>

(Explanation)

The validity of questionnaire was approved by two experts in CDA. Based on their feedback, some items were deleted, added, or clarified for the respondents as per Table 2. The inter rater reliability of the experts was 85% which allows further use of the instrument and indicates a high level of reliability. The same questionnaire was administered in both the pre- and the post- treatment.

Table 2

The experts' recommendations

Deleted Items	Modified Items	Added Items
<i>I practice what has been defined/ modelled (grammar and structures explicitly).</i>	31, 32,34,35,36, 39	37+38
<i>I use Arabic when I do not have the appropriate English.</i>		

According to the operationalized framework, a test was developed from a passage in the textbook entitled *Reading Interactions I, Middle East Diamond Edition* written by Kim and Hartmann (2012) and then validated by two experts in CDA to examine the analytical reading practices among the participants (see Appendix A). In week 13, the post-test, which is the same as the pre-test, was administered after introducing CDA instruction. Table 3 displays the distribution of questions and their weight according to the analytical reading practices items on subscales.

Table 3

The distribution of questions on analytical reading practices

Factors	Questions	Weight
<i>Text analysis (Description)</i>	1 and 2	8
<i>Discourse Analysis (Interpretation)</i>	3 and 4	8
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis (Explanation)</i>	5	8

The two experts recommended using a rubric for marking question (5) to ensure the fairness in the marking of the fifth question regarding the critical discourse analysis of the text.

5. Data Analysis and Results

The study question is as follows: *To what extent does the use of CDA levels of analysis improve the analytical reading practices among EFL undergraduates in Saudi Arabia?* A paired-samples t-test (SPSS) was employed to get means, standard deviations, significances, and correlations. The collected data from the pre- and post- questionnaires and tests were analyzed. For the purpose of triangulation, the sample-paired t-test was also used to compare the data and correlate the results of the two instruments.

Table 4

Paired sampled t-test of the pre- and post- questionnaire

Analytical reading practices	Quest.	Means	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Text Analysis</i>	Pre-post	2.8992-	-1.24695-	.54146-	.36487.	11006	-11.330-42 .000
			4.1462				

Discourse Analysis	Pre-post	2.8887-4.0107	-1.12203-	.41071-	.44588.10564	-10.621-42	.000
CDA	Pre-post	2.4630-3.7023	-1.23932-	.39218-	.64012.13775	-8.997-42	.000
Overall Analysis	Pre-post	2.7638-3.9756	-1.21178-	.41020-	.40507.10516	-11.523-42	.000

Table 4 shows that text analysis (description practice) scored a mean of 4.15 in the post-questionnaire compared to 2.99 in the pre-questionnaire with standard deviations of .364 and .541; respectively. Discourse analysis (interpretation practice) in the post-questionnaire scored a mean of 4.01 compared to 2.89 in the pre-questionnaire with standard deviations of .445 and .410; respectively. In the post-questionnaire, CDA (explanation practices) had a mean of 3.70 compared to 2.46 in the pre-questionnaire. The total analytical reading practices in the post-questionnaire scored a mean of 3.98 compared to 2.80 with standard deviations of .405 and .410; respectively.

The analysis shows statistical differences at the level of each practice (.000) and the overall (.000). The means in Table 4 shows the average of improvement for each subscale and the whole scale, which is significant. It can also be noticed that the discourse analysis (interpretation category) scored the lowest mean (1.12) in improvement, while the other two categories, text analysis (description, 1.25) and critical discourse analysis (explanation, 1.24), scored very close means of improvements. The overall mean difference between the pre- and post-questionnaires is 1.21.

Table 5 shows the results of different paired-sample t-tests before and after the change in the learning approach. The change is proved a significant benefit in the posttest.

Table 5

The pre- and post- tests' paired differences of the T-Test

Analytical reading practices	Test	Means	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error		Sig.(2-tailed)		
					Mean	t			
Text Analysis	Pre-post	2.5679	-4.2156	1.6477	.92744-	.85822	.11006	-11.330-42	.000
Discourse Analysis	Pre-post	2.9356	-4.1281	1.1925	.97490-	.96503	.10564	-10.621-42	.000
CDA	Pre-post	1.3763	-3.2847	1.9084	1.00616-	.95915	.13775	-8.997-42	.000
Overall Analysis	Pre-post	6.8798	-11.6277	4.7479	2.11392-	2.25214	.10516	-11.523-42	.000

It is noticed that text analysis (description practices) shown in Table 5 scored a mean of 4.22 in the posttest compared to 2.57 in the pretest, and standard deviations of .927 and .858; respectively. While the discourse analysis (interpretation practices) in the posttest had a means of 4.13 in comparison with 2.94 in the pretest with standard deviations of .974 and .965; respectively. The critical discourse analysis (explanation practices) had a mean of 3.28 compared to 1.38. The total analytical reading practices scored a mean of 11.62 compared to 6.87, and standard deviations of 2.11 and 2.52; respectively. Table 5 also displays the very low means of the overall of analytical reading practices in the pretest 6.88 compared to 11.63 in the posttest.

Table 5 shows the mean differences and significances of the pre- and post-tests of the three analytical reading practices. It can be noticed that there are statistical significances in the three categories and overall. The table proves that very high significances do exist at the level of each analytical practice and overall (.000). Discourse analysis (interpretation practices) scored the lowest mean (1.19), followed by text analysis (description practices) which scored 1.64. Critical discourse analysis (explanation practices) scored the highest mean (1.91).

The results of the data analysis of the pretest and pre questionnaire and the posttest and post questionnaire were correlated using the sample paired t-test analysis. While the existence of significances are proved with the CDA (explanation) and the total practices in the pre-questionnaire and pretest, only CDA level (explanation practices) is proved to be significant in the mean differences of the post questionnaire and test. Table 6 shows the correlation of the pre-questionnaire and pretest.

Table 6
The pre- questionnaire and pretest's paired differences

Analytical reading practices	Questionnaire & test	Mean	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Text Analysis</i>	Pre-questionnaire Pretest	2.8992	.33132	1.10569	.16862	1.965	42	.056
<i>Discourse Analysis</i>	Pre-questionnaire Pretest	2.8887	-.04688	1.10353	.16829	-.279	42	.782
<i>CDA</i>	Pre-questionnaire Pretest	2.4630	1.08672	1.08090	.16484	6.593	42	.000
<i>Total</i>	Pre-questionnaire Pretest	2.7638	.47051	.84146	.12832	3.667	42	.001

It can be noticed in Table 6 that there is a statistical significance in the overall of the three analytical reading practices (.001) between the pretest and pre questionnaire. There are no statistical significances between the pre questionnaire and pretest in the categories of text analysis (description .056) and discourse analysis (interpretation 782). On the other hand, the CDA (explanation) category showed a significance of .000.

Table 7 shows the correlation of the data analysis of the post questionnaire and posttest.

Table 7
The post questionnaire and posttest's paired differences

Analytical Reading practices	Questionnaire & Test	Mean	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Description</i>	Post Quest. Post test	4.1462	-.06940	.94386	.14394	-.482	42	.632
		4.2156						

Interpretation	<i>Post Quest.</i>	4.0107	-.11741-	.94746	.14449	-.813-	42	.421
	<i>Posttest</i>	4.1281						
Explanation	<i>Post Quest.</i>	3.7023	.41767	1.12340	.17132	2.438	42	.019
	<i>Posttest</i>	3.2847						
Total	<i>Post Quest.</i>	3.9756	.09943	.81520	.12432	.800	42	.428
	<i>Posttest</i>	3.8761						

It is clear that the overall categories of analytical reading practices did not show any significance (.428). There is no significant difference between the first two categories: text analysis (description, .632) and discourse analysis (interpretation, .421). The only significance can be seen in the critical discourse analysis (explanation category .019). As for the data triangulation of the instruments, the correlations of the pre questionnaire and pretest proved to be consistent and in agreement. The results obtained from the post questionnaire and post-test do not show any correlation in the overall analytical reading practices. The discrepancies between the results of the post questionnaire and posttest can be attributed to the fact that students always reflect what is good about them even though it may not be existent which is considered to be data falsification (Bredl, Winker, & Kötschau, 2012). One more reason for this falsification may be students did not pay as much attention to the questionnaire as they did to the test.

6. Discussion

The results of both the questionnaires and tests showed that there is improvement in the analytical reading practices in the reading class after introducing CDA instruction. This result may be attributed to a number of factors. Prior to the implementation of CDA, the participants were mere readers of the text; they did not question the ideological load of the text; the participants struggled to find out the linguistic meaning of the text. That is to say, for the participants, the job of a good reader is to reveal the vocabulary and the grammar of the text. The participants seek to translate difficult words into Arabic or to identify parts of speech and word pronunciation. After that, they try to answer short or long questions about the text. The improvement in the analytical reading practices also indicates the significant role of CDA in fostering critical thinking. The participants tried to question the text and resist it. This progress reflects the positive impact of CDA instruction in EFL reading classroom.

Firstly, the result indicates that after introducing CDA, the participants' use of the explanation practices has increased. Such use is manifested in a number of analytical practices including the use of personal and social skills, identification of the text type and sociocultural purpose, discussion and sharing of ideas on the author's ideological choice of words, analysis of the social identities represented in the text, and finding out the ideological expressions and whom they serve in the text. This result is in agreement with Ameri's (2015) recommendation that CDA can help to explore how language is used to construct ideological representations in different contexts. In the same vein, Al Ghazali (2007) concluded that teaching CDA in the classroom highlights the effect of social power(s) on text composition. However, the result of the current study is contrary to the previous study (Azman et al., 2013) which revealed limited use of analyzing practices (M 1.9) among EFL Yemeni students. The result of current study also reveals the role of CDA tools in shifting the students' position from being mere receivers of knowledge to resist the texts. This is in agreement with Ko (2013) who suggested that CDA would help students to be active critical readers.

Secondly, text analysis (description) is manifested in the form of some analytical practices such as identifying whether the writers' choice of vocabulary and grammar affects meaning.

This result shows the role of analyzing the macro level of the text in the micro level of the text. It becomes easier for students to find the linguistic meaning after seeing the big picture of the text. CDA helps students to find the meaning of unfamiliar words from the context of the text. This result is in agreement with (Azman et al., 2013) who found that EFL students' use of code breaking practices (M 2.3) increased after employing the four resources model. Similarly, Khabiri and Pakzad (2012) found that critical reading strategies have a great effect on EFL learners' vocabulary. E. Rahimi and Sharififar (2015) found that CDA enhanced students' abilities to decode the meaning of the text.

Third, discourse analysis (interpretation) is manifested in the identification of the text's audience, bringing the readers' background knowledge to the text, questioning the text, linking the text with other similar texts, classifying whether the text is representative of a specific issue, and asking about the author of the text. The result shows a reasonable increase in the interpretative practices. It indicates the challenge of EFL readers in questioning the producers of the text. Traditionally, students never question the writer's ideology or worldview. This result is in agreement with the previous study (Azman et al., 2013) who found a slight use of text use practices (M 2.2) and text participation practices (M 1.9) among EFL Yemeni students. The findings are also in line with Abbasian and Malae (2016) who revealed that CDA helped students to read between the lines.

In general, the study findings agree with Hashemi and Ghanizadeh (2012) who found that CDA influences the learners' critical thinking abilities in a positive way. Dar et al. (2010) revealed that the majority of students' level of awareness was improved. Similarly, Macknish (2011) found that Chinese students in Singapore engaged in critical reading discourse. With another skill, Kashkuli, Ghanbari, and Abbasi (2016) indicated the efficiency of the CDA-oriented approach to teaching writing skills.

7. Conclusion

This study answers the question: *To what extent does the use of CDA levels of analysis improve the analytical reading practices among EFL undergraduates in Saudi Arabia?* A conceptual framework of analytical reading practices was developed based on Fairclough (1995) and Cots (2006) CDA. An EFL reading lesson is considered a communicative event in which EFL reading is viewed as 'social practice' manifested in the form of discourses. To reveal a discourse, EFL students need to move within three levels of analysis: text analysis (description), discourse analysis (interpretation), and critical discourse analysis (explanation).

A quasi-experimental design was used in this quantitative study. Two instruments (questionnaire and test) were employed in an EFL reading class of 43 students. The treatment lasted for one semester of fourteen weeks. Before the treatment, the class was taught through the traditional non-critical approaches to EFL reading. After six weeks, the pre questionnaire and the pretest data were collected and analyzed. Then, the CDA's three levels of analysis were introduced to students; they were employed with certain types of reading texts including newspaper texts and students' textbooks. After the treatment, the same questionnaire and test were administered, and the post treatment data were collected and analyzed. The results showed that after treatment with CDA, the students' analytical reading practices (especially the explanation practices) were successfully improved compared to their traditional classes. In other words, the results revealed that the CDA's levels of analysis played a significant role in fostering analytical reading practices in the participants.

CDA instruction can be used to increase students' level of awareness on the ideologically loaded reading materials. When students analyze texts, they become aware of the sources of power, and the link between discourse and social practice. CDA is the area of the first teacher-researcher's interests. Yet, students and teachers would face two challenges. Teachers of EFL reading need to be trained to employ CDA instruction in their classrooms. When using CDA's three levels, not every CDA concept is equally useful; facilitators as well as students can select tools which would help in finding out the writer's purposes (Huckin, 1997).

Although this study has operationalized the three levels of CDA in an EFL reading classroom, the results are still general at the third level: the critical discourse analysis (explanation). In other words, CDA can be used more specifically to increase the students' critical intercultural awareness and to promote intercultural communication. CDA can be used by students to analyze multimodal texts such as videos and social media networks. For example, interviews and observation cards could be used to show how the participants resist the reading texts and how they develop their critical analytical skills. In other words, further research could offer insight as to whether the reported changes in students' analytical reading practices were also reflected in the classroom behavior. As the pretest and posttest are entirely the same, there could be test sensitization, which might affect the interpretation of the results. This is considered another limitation of this study.

Acknowledgement

This research is funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research of Najran University in the seventh stage with code No. NU/ SHED/15/044.

References

- Abbasian, G. R., & Malae, N. (2016). The Effect of Critical Discourse Analysis Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension and Orientation. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(17), 1-20.
- Al-Homoud, F., & Schmitt, N. (2009). Extensive reading in a challenging environment: A comparison of extensive and intensive reading approaches in Saudi Arabia. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 383-401.
- Al-Musallam, E. I. (2009). *College instructors' and learners' attitudes to authentic EFL reading materials in Saudi Arabia*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. King Saud University.
- Al Ghazali, F. (2007). Critical discourse analysis: How can awareness of CDA influence teaching techniques? *TESOL Arabia*.
- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge language assessment series: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alshumaimeri, Y. (2011). The effects of reading method on the comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 4(1), 185.
- Amari, F. Z. (2015). The role of critical discourse analysis in EFL teaching/learning. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 6, 87-93.
- Azman, H., Bhooth, A. M., & Ismail, K. (2013). Readers reading practices of EFL Yemeni students: recommendations for the 21st century. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies*, 13(3), 63-78.
- Bredl, S., Winker, P., & Kötschau, K. (2012). A statistical approach to detect interviewer falsification of survey data. *Survey methodology*, 38(1), 1-10.
- Carrell, P. L. (1988). Some causes of text-boundedness and schema interference in ESL reading. *Interactive approaches to second language reading*, 101-113.

- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cots, J. M. (2006). Teaching 'with an attitude': Critical Discourse Analysis in EFL teaching. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 336-345.
- Dar, Z. K., Shams, M. R., & Rahimi, A. (2010). Teaching reading with a critical attitude: Using critical discourse analysis (CDA) to raise EFL university students' critical language awareness (CLA). *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 3(2).
- Dellinger, B. (1995). *Finnish views of CNN television news: a critical cross-cultural analysis of the American commercial discourse style*. Wasaensis: Universitas Wasaensis.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London and New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London Edward Arnold.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 375-406
- Hammond, K. (2006). More than a game: A critical discourse analysis of a racial inequality exercise in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 545-571.
- Hashemi, M. R., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2012). Critical discourse analysis and critical thinking: An experimental study in an EFL context. *System*, 40(1), 37-47.
- Huckin, T. N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom Applications*. Washington: United States Information Agency.
- Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 18(3), 329-342.
- Jdetawy, L. F. A. (2011). Problems Encountered by Arab EFL Learners. *Language in India*, 11(3).
- Kang, H. (2007). A Case study: Comparing reading strategies of advanced CFL learners on different genres and media of text. Retrieved 21/1/2017, from Education: 1st Place (The Ohio State University Edward F. Hayes Graduate Research Forum <http://hdl.handle.net/1811/31925>
- Kashkuli, F. R., Ghanbari, N., & Abbasi, A. (2016). The effect of Van Dijk discourse strategies on Iranian EFL learners' writing proficiency. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(4), 819.
- Khabiri, M., & Pakzad, M. (2012). The effect of teaching critical reading strategies on EFL learners' vocabulary retention. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 31(1), 73-106.
- Kirn, & Hartmann. (2012). *Reading Interactions*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ko, M.-y. (2013). A critical discourse analysis of EFL learners' post-reading reflections in a critical literacy-based class. *English Linguistics Research*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Macknish, C. J. (2011). Understanding critical reading in an ESL class in Singapore. *TESOL Journal*, 2(4), 444-472.
- Nezami, S. R. A. (2012). A critical study of comprehension strategies and general problems in reading skill faced by Arab EFL learners with special reference to Najran University in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal Social Science and Education*, 2(3), 306-316.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329-348.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah.
- Rahimi, E., & Sharififar, M. (2015). Critical discourse analysis and its implication in English language teaching: A case study of political text. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(3), 504.
- Rahimi, S. (2013). Promoting the Reading Comprehension of High-School Students through

- Critical Discourse Analysis. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 3(4), 56.
- Rajabi, P. (2009). Cultural orientation and reading comprehension models: the case of Iranian rural and urban students. *Novitas-Royal*, 3(1), 75-82
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*: Cambridge university press.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of educational research*, 75(3), 365-416.
- ur Rahman, M. M., & Alhaisoni, E. (2013). Teaching English in Saudi Arabia: prospects and challenges. *Academic Research International*, 4(1), 112.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 1-37). London: Sage.
- Wallace, C. (1992). Critical literacy awareness in the EFL classroom. *Critical language awareness*, 59-92.
- Winch, G., Johnston, R. R., March, P., Ljungdahl, L., & Holliday, M. (2006). *Literacy: Reading, Writing and Children's Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yu-hui, L., Li-rong, Z., & Yue, N. (2010). Application of Schema Theory in Teaching College English Reading. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(1), 59.

Appendix A

Pre and Post Test

Name: _____ Academic No: _____

Question No.	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Comments
Max. mark	5	3	3	5	8	24	
Marks obtained							

Text 1: Analyze the paragraph critically and answer the questions that follow:

The diets of whole cultures and regions come from location, history, and tradition. For example, the typical Mexican diet is a combination of foods from pre-Columbian, Spanish, and French cultures. It is rich in complex carbohydrates (corn, beans, rice, breads) and protein (beans, eggs, fish, meat). Fish and fish products from the seas around Japan are one of the most important parts of the traditional Japanese diet. Rich in vitamins and minerals, seafood is served grilled, baked, raw, dried, pickled, hot, and cold. Soy products (miso, tofu, and bean paste) fermented vegetables, and rice are also important in the typical Japanese diet. Religious practices may also greatly affect diet. These laws prohibit eating pork or bacon or other meat from pigs, shellfish, snake, or insects. In addition, some people can not eat meat and dairy (milk products) at the same meal. Muslims follow the laws of *eating halal*, an Islamic system of eating only permitted foods. Some foods, such as pork or insects, are not permitted. Though people can eat some meat such as beef from cows, the animals must be killed in a special way, according to ritual. Also, for religious reasons, some Christians eat fish instead of meat on Fridays. They also limit their food choices during Lent (the 40 days before Easter) in the spring. (Kirn & Hartmann 2012, p.45)

Q1. "The diets of whole cultures and regions come from location, history, and tradition". Complete the table below with diets from cultures and regions not in the paragraph. 5 points

Diets of whole cultures and regions	Based on history	Based on location	Based on religion
In the paragraph	Mexican food	Japanese seafood	Islamic and Christian food

