



READING BETWEEN THE TEXTBOOKS: COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES IN THE AGE OF MULTIPLE TEXTBOOK REFORM IN GREECE

Georgios Angelopoulos¹,

Nikolaos Angelopoulos²,

Ioanna Bakopoulou³ⁱ

¹Primary Education Teacher,
M.Ed. in "Educational Sciences",
Hellenic Open University,
Greece

²Primary Education Teacher,
M.Sc. in "Computer Science and Technology",
University of Patras,
Greece

³Primary Education Teacher,
M.A. in "Creative Writing",
Hellenic Open University,
Greece

Abstract:

This article aims to highlight the important role that reading strategies play in how students process and comprehend texts. It begins with a theoretical overview of strategies used during reading, drawing on the international literature. The review brings to light a wide range of reading strategies that teachers can put into practice, depending on their educational level, class, and the profile of their students. Each strategy is examined both in theory and in practice, with concrete teaching examples drawn from various textual sources within the framework of the Multiple Textbook Policy (Law 4823/2021), which allows teachers to choose among approved alternative textbooks. The analysis of the practical section highlights the specific aspects of each strategy and its value as a teaching tool that supports differentiated instruction.

Keywords: reading comprehension, text, reader, reading strategies, differentiated instruction

ⁱCorrespondence: email angeological@gmail.com, aggelonik@gmail.com, agghra1@gmail.com, iobakopoulou@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Developing text comprehension skills is essential for taking part in today's literate world. Teaching written comprehension is one of the primary goals of education, yet it is also one of the most demanding skills teachers are called upon to teach. Reading comprehension is an especially complex process that draws on a variety of underlying skills; much of it takes place inside the reader's mind and is not directly observable. It does not come naturally to children — it requires steady guidance and support from the teacher.

Kouloumbaritsi (2011) defines comprehension as a process of accessing the meaning of a text, during which the reader seeks to build a mental representation of it. Seen this way, text comprehension is a complex cognitive activity and the product of an interaction between factors related to both the reader and the text itself (Vamvoukas, 2008; Kintsch, 2009; Tzouriadou & Anagnostopoulou, 2011; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014).

Engaging with a text involves following an integrated sequence of linguistic messages — ideas, experiences, opinions, or information — expressed within a communicative context (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1999). Comprehension starts at a first level with decoding words and sentences, then moves to a second level where the reader connects the meaning of all the sentences to build a mental representation (Kendeou *et al.*, 2014).

The reader's engagement is tied to their overall cognitive and linguistic abilities, but also to their motivation and prior knowledge (Vamvoukas, 1984). According to Psaltou-Joycey (2010), readers draw on their strategies and experience to interact with the text and construct its meaning. In this way, the reader's active participation becomes crucial, as it plays an essential role in progressively completing the writer's work (Anastasiou & Griva, 2009; Giasson, 2014).

In short, understanding written language is a multifaceted process that goes well beyond decoding characters. It is a genuine meaning-making process, and it remains inseparably tied to the reader's active engagement (Snow & Sweet, 2003).

2. The Multiple Textbook as an educational framework

The digital media revolution (*media revolution*) is reshaping the role of educational materials. The idea of the textbook as a single, closed teaching tool has given way to the broader notion of "*educational media*" (Apple, 2000; Selwyn, 2016). The focus shifts to the "*learning environment*" that is created by a variety of media and a diverse set of stimuli. In this environment, which now includes new technologies, teachers work with students to interpret and evaluate materials, so that knowledge acquisition is based on discourse (*discourse-based knowledge acquisition*), on negotiating meaning, and on the social context (Mercer, 2000).

From this perspective, the intended learning outcomes of the new Curricula are achieved by drawing on both core educational materials and supplementary digital

resources (Pingel, 2010). This creates a dynamic web of information flows connecting the textbook, the Curricula, and the digital supplementary materials.

As part of this reform, the Greek educational system introduced the “Multiple Textbook” (*Multiple Textbook Policy*) — the option of choosing among approved alternative textbooks for each subject (Law 4823/2021, articles 84–85). The textbook thus takes on a new, dynamic role: it is no longer the centerpiece of a closed teaching process, but rather sets the learning processes in motion, provides directions that put the Curriculum into practice, and suggests activities that draw on supplementary digital resources (Pingel, 2010). In this article, the teaching examples are drawn from Language textbooks that fall within this framework.

3. Reading strategies

Teachers often try to keep students from being passive recipients of a text’s message by weaving a set of reading strategies into the learning process. A reading strategy can be thought of as a “*mental tool*” that a reader uses to support, monitor, and repair their comprehension (Afflerbach & Cho, 2009). Readers with strong comprehension skills can be described as *strategic readers*, who — both consciously and unconsciously — draw on specific strategies to resolve comprehension difficulties and regulate their own reading behavior.

The literature offers a wide range of definitions that give conceptual shape to the term “*reading strategies*.” Most of them refer to conscious processes aimed at effectively constructing meaning from any written text (Afflerbach *et al.*, 2008; Carrell *et al.*, 1998; Choo *et al.*, 2012; Erler & Finkbeiner, 2007).

The literature distinguishes three categories of reading strategies: strategies used *before* reading (*pre-reading strategies*), strategies applied *during* reading (*during-reading strategies*), and strategies used *after* reading (*post-reading strategies*). These categories give teachers room to choose, adapt, and use them in differentiated ways (Anderson, 1999; Yusuf, 2011).

4. During-reading strategies

The literature emphasizes that effective readers draw on strategies before, during, and after reading a text (Antoniou, 2005; Dermitzaki *et al.*, 2008; Mason *et al.*, 2013). Alderson (2000) and Noli & Sabariah (2011) also stress how important it is to use a variety of strategies for effective comprehension.

This article focuses on strategies applied *during* reading. These are techniques used while the reader is working through a text. Research shows that these strategies make it easier to understand complex texts, improve the retention of information in long-term memory, and strengthen the ability to analyze and interpret (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Rosenshine, Meister, & Chapman, 1996). At the same time, they help readers actively engage with the text and develop critical thinking (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Rog (2015)

also notes that these strategies are especially important because they make the reader an active participant in comprehending the text, rather than a passive recipient of the information it contains.

4.1 Say Something

4.1.1 Description of the strategy

The “Say Something” strategy (*Say Something*) is based on the short, frequent conversations that develop between students while reading a text. Specifically, students pause at certain points — paragraphs or stanzas — and engage in a structured dialogue about what they have just read (Short *et al.*, 1996). Beers (2003) notes that applying this strategy counteracts the tendency to finish a reading without any commentary — a habit that gets in the way of comprehension.

4.1.2 How it works

The strategy requires at least two students working together. The first reads a passage aloud, pauses at chosen points, and comments on what they have read; the other then responds verbally to what they heard. The roles alternate until the whole text has been read.

While reading the passage, the first speaker chooses one of the following actions:

- *Make a prediction.*
- *Ask a question.*
- *Clarify something that seems unclear.*
- *Offer a comment.*
- *Link the passage to other parts of the text or to personal experiences.*

The partner responds to what they heard in one of the following ways:

- *Agreeing or disagreeing with the prediction.*
- *Answering the question or asking a new one.*
- *Building on the comment or the connection that was made.*

Note: If the first speaker cannot come up with a comment, they should reread the passage before moving on.

4.1.3 Stem sentences

Within the framework of differentiated instruction, teachers can provide students with a table of stem sentences for commenting (Table 1). These phrases work as linguistic *scaffolding*, especially helping students who struggle to start the conversation. For instance, a student who wants to make a prediction might begin with: “*Reading this passage, it seems to me that...*”.

Table 1: Stem sentences for commenting

Category	Stem Sentences
Making a prediction	• I predict that... • I bet that... • I think that... • I wonder if... • Reading this passage [reference], it seems to me that...
Commenting on something in the text	• I agree with... because... • I disagree with... because... • The part that puzzles me is... • The part that confuses me is... • I like the part where... • I don't like this part because... • My favorite part so far is... • I think that...
Clarifying something unclear	• Now I understand that... • At first, I thought that... but now I think that... • The phrase "... " means...
Asking a question	• Why... • What would happen if... • Do you think that... • Who is... / Where... / How... • In what way... • What does this phrase mean...
Making connections with the text	• This part reminds me of... • This part of the text is like... • This character is like [other character] because... • What I read has happened to me...

4.1.4 Application examples

According to Elkins (2005), the “Say Something” strategy is particularly effective in differentiated instruction settings, as it supports students with different learning profiles — such as auditory learners — in deeply processing complex concepts through structured dialogue. What follows are two application examples: the first with a Grade 3 (Year 3) text focused on an environmental theme, and the second with a Grade 5 (Year 5) text focused on the complex ideas of bilingualism and identity. The texts come from the digital library of school textbooks [Melispi](#).

4.1.4a Example A — Language, Grade 3 (Year 3), Volume B, p. 30

Text: [“The chaos we have created”](#)

“This is the chaos we have created. These are the fish that swim in the chaos we have created. This is the seal that eats the fish that swim in the chaos we have created. This is the net that catches the seal that eats the fish that swim in the chaos we have created. This is the steel boat that casts the net that catches the seal that eats the fish that swim in the chaos we have created.”

Student A (reads the passage aloud)

→ *Prediction:*

"I think it's talking about something bad we're doing to the sea... because it keeps saying the word chaos and that makes me think we've done a lot of damage."

Student B (responds verbally)

→ *Comment:*

"I agree! I think the chaos is the trash we throw in the sea. I've seen it at the beach too — it's really ugly stuff."

(Roles switch)

"BUT... we're the ones who can fix the situation, cut down our trash at work and when we're having fun, recycle the plastic we throw away, and shrink the landfill right away."

Student B (reads the passage aloud)

→ *Connection to personal experience:*

"This reminds me of when we were picking up trash last year in the schoolyard. We filled a whole bag!"

Student A (responds verbally)

→ *Prediction:*

"Yeah, I remember too! I think if we did that more often, the sea would be cleaner. Maybe the text says something like that later on."

4.1.4b Example B — Our Language, Grade 5 (Year 5), Volume C

According to Elkins (2005), this approach is particularly effective in differentiated instruction settings, as it supports students with different learning profiles. What follows is an application of the strategy to the text "[Stathis, 11 years old — Language biographies](#)", Unit 7.2: "[Why do we speak many languages?](#)", p. 17". The text explores the ideas of bilingualism and linguistic identity.

"My name is Stathis, I'm 11 years old, and I'm bilingual. I live in Stockholm and go to a Swedish school. But every now and then, as soon as school lets out, I run to Greece..."

Student A (reads the passage aloud)

→ *Prediction:*

"I think Stathis really loves Greece, because he says he 'runs' there as soon as school lets out. Like he can't wait!"

Student B (responds verbally)

→ *Comment:*

"I agree too. It reminds me of going to my grandpa's in the summer. I talk differently there, more relaxed. Maybe Stathis feels the same when he speaks Greek."

(Roles switch)

"With my brother we talk however it comes out each time... my mom knows Swedish really well, and my dad understands Greek, but they insist on speaking English with each other... their secret language!"

Student B (reads the passage aloud)

→ *Clarification:*

"Now I get why the family speaks so many languages! Each person uses the one they know best or the one they like. And English is the parents' 'secret' language!"

Student A (responds verbally)

→ *Connection to the unit:*

"Yes, and it reminds me of what we said in class — that we pick how we talk depending on where we are and who we're with. At home we talk differently than at school."

4.2 Save the Last Word for Me

4.2.1 Description of the strategy

The "Save the Last Word for Me" strategy (*Save the Last Word for Me*) was proposed by Short *et al.* (1996) and provides a structured framework for group discussion about the content of a text. It rests on the idea that the student — and not the teacher — is the one who has the last word in a discussion. According to Beers (2003), this motivates students, especially the more hesitant ones, and gives their ideas particular weight.

As part of this strategy, students are first asked to write down individually the most important idea or ideas of a text. They then share their ideas in group or whole-class settings and discover common ground.

4.2.1.1 How it works

Rasinski and Padak (2000) describe the stages of the method as follows:

- The teacher asks students to read a text and identify a point that excited them, confused them, caught their interest, or made them angry. This point might relate to an event or to the thoughts and words of a character in the text.
- Students write down their “discovery” on a post-it note and jot down their thoughts about their choice on the back.
- The teacher asks one student to share their choice with the class, without commenting. That student then takes charge of the discussion, calling on classmates to react to what they heard. The teacher can step in and comment only after the students have shared their views.
- Finally, the student leading the discussion reads out their own comment — in other words, they have the last word. After this reading, no other student is allowed to respond further.
- The process is repeated with a new student announcing their own choice. It can be used throughout the school year, across all subjects, with a different student in the lead each time.

According to Rasinski and Padak (2000), this process has a positive effect on students because:

- it creates the right setting for them to think about and discuss the information and ideas in a text;
- it gives them the chance to make personal connections with the information presented in a text;
- it encourages active participation in the learning process.

4.2.2 Application examples

What follows are two application examples: the first with a Grade 4 (Year 4) text and the second with a Grade 5 (Year 5) text, both taken from the new Language textbooks (Multiple Textbook).

4.2.2a Example A — Language, Grade 4 (Year 4)

Textbook: [My Language, Volume B](#)

Text: “Mantaras and Tromaras” (pp. 89–90)

Selected passage:

“But look, my dear Tromaras, since the X is the most important thing! Everything else is unnecessary, and that’s why, since the map was so big, I tore it up and kept only the X. Didn’t I do the right thing?”

Step 1 – Individual note-taking (post-it)

A student picks the passage and writes their thought on the back of a post-it:

Post-it:

"I picked this one because Mantaras made me laugh! How can you tear up the map and keep only the X? Without the rest of the map you don't know anything! It's like keeping just one word from a whole book."

Step 2 – Group discussion

The student reads the passage to their group without revealing their comment:

Student 1: (comment) *"Mantaras is funny, but what he did doesn't make any sense!"*

Student 2: (comment) *"How are you going to find the treasure if you don't have the whole map? He's crazy!"*

Step 3 – The last word

The student reads their thought from the post-it, closing the discussion. No further comments from the others are allowed.

Note: The last word always belongs to the student who chose the passage. The others listen without commenting.

4.2.2b Example B – Language, Grade 5 (Year 5)

Textbook: [Our Language, Volume C](#)

Text:

"The Boring Sundays, Icarus, and the times tables" (Alki Zei, The Tin Tiger in the Window, pp. 33–34)

Selected passage:

"We sat around sulking for quite a while, and then each of us picked a windowpane as her own and said, whichever one gets the most raindrops, that one wins."

Step 1 – Individual note-taking (post-it)

A student picks the passage and writes on the back of the post-it, in simple words:

Post-it:

"I picked this part because I really loved how the girls found a way to play with nothing, just because they were bored. It reminded me of a time when the power went out at our house, and we had no TV or tablet. Back then, my little sister and I started playing with shadows on the wall using a flashlight, and we actually had a great time!"

Step 2 – Group discussion

The student reads only the sentence from the book to the whole class, without revealing her comment. Her classmates react:

Student 3: (*comment*)

“They must have been really bored that Sunday, since it was raining and they couldn’t go out.”

Student 4: (*comment*)

“It’s clever how something so simple, like raindrops on the window, turned into a contest!”

Step 3 – The last word

The student reads her own comment from the post-it – the connection to the power going out and the shadow play. With this reading, the discussion ends; no other student is allowed to respond, ensuring respect for her personal view.

Note: The last word always belongs to the student who chose the passage. The others listen without commenting.

4.2.3 Closing evaluation

Using familiar vocabulary – such as *“had a great time”* or *“found a way to play with nothing”* – allows the student to build empathy with Alki Zei’s characters. As Rasinski and Padak (2000) point out, this active engagement helps children process the meaning of the text in depth through their own everyday lives, turning reading into a lived experience.

4.3 Text Coding

4.3.1 Description of the strategy

During their school years, students come into contact with a wide range of written texts across different subjects. Yet many students struggle to use reading as an effective learning tool. To address this, many teachers have added the “Text Coding” strategy (*text coding*) to their teaching repertoire.

Harvey and Goudvis (2015), describing the strategy, note that it is an active reading strategy that lets students mark their thoughts on the text using symbols or letters as they read. In this way, readers reach a deeper level of engagement with the text (Porter-O’Daniel, 2004). Elish-Piper and L’Allier (2011) similarly emphasize that coding encourages readers to make connections between the content of the text and their own ideas, knowledge, beliefs, and life experiences.

A key issue when applying the strategy is choosing which codes students will use to mark up the text. An illustrative coding system, developed by Daniels and Zemelman (2004), is shown in the table below.

Table 2: Coding system by Daniels & Zemelman (2004)

Symbol	Meaning
*	Confirms your thinking
×	Interesting point
X	Contradicts what you were thinking
?	New information / something to think about
R	Reminds you of something familiar
??	Confusion
A	Answers a question you had

3.3.2 Modelling the strategy

The teacher presents and explains to the class the symbols that will serve as the basis for coding the text. Within the framework of differentiated instruction, an illustrative table of symbols could look like this:

Table 3: Illustrative coding table

Symbol	Meaning
!	I found an interesting point
;	I don't understand this part
yes	I agree with what I read
no	I disagree with what I read
*	I didn't know this information
**	I already knew this information
R	This information reminds me of something

The teacher then thinks aloud (*think-aloud*) through the content of the text, marking the corresponding coding symbols as they go. The same process is then repeated with a different text and the whole class taking part. Finally, students work on their own, applying the strategy to a text of their own.

4.3.3 Practical observations

From applying the strategy in everyday teaching, the following observations emerge:

- The number of symbols introduced to students at first should be small and expand gradually, depending on the goals the teacher sets.
- Every teacher can choose the symbols they consider suitable for the profile of their class.
- Through discussion, it should be made clear that it is not necessary to use every symbol on the table when coding.
- It is natural for coding to vary from one student to another.

A closely related reading strategy is *text annotation (annotation)*. Simpson and Nist (1990) point out that in annotation, readers write notes in the margins of the text or underline and mark important passages as they read.

In sum, the coding strategy — like the related annotation strategy — increases student engagement and strengthens comprehension of the text. At the same time, within

differentiated instruction, it helps students who struggle with comprehension visualize the key points of a text.

4.3.4 Application examples

What follows are two application examples of the strategy: the first with a Grade 6 (Year 6) text with scientific and environmental content, and the second with a Grade 3 (Year 3) text of an experiential, narrative character.

4.3.4a Example A — Grade 6 (Year 6), Volume B: [“The story of an anti-pollution operation”](#) pp. 25–26

The text describes the response to a maritime accident off Salamis, offering plenty of information about the technology and ecology involved.

Coding sample

“In September 2017 there was a serious maritime accident. A tanker, the ‘Agia Zoni II,’ sank in the sea area of Salamis.”

Code: *** (I knew this — I saw it on the news with my parents)*

“The winds carried huge oil slicks toward the shore...”

Code: *? (Why are the winds carrying it? Where does the oil go after that?)*

“The next day, information systems using satellite imagery were put to use...”

Code: *! (I didn’t know they used satellites for this — that’s cool!)*

“The polluting oil... ends up as biofuel... there is an effort to reach a zero environmental footprint.”

Code: ** and yes (It’s good that they turn it into biofuel and don’t just throw it away)*

4.3.4b Example B — Grade 3 (Year 3): [“A Flame in the Dark”](#) pp. 21–22

The text is about the life and education of Helen Keller, focusing on the power of will and on alternative ways of communicating.

Coding sample

“D-O-L-L. The girl imitated the teacher until she managed to spell the word correctly.”

Code: *! (How did she do it? I couldn’t do it without seeing!)*

“Anne gave her the doll.”

Code: *A (Ah, that’s why she gave her the doll — to reward her!)*

“How do we understand someone without them speaking to us?”

Code: ?? (*I don't get how you know what someone is saying if they're not talking*)

"With our team... we write in her journal... we use very few words, we add pictures, symbols..."

Code: R (*Like the emojis we send on WhatsApp!*)

4.3.5 Closing evaluation

Applying coding to the texts above shows how the strategy can turn reading from a passive intake of information into a dynamic process of linking with the reader's prior knowledge. As Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) note, students are encouraged to make connections with their own beliefs and life experiences — something that strengthens deep comprehension. Beyond that, using symbols in a differentiated way allows each reader to adapt the process to their own needs, making the text more accessible and easier to work with.

4.4 Story Mapping

4.4.1 Description of the strategy

Research suggests that most students develop adequate reading comprehension skills by Grade 3 (Year 3) of primary school (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). Yet a significant number of students are unable to draw meaning from a written text, even though they have no trouble decoding it (Lipka *et al.*, 2006). To support these students, the literature highlights a range of strategies that offer a structured framework for building meaning from written text (Reed & Vaughn, 2012). Among them, "Story Mapping" holds a prominent place.

The strategy is a graphic representation of both the fundamental elements that make up a narrative text and the relationships between them (Davis & McPherson, 1989; Li, 2000). Wright (2003) refers to a process in which students recognize the basic structure of a narrative text within a graphic organizer. The structural elements identified by Foley (2000) are: the *setting* (the place and time in which the story takes place), the *initiating event* (the event that creates the problem and sets things in motion), the *conflict* (the central event of the story), the *events* (the characters' attempts to resolve the conflict), the *characters*, the *resolution* (the outcome of the conflict) and the *theme* (the main idea of the story).

A key part of the strategy is the graphic organizer, which acts as a framework for recording, organizing, and understanding the information in a narrative text (Table 4).

Table 4: Story mapping graphic organizer

Title of the text:	Student's name:	
	Characters	
Setting		Problem
	Characters' Actions to Solve the Problem	
	Problem Resolution	

4.4.2 Modelling the strategy

Modelling (*modelling*) is the critical first stage in teaching the strategy, as it lets students see the cognitive processes of an experienced reader. According to the literature, this process reduces cognitive load and helps build an organized schema of knowledge.

Stages of modelling

Stage 1 – Presentation of the graphic organizer

The teacher presents the graphic organizer (Table 4) to the whole class, explaining the meaning of each structural element: characters, setting, problem, actions, resolution, and theme. They note that the organizer works as a “map” that helps the reader avoid getting lost in the information of the text.

Stage 2 – Read-aloud and think-aloud

The teacher reads the text aloud and pauses at key points to externalize their thinking. In the example below, the text used is [“Isis and the Seven Scorpions”](#) from the Grade 3 (Year 3) Language textbook, Volume B, pp. 14–15:

For the Setting: “I read that Isis is hiding in the marshes of ancient Egypt. This is the setting – the place and time of the story. I note it in the corresponding box.”

For the Problem: “Here I see that the noblewoman shuts her door on the hungry Isis. This sets the story in motion – so it’s the initiating event, that is, the problem.”

Stage 3 – Collaborative completion (guided practice)

With the students’ help, the teacher fills in the fields of the graphic organizer for the text “Isis and the Seven Scorpions”:

Table 5: Graphic organizer – “Isis and the Seven Scorpions”, Grade 3 (Year 3)

Title of the text:		
Isis and the Seven Scorpions		
Characters		
Isis, the seven scorpions, Seth, the noblewoman, the poor woman, the noblewoman’s child		
Setting		Problem
Ancient Egypt; marsh, the noblewoman’s mansion, the poor woman’s cottage		Isis is being pursued by Seth and the noblewoman refuses to take her in

Actions to Solve the Problem
1. Isis finds shelter in the poor woman's home. 2. The scorpions take revenge by stinging the noblewoman's child. 3. Isis decides to heal the child even though the mother had wronged her.
Problem Resolution
Isis saves the little boy by using magic spells
Theme (main idea)
The value of hospitality and generosity in the face of cruelty

Note: Finally, students are given opportunities to apply the strategy independently, with a new text of their own choice or of the teacher's choice.

4.4.3 Effectiveness of the strategy

Research points to the following positive outcomes from using story mapping:

- **Building a knowledge schema:** It helps students create an organized schema and connect their prior knowledge to the content of the text (Shanahan *et al.*, 2010).
- **Reducing semantic load:** Students can reduce the amount of information they have to process in order to draw meaning from the text (Faggella-Luby *et al.*, 2007; Jitendra & Gajria, 2011).
- **Relieving working memory:** Working memory overload is significantly reduced (O'Donnell *et al.*, 2002).

In sum, story mapping improves the ability to comprehend and retell narrative texts, strengthening comprehension of their content (Lapp *et al.*, 2010).

5. Conclusion

The process of understanding a text begins before it is read, continues throughout the reading, and is completed with discussions and activities afterwards (Beers, 2003). According to the literature, there are comprehension strategies that come before, alongside, or after reading, in order to support students (Irvin *et al.*, 2003).

However, every student has different needs and a different level of difficulty with reading comprehension, as most do not have the metacognitive skills required to support the many processes of comprehension (Mason *et al.*, 2013). Teachers, therefore, must choose the methodologies and strategies that best foster self-regulation and critical thinking.

Aarnoutse and Schellings (2003) found that reading strategies can be adapted to the specific characteristics of each reader, helping them draw on the mental processing skills they need. According to the researchers, once readers learn to use effective strategies, they apply them regularly depending on the demands of the text (van Kraayenoord & Schneider, 1999). At the same time, Wangsgard (2010) points out that without these strategies, any attempt at text comprehension will fall short of expectations. This article has tried, within the limits of length, to present an indicative selection of reading strategies aimed at engaging students actively with the text while reading. The literature review brings to light a wealth of similar strategies that teachers can put into practice, depending on the educational level and class.

Creative Commons License Statement

This research work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>. To view the complete legal code, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>. Under the terms of this license, members of the community may copy, distribute, and transmit the article, provided that proper, prominent, and unambiguous attribution is given to the authors, and the material is not used for commercial purposes or modified in any way. Reuse is only allowed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that no conflict of interest exists regarding the publication of this paper.

About the Authors

Georgios Angelopoulos is a Primary Education Teacher currently serving at the 25th Primary School of Patras, Greece. He holds a Master's Degree (M.Ed.) in "Educational Sciences" from the Hellenic Open University. He has published numerous research articles in both peer-reviewed international and Greek educational journals. His research interests focus on reading comprehension strategies, primary education pedagogy, and differentiated instruction.

Nikolaos Angelopoulos is a Computer Science Educator currently seconded to the University of Patras, Greece. He holds two Master's Degrees (M.Sc.) from the University of Patras, one of which specializes in Artificial Intelligence. He has published a considerable number of research articles in peer-reviewed international and Greek academic journals. His research interests lie in educational technology, artificial intelligence in education, and computer science pedagogy.

Ioanna Bakopoulou is a Primary Education Teacher currently serving at the Primary School of Panopoulo, Ilia, Greece. She holds two Master's Degrees (M.Ed. / M.A.) from the Hellenic Open University, specializing in "Adult Education" and "Creative Writing." She has published several research papers in international and Greek educational journals. Her main academic interests include adult learning methodologies, creative writing in primary education, and innovative pedagogical practices.

References

- Aarnoutse, C., & Schellings, G. (2003). Learning reading strategies by triggering reading motivation. *Educational Studies*, 29(4), 387–409.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305569032000159688>

- Afflerbach, P., & Cho, B. (2009). *Identifying and describing constructively responsive comprehension strategies in new and traditional forms of reading*. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 69–91). Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313439813_Identifying_and_describing_constructively_responsive_comprehension_strategies_in_new_and_traditional_forms_of_reading
- Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, 61, 364–373. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.5.1>
- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732935>
- Anastasiou, D., & Griva, E. (2009). Awareness of reading strategy use and reading comprehension among poor and good readers. *Elementary Education Online*, 8(2), 283–297. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256196016_Anastasiou_D_Griva_E_2009_Awareness_of_reading_strategy_use_and_reading_comprehension_among_poor_and_good_readers_Elementary_Education_Online_82_283-297_In_the_online_journal_httpilkogretim-onlineorgt
- Anderson, N. J. (1999). *Exploring second language learning*. Heinle & Heinle. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Exploring-Second-Language-Reading%3A-Issues-and-Anderson/c9e3d3ba8ba6d09fdee01d55ecdd8ab3c60d09e5>
- Αντωνίου, Φ. (2005). Ενίσχυση της αναγνωστικής κατανόησης. Στο Σ. Παντελιάδου & Φ. Αντωνίου (Επιμ.), *Διδακτικές προσεγγίσεις και πρακτικές για μαθητές με μαθησιακές δυσκολίες* (σ. 41–48). Γράφημα. [in Greek]
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). Routledge. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/officialknowledg0000appl_n3n0
- Βάμβουκας, Μ. (1984). Ψυχοπαιδαγωγική θεώρηση της κατανόησης των αναγνωσμάτων. Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη. [in Greek]
- Βάμβουκας, Μ. (2008). Εισαγωγή στην Ψυχοπαιδαγωγική Έρευνα και Μεθοδολογία. Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη. [in Greek]
- Beers, K. (2003). *When kids can't read, what teachers can do: A guide for teachers grades 6–12*. Heinemann. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/whenkidscantread0000beer>
- Carrell, P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). *Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading*. In R. C. Friedman & B. M. Shore (Eds.), *Talents unfolding: Cognition and development* (pp. 167–187). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003092114195>

- Choo, T. O. L., Eng, T. K., & Ahmad, N. (2012). Effect of reciprocal teaching strategies on reading comprehension. *The Reading Matrix*, 11(2), 140–149. Retrieved from https://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/april_2011/choo_eng_ahmad.pdf
- Daniels, H., & Zemelman, S. (2004). *Subjects matter: Every teacher's guide to content-area reading*. Heinemann. Retrieved from https://books.google.ca/books/about/Subjects_Matter.html?id=DHHuAAAAMA_AJ
- Davis, Z. T., & McPherson, M. D. (1989). Story map instruction: A road map for reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 43(3), 232–240. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20200342>
- Dermitzaki, I., Andreou, G., & Paraskeva, V. (2008). High and low reading comprehension achievers' strategic behaviors and their relation to performance in a reading comprehension situation. *Reading Psychology*, 29, 471–492. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ820098>
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(3), 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1598/0872071774.10>
- Elish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. K. (2011). Examining the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading gains in grades K–3. *The Elementary School Journal*, 112, 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1086/660685>
- Elkins, H. (2005). *Ideas and strategies for teaching in the content areas*. Indiana University, Department of Language Education.
- Erler, L., & Finkbeiner, C. (2007). *A review of reading strategies: Focus on the impact of first language*. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (pp. 187–206). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290483635_A_review_of_reading_strategies_Focus_on_the_impact_of_first_language
- Faggella-Luby, M., Schumaker, J. S., & Deshler, D. D. (2007). Embedded learning strategy instruction: Story-structure pedagogy in heterogeneous secondary literature classes. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 30, 131–147. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30035547>
- Foley, M. M. (2000). The (un)making of a reader. *Language Arts*, 77(6), 506–511.
- Γεωργακοπούλου, Α., & Γούτσος, Δ. (1999). Κείμενο και επικοινωνία. Ελληνικά Γράμματα. [in Greek]
- Giasson, J. (2014). Η αναγνωστική κατανόηση (μτφ.-επιμ. Μ. Φουντοπούλου). Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη. [in Greek]
- Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2015). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension for understanding and engagement* (3rd ed.). Stenhouse. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032682525>
- Irvin, J. L., Buehl, D. R., & Klemp, R. M. (2003). *Reading and the high school student: Strategies to enhance literacy*. Allyn & Bacon. Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/Reading-High-School-Student-Strategies/dp/0205489397>

- Jitendra, A. K., & Gajria, M. (2011). Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 43, 1–16. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17161/foec.v43i8.6690>
- Kendeou, P., van den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive view of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 29(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12025>
- Kintsch, W. (2009). *Learning and constructivism*. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 223–241). Routledge. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2009-09809-012>
- Κουλουμπαρίτση, Α. (2011). Αναλυτικό πρόγραμμα και διδακτικός σχεδιασμός: Θεωρητικές αναζητήσεις και παραδείγματα εφαρμογών από το σχολείο. Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη. [in Greek]
- Lapp, D., Fisher, D., & Johnson, K. (2010). Text mapping plus: Improving comprehension through supported retellings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(5), 423–426.
- Li, D. (2000). *Effect of story mapping and story map questions on the story writing performance of students with learning disabilities*. Texas Tech University. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.53.5.8>
- Lipka, O., Lesaux, N. K., & Siegel, L. S. (2006). Retrospective analyses of the reading development of grade 4 students with reading disabilities: Risk status and profiles over 5 years. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39, 364–378. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/00222194060390040901>
- Mason, L. H., Meadan-Kaplan, H., Hedin, L., & Taft, R. (2013). Self-regulating informational text reading comprehension: Perceptions of low-achieving students. *Exceptionality*, 21(2), 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2012.747180>
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464984>
- Noli, M. N., & Sabariah, M. R. (2011). Reading strategies of English as a second language (ESL) high and low achievers. *English Language Journal*, 4, 49–66.
- O'Donnell, A. M., Dansereau, D. F., & Hall, R. H. (2002). Knowledge maps as scaffolds for cognitive processing. *Educational Psychology Review*, 14(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013132527007>
- Pingel, F. (2010). *UNESCO guidebook on textbook research and textbook revision (2nd rev. ed.)*. UNESCO/Georg Eckert Institute.
- 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>
- Porter-O'Daniel, C. (2004). Beyond the yellow highlighter: Teaching annotation skills to improve reading comprehension. *English Journal*, 93(5), 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4128941>
- Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Erlbaum. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1995-97198-000>

- Psaltou-Joycey, A. (2010). *Language learning strategies in the foreign language classroom*. University Studio Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353044181_LANGUAGE_LEARNING_STRATEGIES_AN_OVERVIEW
- Rasinski, T., & Padak, N. (2000). *Effective reading strategies: Teaching children who find reading difficult*. Merrill. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Effective_Reading_Strategies.html?id=Bf9JAAAYAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Reed, D. K., & Vaughn, S. (2012). Retell as an indicator of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 16, 187–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2010.538780>
- Rog, J. L. (2015). *Struggling readers: Why band-aids don't stick and worksheets don't work*. Hawker Brownlow Education.
- Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching students to generate questions: A review of the intervention studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(2), 181–221. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543066002181>
- Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates (2nd ed.)*. Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-022-09971-9>
- Short, K. G., Harste, J., & Burke, C. (1996). *Creating classrooms for authors and inquirers (2nd ed.)*. Heinemann. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ed391162>
- Simpson, M. L., & Nist, S. L. (1990). Textbook annotation: An effective and efficient study strategy for college students. *Journal of Reading*, 34, 122–131. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40032053>
- Snow, C. E., & Sweet, A. P. (2003). *Reading for comprehension*. In A. P. Sweet & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension* (pp. 1–11). Guilford Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Rethinking_Reading_Comprehension.html?id=YiefzqdD8KMC&redir_esc=y
- Τζουριάδου, Μ., & Αναγνωστοπούλου, Ε. (2011). Παιδαγωγικά προγράμματα για παιδιά με μαθησιακές δυσκολίες. Προμηθεύς. [in Greek]
- van Kraayenoord, C. E., & Schneider, W. E. (1999). Reading achievement, metacognition, reading self-concept and interest: A study of German students in grades 3 and 4. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 14(3), 305–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173117>
- Wangsgard, N. (2010). The before, during, and after reading scale. *Reading Improvement*, 47(4), 179–187. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ971912>
- Whitehurst, G. J., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Child development and emergent literacy. *Child Development*, 69, 848–872. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1132208>
- Wright, D. B. (2003). *Group story mapping*. Teaching and Learning.

Yusuf, H. O. (2011). The effect of pre-reading activities on students' performance in reading comprehension in senior secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 2(9), 1451–1455. Retrieved from <https://www.interesjournals.org/articles/the-effect-of-prereading-activities-on-students-performance-in-reading-comprehension-in-senior-secondary-schools.pdf>