



The Application of Implicit Stratified Teaching to English Reading Teaching in Junior Middle School

Qin He^(✉) and Guojing Chen

College of Foreign Languages, Kashi University, Kashi 844000, Xinjiang, China
heqin@KSU.edu.cn

Abstract. Under the current teaching system in China, teachers are still adopting the same teaching contents, teaching objectives, teaching activities and the same evaluation methods to all the students in one class. This will probably make high-level students feel that the classroom is not challenging, and lower-level students can't keep up with others and lose confidence gradually. In this case, stratified teaching emerged to help the teacher to pay attention to the individual differences of students and to meet the needs of students at different levels. In the implicit stratified teaching mode, the students with the similar learning level are secretly assigned to different groups in the classroom on the basis of considering the students' original foundation, intelligence characteristics, and learning potential to meet the learning needs of students at different levels. It can be concluded that the implicit stratified reading teaching greatly embodies the principle of teaching students according to their aptitude. Only according to the students' cognitive characteristics and learning style, can the teacher train the students as independent learners.

Keywords: Implicit stratified teaching · English reading · Reading ability

1 Introduction

When discussing the basic concept of English curriculum, the English Curriculum Standard (2011) [1] clearly pointed out that: Teaching should be oriented to all students, teachers should pay attention to different characteristics and individual differences of language learners. It is necessary and urgent to improve students' reading ability with fully respecting students' individual differences in English reading, and urgent to adopt different methods to meet different students' different needs. Since the 1980s, stratified teaching was firstly introduced in Shanghai, and it was applied and improved in many other areas of China to face the differentiation of students, to implement more effective teaching to train independent learners. The implicit stratified teaching was derived from stratified teaching. Implicit stratified teaching is a teaching method on the basis of teachers' inner understanding of the students' existing knowledge, study capacity, mentality

Project: Research on the Construction of Blended Teaching Model in The Course of English Pedagogy (PT-2020046).

© The Author(s) 2023

A. Volodin and I. Roumbal (Eds.): ICECIDT 2022, ASEHR 677, pp. 173–188, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-02-2_20

and hobbies, the students with the same learning proficiency are secretly assigned to different groups in the classroom, and from teaching objectives, teaching activities to teaching assignments are stratified to meet the learning needs of students at different levels [1].

2 The Application of Implicit Stratified Teaching to English Reading Teaching in Junior Middle School

An experimental study on the implicit stratified teaching of English reading in junior middle school was made. The research aims at finding out whether the implicit stratified teaching will influence junior middle school students' reading ability and which level of students' reading ability was improved more. The research questions are as follows: (1) Can implicit stratified teaching improve students' reading score? If so, which level of students will be improved more? (2) What aspects of reading ability will be improved?

Two paralleled classes in Grade 8 in No.11 Middle School in Kashi were selected as subjects, Class 2 was selected as experimental class and Class 4 was selected as controlled class. These two classes were selected as subjects because of three reasons. First of all, these two classes have similar average English scores. According to the scores of experimental class and controlled class in the final unified examination of the second term in 2018–2019 in Kashi, the value of sig. (2-tailed) is 0.882 that is higher than 0.05 which means there is no significance between these two classes. Secondly, the student constitution is similar in these two classes. There are 22 boys and 20 girls in Class 2, and 21 girls and 22 boys in Class 4. The students in these two classes have learned English over 8 years. Thirdly, there is no difference between the two classes in terms of teaching methods and learning methods. Before the experiment, the experimental class and the controlled class were taught by the same teacher, so the same learning strategies are cultivated. Both the experimental class and the controlled class adopted same teaching method to teaching, such as Task-Based Language Teaching and PWP approach. To fulfill the research aim, four instruments were adopted, test-paper, questionnaire and interview. These four instruments are supplementary each other, none of them can be dispersed with. In order to ensure the scientific nature of the experimental data, in the experiment, the SPSS 21.0 was used to analyze the questionnaire and the results before and after the test.

Before the research, three preparing work was done, in which teaching content analysis, students' existing knowledge analysis and students' group cooperation training were included. Five parts are included in the experiment: (1) Student Stratification (2) Objective Stratification (3) Teaching Activity Stratification (4) Assignment Stratification (5) Evaluation Stratification. The reading score distribution and English gross scores distribution are similar in experimental class. When setting stratified objectives, the teacher allow the students in level C have a lower learning objective which is in line with their reading ability and let them gradually achieve the unified objectives. By doing a variety of exercise or tasks to test whether the students in level C have reached their goals. If they've got it, try to design next unified objectives for them. The general rule followed in the implementation of the implicit stratified reading teaching is that reading activities aimed at achieving the unified goal of the class or the unit must be completed by the

Table 1. Teaching Sample

Unit 2 How Often Do You Exercise? Section B (2b) What Do No.5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?		
Background Information		
Teacher	He Qin	Time 45 min
Type	Reading	Period Period 3
Theme	What Do No. 5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?	
Subject	Grade 8, No. 11 Middle School	
Teaching Content Analysis		
The teaching material is "Go for it" Grade 8, Book 1. The lesson is the third period of Unit 2. The topics in this unit are in line with the reality of students' lives. This unit mainly covers the usage of frequency adverbs, the aim is to let students know how to express how often students do all kinds of activities. Section A in this unit has designed some tasks to ensure students talk about how often people do things. In "Grammar Focus" part, students have done some grammar activities about the usage of frequency adverbs. The text presented in this lesson presents many frequency adverbs and they are still important but aren't the learning difficulties.		
Subject Analysis		
The eighth grade students already have certain English expression ability, and the content of this course is in line with the daily life of the students, so the students have strong interests and motivation. They know the meaning of "skimming" and "scanning" in reading but some students still feel confused how to use these two skills in reading, let alone how to analyze the structure of a text.		
Teaching Aims		
Knowledge Aim	Let students have a better understanding of the usage of frequency adverbs.	
Ability Aims	Let students master how to use skimming to get the main idea. (level A, Level B, Level C)	
	Let students know how to use scanning to get specific information. (level A, Level B, Level C)	
	Let students understand how to analyze the structure of a paragraph. (Level B, Level A)	
Cultivate students' critical thinking. (Level A)		

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Unit 2 How Often Do You Exercise? Section B (2b) What Do No.5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?	
Emotion Aims	Let students learn to develop good habits and arrange their work reasonably.
Teaching Focus	Use skimming to get the main idea of text and each paragraph. Use scanning to get the different activities the students do in No. 5 High School and describe their frequency.
Teaching Difficulties	Use topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence to analyze the structure of a paragraph. Use scanning to get the different activities the students do in No. 5 High School and describe their frequency. (Level B, Level C) Use topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence to analyze the structure of a paragraph. (level A, Level B, Level C)
Teaching Method	PWP
Teaching Aids	Multimedia
Teaching Preparation	Tell students the class is a competition, the top three group winners can choose their homework from the teacher's homework list. Each group member need to try their best to get more mark, and if any member never contributes to the whole group, the rank of the group will be put backward.
Teaching procedures	
Steps	Activity(Teacher) Activity(Ss) Interactions Sub-aims Time Designing Analysis
Step 1 Warm up	Greet students by showing three pictures of teacher's activities in her free time. Listen to the teacher and ask any question if they like T-Ss Get ready for the class 1 min Arouse their interests.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Unit 2 How Often Do You Exercise? Section B (2b) What Do No.5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?						
Step 2 Pre-reading	<p>1. List two tasks and let the students to choose to finish. Different tasks get different marks.</p> <p>Task 1 (3 marks): try to use two or three sentences to answer: What do you usually do in your daily life?</p> <p>Task 2 (6 marks): Give us a short report about your group member's activities in free time</p>	Discuss in a group	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	Get ready for the class	4 min	<p>Task 1 is designed for students in level C, it will give a chance for them to get marks to contribute to the group, and also to practice the usage of frequency adverbs.</p> <p>Task 2 is designed for the students in level B and level A which aims to let these students have a little challenge and go further.</p>
Step 2 Pre-reading	<p>2. Propose two questions to have a short discussion: How do you get the main idea of a text or a paragraph? Do you need read word by word? (2 marks)</p>	Discuss in a group	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	Get ready for the skimming	1 min	This task is designed to let the students in level A help the students in level B and level C to have a clear understanding how to use skimming to find out topic sentence and get the main idea.
Step 3 Reading	<p>3. Let students skim the text to: underline the topic sentence and key words of each paragraph and the text and have a short summary about the main idea. (2 marks)</p>	Read and underline individually → Discuss in a group → Report the answer → Summarize the main idea	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	Practice skimming	2 min	Skimming is the basic skill that the whole class must master, so it must be done individually first. And the group discussion can give the students in level C confidence to present later.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Unit 2 How Often Do You Exercise? Section B (2b) What Do No.5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?						
	4. Show a pie chart related to the third paragraph and lead students to use scanning to match the activities and the frequency adverbs together and let them read the second and the fourth paragraph to fill the pie chart. (4 marks)	Read and fill in the pie charts individually → Pair check → Check in whole class	T-Ss, Sa1-Sa1, Sa2-Sa2, Sb1-Sb2	Practice scanning and Prepare for the next step	3 min	The teacher chooses a relatively easy pie chart to guide students to scan and transit information which is necessary in reading items. And it will give an example for the students in level C, at the same time leave two another a little complex pie charts to fill in order to make the students in level B and in level A also have the motivation to finish them.
	5. Let students describe how many people and how often they take these three activities with the help of the pie chart they've filled. (6 marks)	Describe in group → Present in whole class	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	Understand the structure of a paragraph	6 min	It will be a little difficult for the students in level C to describe the whole chart, but if they can describe some of it, they will gradually improve themselves and they will feel happy they contribute to the group. And for the students in level A and level B, in the process of helping others, it is a process of transiting information, they will improve a lot. With the same activity but different requirement will help different students improve.
Step 3 Reading	Read the fifth paragraph and try to answer: What does the writer think is the best way to relax? Why? (2marks) Do you think the students' habit at No. 5 are healthy? Why or why not? (3marks)	Read individually → Discuss in a group → Share in class	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	Understand the writer's opinion and have a deep thinking about healthy habit	6 min	These two questions are designed hierarchically. The first question is about the fact in the fifth paragraph it will be easy to answer for the students in level C, and there is no standard answer to the second question, it is a good question to improve the critical thinking ability of each level.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Unit 2 How Often Do You Exercise? Section B (2b) What Do No.5 High School Students Do in Their Free Time?						
Step 4 Post-reading	Show a pie chart about the survey on how students use cellphone as follow:	Write a paragraph by using the information in the pie chart → Check in group → Present in class	T-Ss, Sa1-Sa1, Sa2-Sa2, Sb1-Sb2	Have a deep understanding of the structure of a paragraph	7 min → 3 min → 2 min	With the help of last task, it won't be too difficult to finish for the students in level A and level B. For the students in level C, it will be a big progress they just write a topic sentence and one supporting sentence no matter with the help of the last task or the help of group work.
	Step 5 Summary	Let students try to summarize what skills they have learned in this class.	Discuss in group	T-Ss, Sc2-Sb2-Sa2	3 min	Peer encouragement is as much important as teacher's positive feedback for each level.
Step 6 Homework	Memorize the method to analyze the structure of a paragraph.					1 min
	Choose one paragraph to retell form paragraph two to paragraph five.					
	Make an outline of a short passage using the information presented in pie chart of cellphone survey.					

students themselves, and then carried out group discussions and class presentations. The method of assignment stratification in this research consulted the method from Professor Hu Xinghong who is one of the pioneers who adopted stratified teaching in China. The process evaluation and summative evaluation were combined in the process of implementing implicit stratified teaching, following the principle of strict requirements for level-A students, encouraging level-B students and praising C students.

The teaching sample is shown in Table 1.

3 Research Results and Discussion

After the students took the third monthly exam, it meant that the practical part of the experiment ended and began to enter the stage of collecting and sorting out the experimental data. Data collation was divided into three steps. The first step was to sort out the results of the pre-test. Before the experiment, the pre-test results had been preliminarily sorted out. After the experiment, the data of pre-test were checked again, and the scoring rate of all kinds of questions in the pre-test paper was calculated. The second step was to collect and sort out the post-test results. The average scores of the two classes and the average scores of the students in three levels in the experimental class were calculated. In order to compare the changes in students' reading ability, the author calculated the scoring rate of each type of reading question of post-test paper. The third step was to put pre-test and post-test results into the SPSS 21.0 to contrast: the differences between experimental class and controlled class, the differences among students at different levels in experimental class and the differences among the scoring rate of each type of question.

The interview was done on the basis of data collation. The experimental data showed that the implicit stratified teaching can promote the reading ability, but the influence on the students of in level B and level C are more obvious than that in level A. Implicit stratified teaching improved students' reading ability, but had different influence on different reading abilities. The ability of guessing words and refining the main idea was obviously improved, but the improvement of detail problems was not very obvious. In view of the above results, the author would like to know students' feelings about the experiment and the pros and cons of this experiment through interviewing with different levels of students. According to the experimental results and the purpose of the interview, the author listed the outline of the interview. On December 5, the author picked six students at three different levels in random, two students from each level. The author recorded the results of the interview carefully and privately.

3.1 Results and Analysis of Pre-test Between EC and CC

In order to demonstrate Class 2 and Class 4 are suitable to be experimental class and controlled class, it is necessary to analyze whether there is significance between their reading score (Table 2).

As it is shown in "Table 2", the average score in experimental class and controlled class are respectively 18.67 and 18.84, the difference between the experimental class and controlled class is 0.17. The values of the Standard Deviation in experimental class

Table 2. Independent Samples T-test of the EC and CC in the Pre-test

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
pre-test	EC	42	18.67	5.31297	-.149	.882
	CC	43	18.84	5.25507	-.149	.882

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) CC = controlled class (Class 4) N = number

Table 3. Independent Samples T-test of the EC and CC in the Post-test

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
post-test	EC	42	23.10	4.61604	3.725	.000
	CC	43	19.12	5.20627	3.730	.000

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) CC = controlled class (Class 4) N = number

and controlled class are respectively 5.31297 and 5.25507. The values of the Standard Deviation show that the experimental class's reading score distribution is more decentralized than controlled class. It can be seen that the value of T is -1.49 that is lower than 2.045 ($T < 2.045$) and the value of P is 0.882 that is higher than 0.05 ($P > 0.05$).

Above all, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between experimental class and controlled class in the reading scores of the pre-test, and the results can be used for further study to check the effectiveness of the experiment.

3.2 Results and Analysis of Post-test Between EC and CC

The experiment has lasted for 3 months from September to December 2019. Except the implicit stratified teaching was adopted in the experimental class, there was no other difference between the experimental class and controlled class. The reading scores of the third monthly English exam were regarded as the post-test scores. The test results were analyzed and presented in Table 3.

By comparing and analyzing the reading scores of the experimental class and the controlled class, it can be found that the reading scores of the experimental class and the controlled class changed significantly. First of all, from the average score, the average score of the experimental class is 23.10 , while the average score of the controlled class is 19.12 , and there is a gap of 3.98 points between the two classes. In the pre-test, the gap between the experimental class and the controlled class is 0.17 , 3.98 is much higher than 0.17 , the gap enlarged. Secondly, combined with the value of Sig. (2-tailed), the value of Sig. (2-tailed) in the post-test is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$), it can be concluded, in the post-test, there were significant differences between the experimental class and the controlled class.

The value of the Standard Deviation in experimental class is 4.61604 and that of controlled class is 5.20627 . In other words, the score distribution between the experimental class and controlled class is different and the reading score of the controlled class is more decentralized than that of the experimental class. Compared with the value

of the Standard Deviation in pre-test, which are respectively 5.31297 and 5.25507, the Standard Deviation of experimental class in post-test decreased by 0.67 and controlled class increased by 0.05. The results show that the implicit stratified teaching effectively reduced the polarization in reading.

To sum up, the value of T is 3.725 ($T > 2.045$) and the value of P is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$), which means that there is significant difference between the experimental class and controlled class in reading scores in the post-test.

3.3 Results and Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test in EC

In order to check the effectiveness of implicit stratified teaching to English reading in experimental class, the author compared the changes of reading scores between the pre-test and the post-test by using Paired Sample Test in experimental class.

By comparing and analyzing the reading scores of the experimental class and the controlled class, it can be found that the reading scores of the experimental class and the controlled class changed significantly. First of all, from the average score, the average score of the experimental class is 23.10, while the average score of the controlled class is 19.12, and there is a gap of 3.98 points between the two classes. In the pre-test, the gap between the experimental class and the controlled class is 0.17, 3.98 is much higher than 0.17, the gap enlarged. Secondly, combined with the value of Sig. (2-tailed), the value of Sig. (2-tailed) in the post-test is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$), it can be concluded, in the post-test, there were significant differences between the experimental class and the controlled class.

The value of the Standard Deviation in experimental class is 4.61604 and that of controlled class is 5.20627. In other words, the score distribution between the experimental class and controlled class is different and the reading score of the controlled class is more decentralized than that of the experimental class. Compared with the value of the Standard Deviation in pre-test, which are respectively 5.31297 and 5.25507, the Standard Deviation of experimental class in post-test decreased by 0.67 and controlled class increased by 0.05. The results show that the implicit stratified teaching effectively reduced the polarization in reading.

To sum up, the value of T is 3.725 ($T > 2.045$) and the value of P is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$), which means that there is significant difference between the experimental class and controlled class in reading scores in the post-test.

3.4 Results and Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test in EC

In order to check the effectiveness of implicit stratified teaching to English reading in experimental class, the author compared the changes of reading scores between the pre-test and the post-test by using Paired Sample Test in experimental class.

According to "Table 4", it can be seen that the average scores before and after the experiment are 18.67 and 23.10, there is a gap of 4.43 points before and after the experiment. In addition, the value of P is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$) which means there is significance between pre-test and post-test. Therefore, the results answer the first part of the first research question presented in 4.1 in Chapter Four: Students in experimental class had a great improvement on reading with the help of implicit stratified teaching.

Table 4. Paired Samples Test for Reading Scores in EC

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-test	EC	42	18.67	5.31297	-8.798	.000
Post test	EC	42	23.10	4.61604		.000

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) CC = controlled class (Class 4) N = number

Table 5. Paired Samples Statistics between Pre-A and Post-A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-A	25.75	8	2.91548	-2.183	.065
	Post-A	28.00	8	2.61861		

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) N = number Pre-A: pre-test of level A Post-A: post-test of level A

Table 6. Paired Samples Statistics between Pre-B and Post-B

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-B	19.33	24	2.18028	-6.843	.000
	Post-B	23.64	24	3.57122		

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) N = number Pre-B: pre-test of level B Post-B: post-test of level

3.5 Results and Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test at Different Levels in EC

In order to answer the second part of the first question (Which level was improved more?), the reading scores of each level was analyzed by using Paired Sample Test in experimental class.

From “Table 5”, the average score of level A in pre-test is 25.75 and 28.00 in post-test, it increased 2.25 points. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.065 (>0.05), which indicates there is no significance in level A before and after the experiment.

From “Table 6”, the average score of level B in pre-test is 19.33 and 23.67 in post-test, it increased 4.34 points. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 (<0.05), which indicates there is significance in level B before and after the experiment. It can be seen that students in level B improved more than the students in level A.

From “Table 7”, the average score of level C in pre-test is 11.40 and 17.80 in post-test, it increased 6.4 points. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 (<0.05), which indicates there is significance in level C before and after the experiment. It can be seen that students in level C improved most among the students in these three levels.

Table 7. Paired Samples Statistics between Pre-C and Post-C

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-C	11.40	10	2.31900	-6.857	.000
	Post-C	17.80	10	2.39444		

a. Note: EC = experimental class (Class2) N = number Pre-C: pre-test of level C Post-C: post-test of level C

Table 8. Scoring Rate of Each Type of Question of Pre-test

Question Type	Title Number	Scoring Rate in single events	Total Reading Scoring Rate	Average
Detail Understanding	26–29, 36, 37, 39	70.71%	62.33%	9.9
Main Idea	30, 40	35.00%		1.4
Form	31–35	71.00%		7.1
Word Guessing	38	15.00%		0.3

3.6 Effects on Reading Ability

Both in the pre-test paper and the post-test paper, there are three articles 5 questions in each article, 2 points for each question and 30 points is the full mark. There are four types of questions, respectively: (1) Detail Understanding, it mainly examines students' ability to find relevant information in the article. (2) Main Idea, it detects students' ability of getting the main idea. (3) Form, which aims to check whether students understand the information provided by the form. (4) Word Guessing, which reflects students' ability to guess new words according to context. Both in pre-test paper and post-test paper, there are seven questions about detail understanding and the full mark is 14 points; there are five questions about form and the full mark is 10 points; there are two questions about main idea and the full mark is 4 points; there is one question about word guessing and the full mark is 2 points. The scoring rate of each type of question was figured out and the results are shown in Table 8.

From "Table 8", it shows that before the experiment, the total scoring rate of four types of questions is 62.33%; the scoring rate of questions about detail understanding is 70.71%; the scoring rate of questions about form is 71%; the scoring rate of questions about main idea is 35% and that of word guessing is 15%. It can be seen that students are relatively good at questions about detail understanding and form which means students have better ability of knowing how to find specific information in reading; the average score of questions about word guessing is low at 0.3 point and that of questions about main idea is 1.4 points which indicates it's urgent to improve students their ability of getting main idea and guessing word's meaning from context.

According to "Table 9", it shows that after experiment, the scoring rate of four types of questions all increased and the total reading scoring rate is 70% which is 7.76 points

Table 9. Scoring Rate of Each Type of Question of Post-test

Question Type	Title Number	Scoring Rate in single events	Total Reading Scoring Rate	Average
Detail Understanding	31–34, 36, 37, 38	72.86%	70.00%	10.2
Main Idea	35, 40	62.50%		2.5
Form	26–30	74.00%		7.4
Word Guessing	39	45.00%		0.9

higher than that of pre-test. The scoring rate of questions about detail understanding is 72.86% which is 2.15% higher than that of pre-test; the scoring rate of questions about form is 74% which is 3% higher than that of pre-test; the scoring rate of questions about main idea is 62.50% which is 27.5% higher than that of pre-test and the scoring rate of questions about word guessing is 45% which is 30% higher than that of pre-test. It can be seen that the scoring rate of questions about main idea and word guessing increased dramatically and the scoring rate of questions about detail understanding and form slightly improved.

Above all, it can be found that with the help of implicit stratified teaching, students' ability of getting main idea and the ability of guessing word improved significantly but the ability of getting detail information improved not so obviously.

4 Conclusion

4.1 Major Findings

Firstly, the implementation of implicit stratified teaching has a great effect on students' reading ability. The average score of the experimental class increased from 18.67 to 23.10, there is a gap of 4.43 points before and after the experiment and the value of P is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$) which means there is significance between pre-test and post-test. The overall reading level of students has been significantly improved under the guidance of implicit stratified reading teaching. Different level's students improved at different extent. The average score of level C in pre-test is 11.40 and 17.80 in post-test, it increased 6.4 points and the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 (<0.05), which indicates there is significance in level C before and after the experiment. The average score of level B in pre-test is 19.33 and 23.67 in post test, it increased 4.34 points, the value of Sig.(2-tailed) is 0.000 (<0.05), which indicates there is significance in level B before and after the experiment. The average score of level A in pre-test is 25.75 and 28.00 in post-test, it increased 2.25 points, the value of Sig.(2-tailed) is 0.065 (>0.05), which indicates there is no significance in level A before and after the experiment. It can be seen that students in level A improved slightly and students in level B improved more than the students in level A. Students in level C improved most among the students in these three levels.

Secondly, by analyzing the results of pre-test and post-test paper, it indicated that the implementation of implicit stratified teaching made a significant effect on students' reading ability. The scoring rate of questions about detail understanding increased from 70.71% to 72.86%; the scoring rate of questions about form increased from 71% to 74%; the scoring rate of questions about main idea increased from 35% to 62.5%; the scoring rate of questions about word guessing increased from 15% to 45%. It can be seen that the influence of implicit stratified reading teaching on students' ability of getting detail information is not obvious. Students' ability of getting the main idea has been greatly improved, the most obvious improvement is the ability of guessing words.

So, teachers should learn to cultivate students' learning autonomy. Implicit stratified teaching is based on the detailed and comprehensive analysis of students. To implement implicit stratified teaching, it is important to make full use of group cooperation. Teachers should pay attention to the guiding role of assignment to students, and teachers should take the "skillful" mind to arrange assignments.

4.2 Implications

First of all, teachers should learn to cultivate students' learning autonomy. It is necessary to take full account of the multiple identities of teacher. Teachers are not only instructors but also observers and guides. Teachers need to observe which students need help and what help they need; teachers should provide appropriate assistance when it is necessary; teachers should inspire students to find a solution to the problem, rather than pointing out the answer directly. If the students encounter problems in the learning process, they can work together and if students can't solve the problems, the teacher gives some guidance and lead the students to continue to try until they can solve the problems. In teaching process, students must be busier than teachers.

Secondly, implicit stratified teaching is based on the detailed and comprehensive analysis of students. In *Optimization of Teaching Process Theory*, Babansky argued that a thorough and systematic study of students is an important prerequisite for optimizing the process of teaching [2] (Wang Junxiang, 2005). Students are in the center of teaching, teacher should pay attention to the development of students. Before implement student stratification, it is necessary for the teacher to analyze students' Zone of Proximal Development [3] (Lev-Ari, 2016). Therefore, the student stratification should be based on the students' Zone of Proximal Development, and the setting of teaching objectives and teaching activities should be consistent with the students' Zone of Proximal Development. The implementation of implicit stratified teaching, in addition to the analysis of students' Zone of Proximal Development, but also to analyze students' learning style, learning strategy. The difference in students' learning style will affect the setting of teaching activities. For example, there are both auditory and visual learners in the class, and the lead-in activity of reading can't always take listening activities as lead in, which is not conducive to the development of visual students. Some students tend to study autonomously, and some students prefer cooperative learning, which requires teachers to arrange the proportion of individual activities and group activities in teaching reasonably. What's more, it is important to understand students' interest. When set up a topic which is interested by most of students to discuss, students' participation in the classroom teaching is obviously high. There is no doubt that in order to ensure the

effectiveness of teaching, it is necessary to understand the needs of students. And a deep understanding of student is not built in one day, in addition to more observation in class, teachers still have a lot of work to do after class.

Thirdly, to implement implicit stratified teaching, it is important to make full use of group cooperation. The purpose of group cooperation is in accordance with the basic idea of the Zone of Proximal Development Theory, that is, encourage students in problem-solving and arouse students' curiosity by problem-solving, so as to enable students to construct an understanding of knowledge [4] (Wang Wenjing, 2000). In implicit stratified teaching, through the analysis of students, teacher knew students' Zone of Proximal Development and set different teaching objectives for different students. However, students at all levels do not exist in isolation, they are interrelated. Only by making full use of the strength of unity and cooperation, can every student gain something. Therefore, in class, it is necessary for teachers to properly arrange the cooperative learning, and the students in different levels are integrated into a group to help each other and promote each other, so as to promote the interest and initiative of learning.

Last, teachers should pay attention to the guiding role of assignment to students, and teachers should take the "skillful" mind to arrange assignments. Assignment, teaching and evaluation are inextricably linked, assignment and classroom teaching jointly promote the development of students and affect the effectiveness of teaching [5] (Wang Yuefen, 2018). In addition to assigning assignment according to students' ability and teaching objectives, teachers should pay attention to the following three aspects. Firstly, teachers should make the assignment interesting. Based on the consideration of arousing the enthusiasm of the students to finish the assignment, the teacher should arrange the interesting assignment content for the students, so that the students can complete the assignment consciously without the supervision of the teachers and parents. Second, the assignment should be expansive. Teachers cannot be satisfied with teaching according to the content of textbooks, but should consciously help students to expand English knowledge and have a broader vision of English culture [6] (Li Ruyun, 2020). Teachers should go deep into students' life by understanding students' interests and hobbies that they pay attention to, so that English teaching will be lovely and lively. Third, teachers should arrange open assignment for the students. Open assignment is the concrete implementation of respecting students' personality and reflecting students' differences. There is no fixed answer or only conclusion to open assignment. It's especially useful to examine the extensiveness of students' thinking, the practical ability and innovative consciousness of students. To sum up, assignment should be stratified to meet students' ability, be interesting to enhance students' interest in learning, and also be extensible and open to help students develop in the long run.

Authors' Contributions. Qin He wrote the manuscript and analysed the data, contributed to revising and editing the paper. Guojing Chen is responsible for the experimental design.

References

1. Wang, Xian-rong. 2005. Experimental Research on Implicit Hierarchical Teaching of College English. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching* 104 (1): 51.
2. Wang, Junxiang. 2005. The Optimization of Teaching Process. *Comparative Education Research* 22: 127–128.
3. Lev-Ari, S. 2016. Studying individual differences in the social environment to better understand language learning and processing. *De Gruyter Mouton* 02: 1–10.
4. Wang, Wenjing. 2000. The Enlightenment of Vygotsky's "Zone of Proximal Development" Theory to China's Teaching Reform. *Psychological Exploration* 20: 18–20.
5. Wang, Yuefen. 2018. Homework Design Ability—A Neglected Approach to Quality Improvement. *Education for People* 58: 58–62.
6. Li, Ruyu. 2020. Research on Innovative English Homework Assignment in Junior Middle School. *Journal of Education* 03: 42.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

