The Relationships among EFL-Teacher Trainee Metacognitive Awareness, Instructional Beliefs, and Instructional Practices Regarding Reading Strategies

Tipamas Chumworatayee
Thammasat University

Abstract

Two self-report instruments, the SORS-EFL - the adapted version of the revised Survey of Reading Strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002) by Zhang and Wu (2009) - and a reading lesson plan, were designed to determine the extent to which 31 EFL teacher trainees used reading strategies while reading academic materials in English, what they believed about the necessity of reading strategy instruction, and what types of reading strategies they employed in their 50-minute-lesson plan. The results revealed that, as a whole, reading strategies were both used and believed in at a high level. The teacher trainees, however, employed reading strategies in the 50-minute-lesson plan to quite a limited extent and with variable frequency. The correlation analysis suggests a positive relationship between their reading strategy use and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction; however, their employment of reading strategies in the lesson plan had no significant correlation with either their use of strategies or their beliefs in them. Pedagogical implications of the research for the field of EFL teacher education are discussed. Specifically, this study highlights the importance of training EFL teachers in effective reading strategy instruction in classroom practice as an integral syllabus element in the design of reading methodology courses in EFL teacher professional development programs.

Keywords: Metacognitive Awareness, Reading Strategies, EFL Teachers' Instructional Beliefs, EFL Teachers' Instructional Practices, EFL Teacher Trainees

1. Introduction

Reading in English is an essential skill for all EFL learners. In order to read for comprehension, "readers must monitor their comprehension processes and be able to discuss with the teacher and/or fellow readers what strategies are being implemented to comprehend" (Anderson, 1999, p. 38). Although reading is taught as either a separate or integrated skill in all Thai EFL classrooms, it is still questionable if reading strategy instruction is an effective classroom activity.

As students are not always aware of the power of consciously using reading strategies, teachers can play an important role in helping increase their students' awareness and

use of reading strategies in order to become "thoughtful, constructively responsive, and strategic readers" (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002, p. 2). In the case of EFL teachers, understanding how they themselves - as proficient readers - read and how their reading process may differ from those of others is part of their preparation for teaching reading (Aebersold & Field, 2000).

Moreover, in a review of research in the field of ESL/EFL teachers' beliefs and instructional practices, it can be concluded that teachers' beliefs which are derived from various sources (such as past experience, established practice, teachers' personality, educational principles, research-based evidence, and principles derived from a teaching approach or method) can influence what they say and do in the classroom (Johnson, 1992; Kuzborska, 2011; Li & Wilhelm, 2008; Lihua, 2010). Thus, a thorough understanding of the reading process should influence EFL teacher trainees' beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction and how they can teach their students to be aware of and utilize useful reading strategies. However, research studies on EFL teacher trainees' beliefs and instructional practices in the area of reading strategies still present an unclear picture.

Given the importance of EFL teacher trainees' thorough understanding of how they themselves read, their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction, and their reading strategy instructional practices, this paper presents the results of an investigation into the relationships among these three factors. It is hoped that the findings will have implications for teacher educators working with EFL teacher trainees to help them consider how to incorporate reading strategy instruction into their classroom.

In particular, the question addressed in this study is: what are the relationships among EFL teacher trainees' use of reading strategies while reading academic materials in English, their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction, and their employment of reading strategies in a 50-minute-lesson plan?

2. Literature Review

To provide a theoretical background for the present study, reading as a strategic process, EFL reading strategy instruction, EFL teachers' beliefs and instructional practices, and ESL/EFL readers' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies are briefly reviewed below.

2.1 Reading as a Strategic Process

Throughout the years, several descriptions of the ways a reader derives meaning from printed materials have been advanced. Over the past few decades, theories concerning the reading comprehension process have undergone changes from the traditional view of it being language-based and bottom-up (before the 1970s) to the cognitive view of it

being top-down (during the mid-to-late 1970s), and then to the interactive processing view (in the 1980s), which is an interaction between the bottom-up and the top-down approaches.

According to bottom-up processing, the reader processes each word letter-by-letter, each sentence word-by-word, and each text sentence-by-sentence in a linear fashion (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). Top-down processing (psycholinguistics), on the other hand, assumes that the meanings of a text are already in the minds of readers and that readers go to the print to gain confirmation of what they have already guessed (Devine, 2002). Beginning with classic studies by Rumelhart and Bransford and their associates (as cited in Alderson, 2001, p. 43; Carrell, 2002, p. 101), researchers have proposed an interactive processing of reading, which argues that bottom-up or lower-level and top-down or higher-level processes work together interactively as parts of the reading process. Both processes are occurring, either alternately or at the same time (Aebersold & Field, 2000), and both are important strategies for skilled readers (Nuttall, 1996).

Putting it all together, reading is considered an interactive meaning-making process (Anderson, 1999; Carrell, 1998), and skilled readers are strategic meaning-makers who incorporate a wide array of reading strategies (both bottom-up and top-down) to achieve the goal of reading comprehension. Skilled readers not only use different strategies, but know how to plan, monitor, regulate, and remediate their comprehension effectively and efficiently.

As reading research has progressed, researchers have been interested in identifying and classifying reading strategies that skilled readers use to construct meaning from a text. Reading strategies have been classified into different categories by researchers. During the past three decades, however, the reading strategies under the cognitive and metacognitive categories have increasingly been regarded as factors vital for successful reading comprehension. Cognitive strategies are seen as actual conscious behaviors that individuals use to process language to understand, learn, or use in some context, while metacognitive strategies are conscious processes that regulate cognitive strategies and other processing (Phakiti, 2006). Livingston (1997) states that cognitive strategies are used to help an individual achieve a particular goal, while metacognitive strategies are used to ensure that the goal is reached.

Metacognitive and cognitive strategies may overlap in that the same strategy could be regarded as either a cognitive or a metacognitive strategy, depending on the purpose of using the strategy. The use of metacognitive strategies can either precede or follow a cognitive activity. Research indicates that the nature of a task helps determine the strategies naturally employed to carry out the task (Oxford, 1994). Once reading strategies are learned up to the unconscious and automatic level, they can become reading skills (Anderson, 1999).

2.2 EFL Reading strategy Instruction

Grounded in the understanding that skilled readers appear to use more strategies than unskilled ones, fostering reading skills among EFL learners to deal with text strategically should be the goal for all EFL reading classes. EFL students should be trained to acquire and develop the reading strategies used by skilled readers. Generally, the studies conducted to investigate EFL teachers and their influence on classroom practices have provided insights into how to implement effective reading strategy instruction in EFL reading classrooms. The teaching of metacognitive skills (the understanding and controlling of cognitive processes) in addition to cognitive skills is suggested by Anderson (2002) as a valuable use of instructional time for an ESL/EFL teacher. Anderson's viewpoint is supported by Beckman (2002), who states that many students' ability to learn has been increased through the deliberate teaching of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and this is especially true for students with significant learning problems.

Training Thai EFL students to use certain reading strategies has also been found to improve their reading skills and help them become more proficient EFL readers (e.g., Akkakoson & Setobol, 2009; Boonkit, 2006; Chavangklang, 2008; Yoosabai, 2009). These studies also emphasize the necessity of reading strategy instruction in all Thai EFL reading classrooms.

2.3 EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Instructional Practices

As EFL teachers have a very important role in helping their students learn to use reading strategies to form the reading skills needed when they read academic materials in English independently, EFL teacher trainees' pre-existing beliefs about EFL reading strategy instruction cannot be overlooked when teacher educators try to design an EFL reading methodology course.

According to Borg (2001), a belief is "a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior" (p. 186). "Convincing research suggests that beliefs are the best predictors of individual behavior and, in particular, that teachers' beliefs influence teachers' perceptions and judgment which, in turn, affect classroom performance" (Pajares, 1993; p. 45). Kindsvatter, Willen, and Ishler (as cited in Richards & Lockhart, 1996, p. 30) suggest that teachers' belief systems are derived from the following sources: a teacher's experience as a language learner, experience from teaching, a teacher's own personality, expectations of schools, parents, the government and the local society, and education-based or research-based principles.

Because beliefs are crucial to a teacher's instructional practices, much research has been conducted to investigate the important role of beliefs in language teaching and learning.

Peacock (2001), however, suggests that since Horwitz's pioneering study in the late 1980s that investigated pre-service teacher beliefs about language teaching and learning, there appears to have been a shortage of empirical studies on beliefs and language teaching and learning, despite the importance of the topic. Peacock suggests that the inconsistency of previous findings underscores the importance of the area and the need for further empirical studies.

In the area of EFL reading, there are a few studies that have focused on the influence of EFL teachers' beliefs in determining their approach towards teaching reading strategies. Despite some research support for the consistency between beliefs and instructional practices among EFL teachers (e.g., Li & Wilhelm, 2008; Kuzborska, 2011), other research continues to question whether teachers' beliefs are consistent with their instructional practices (e.g., AD-Heisat, Mohamad, Krishnasamy & Issa, 2009; Khonamri & Salimi, 2010; El-Okda, 2005; Zavala, n.d.).

2.4 ESL/EFL Readers' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies

The body of work on metacognitive awareness of reading strategies has been regarded as critical for the understanding of the reading process in both L1 and L2 contexts. According to Mokhtari and Reichard (2002), researchers investigating reading comprehension monitoring among readers have long recognized the importance of metacognitive awareness in reading comprehension because it distinguishes between skilled and unskilled readers.

According to Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001), to accomplish the task of comprehending the text successfully, skilled readers utilize metacognitive knowledge and invoke conscious and deliberate strategies. They stated that the reader's metacognitive knowledge about reading includes an awareness of a variety of reading strategies, and that the interaction among the reader, the text, and the context in which reading takes place is influenced by this metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. They further stated that the reader's metacognitive knowledge which may be influenced by a number of factors, including previous experiences, beliefs, culture-specific instructional practices, and in the case of non-native readers, proficiency in L2 may be triggered consciously or unconsciously when the reader encounters a specific reading task.

Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) and Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) point out that awareness and monitoring of one's comprehension processes are often referred to in the literature as metacognition, which can be thought of as the knowledge of the readers' cognition about reading (metacognitive awareness) and the self-control mechanisms they exercise when monitoring and regulating text comprehension (metacognitive strategies). The term "metacognition" was introduced in the 1970s by John Flavell (as cited in Koda, 2005, p. 212), who was convinced that metacognition has two basic components: the ability to reflect on one's own cognition, and the capacity to regulate

one's own cognitive activities. According to Flavell (as cited in Livingston, 1997, p. 1), metacognition consists of both metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experiences or regulation. Metacognitive knowledge refers to acquired knowledge of three variables: person variables, task variables, and strategy variables (Livingston, 1997; Pintrich, 2002). According to Brown (as cited in Livingston, 1997, p. 2), metacognitive experiences or regulation involve the use of metacognitive strategies or metacognitive regulation. Metacognitive strategies that one uses to control cognitive activities and ensure that a cognitive goal has been met are sequential processes.

An instrument named the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) to measure adolescent and adult ESL students' metacognitive awareness and perceived use of reading strategies while reading academic materials in English has recently been commonly used as a self-report survey instrument among ESL/EFL readers (e.g., Mohamed, Chew, & Kabilan, 2006; Poole, 2005; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Tercanlionglu, 2004; Xianming, 2007; Zhang & Wu, 2009). The 28 reading strategies in the SORS are categorized into three categories: (12 intentional, carefully-planned strategies to monitor or manage reading (Global Reading Strategies), 7 strategies used while working directly with a text (Problem-Solving Reading Strategies), and 9 basic support strategies to aid in comprehending a text (Support Reading Strategies). Judging by the descriptions given for the categories, Mokhtari and Sheorey used the terms global and problem-solving to refer to metacognitive and cognitive reading strategies.

The studies conducted by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) and Tercanlionglu (2004) have demonstrated that, like native-language readers, proficient non-native readers have an awareness of and a reasonable control of reading strategies while reading academic texts, although at a varying frequency of strategy use in different categories. Certain research studies in EFL contexts attempting to investigate reading strategies among proficient EFL readers using the SORS (e.g., Mohamed, Chew & Kabilan, 2006; Monos, n.d.; Xianming, 2007; Zhang & Wu, 2009) have also demonstrated similar results.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

This study involved 31 EFL teacher trainees, eighteen females and thirteen males, enrolled for the first semester of academic year 2011 in the MA (TEFL) English Program at a Thai public university. Most of the participants (27) were between 21 and 30 years old. Twenty-two participants had English as their major, and five had English as their minor, but only three participants had a degree in education. Nine participants had had no teaching experience, but all except one had English as their major or minor. Of those who did have teaching experience, the majority (16) taught in private educational institutions, including tutoring schools. Many of the participants (10)

taught at high-school level, and those who taught at a tutoring school (6) tutored learners at all levels.

3.2 Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study: the Survey of EFL Reading Strategies (SORS-EFL) and a reading lesson plan (see Appendix A). The SORS-EFL was used to determine the extent to which the 31 EFL teacher trainees used reading strategies while reading academic materials in English, and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. The reading lesson plan was used to investigate types of reading strategies the EFL teacher trainees employ in their 50-minute lesson plan.

The SORS-EFL - the adapted version of the revised Survey of EFL Reading Strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002) by Zhang and Wu (2009) - is comprised of a short background questionnaire and three main sections: Section A: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Reading Strategies (SORS-EFL: Section A); Section B: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Beliefs about the Necessity of Reading Strategy Instruction (SORS-EFL: Section B); and Section C: An Open-Ended Questionnaire (SORS-EFL: Section C).

A reading passage entitled "The History of the Internet" (Anderson, 2003, pp. 76-77) together with a 50-minute-lesson plan template was used for the writing of a reading lesson plan. "The History of the Internet" was taken from the first level of a four-level reading series called "ACTIVE Skills for Reading". The series uses thematically organized non-fiction reading passages from varied reading selections including newspaper articles, websites, blogs, journals, letters, etc. for a variety of resources to teach reading comprehension and vocabulary skills. As such, its content is meant to represent academic materials in English.

The lesson plan template was designed using a simple format to accommodate those participants who had had no experience of writing a lesson plan. The participants were asked to outline teacher and student activities together with the time frame in minutes for each step of their lessons. The use of the lesson plan as a research instrument to collect the data on types of reading strategies the participants employed was determined by a pedagogical belief that all good teachers, when they walk into their classrooms, have some type of plan which can be as simple as a mental checklist or as complex as a detailed two-page typed lesson plan that follows a prescribed format (Jensen, 2001). According to Jensen, a lesson plan is "an extremely useful tool that serves as a combination guide, resource, and historical document reflecting our teaching philosophy, student population, textbooks, and most importantly, our goals for our students" (p. 403). As such, the teacher and student activities outlined in the lesson plan reflected the participants' employment of reading strategies.

3.3 Data Collection

The SORS-EFL, along with the reading lesson plan, was distributed to the participants on program orientation day prior to any course instruction. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, gave a description of the instruments, and mentioned that it would take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete the SORS-EFL and about 50 minutes to write a reading lesson plan. However, they could take as much time as they wanted to complete the inventory at home. The subjects were asked to turn in both the SORS-EFL and the reading lesson plan the following week in their first class of the first semester, 2011.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The data from the short background questionnaire, the SORS-EFL: Section A, and the SORS-EFL: Section B were analyzed quantitatively. The statistical software SPSS for Windows was used to compute the collected data. The analysis of the data collected from the SORS-EFL: Sections A and B was based on the SORS-EFL's 28 reading strategy items under the three reading strategy categories. The following is a brief description of each SORS-EFL category as adapted by Zhang and Wu (2009):

1. Global Reading Strategies (GLOB1-GLOB12) are those intentional, carefully-planned techniques by which learners monitor or manage their reading, such as having a purpose in mind, previewing the text as to its length and organization, and using typographical aids and tables and figures.

2. Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB13-PROB19) are the actions and procedures that readers use while working directly with a text. These are localized, focused techniques used when problems develop in understanding textual information. Examples include adjusting one's speed of reading when the material becomes difficult or easy; guessing the meaning of unknown words; and rereading the text to improve comprehension.

3. Support Strategies (SUP20-SUP28) are basic support mechanisms intended to aid the reader in comprehending the text, such as using a dictionary, taking notes, underlining or highlighting textual information.

This study identified three levels of reading strategy use and beliefs based on the average scores on a 5-point Likert scale, as suggested by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002): high (an average score of 3.5 or higher); moderate (an average score of 2.5 to 3.4); and low (an average score of 2.4 or lower).

The data from the SORS-EFL: Section C and the reading lesson plan were analyzed qualitatively. Both interpretive analysis and content analysis were utilized in order to code the data collected. The selection of particular activities (both teacher and student activities) regarding reading strategies mentioned in each step in the 50-minute-lesson

plan was coded according to the 28 SORS-EFL strategy types and the three categories. A table was constructed, and all of the reading strategies under the three reading strategy categories were listed to keep track with the coded data. The coded data were then calculated for the frequency of employment of the strategy types and categories. Peer-debriefing with a university EFL instructor to be an inter-rater was carried out as a means of strengthening the trustworthiness of the analysis and interpretation. The inter-rater carried out data-coding using the method prescribed. The results of her analysis largely matched the researcher's original attempts.

To investigate whether there were any relationships between EFL teacher trainees' use of reading strategies while reading academic materials in English, and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction, a bivariate correlation analysis was used to compute the correlations among the overall average scores, average scores for strategy types, and average scores for the three SORS-EFL categories collected from the SORS-EFL Sections A and B. The bivariate correlation analysis was also used to compare the frequencies of the coded data from the reading lesson plan to the overall average scores and average scores for the three SORS-EFL categories collected from the SORS-EFL: Sections A and B to determine the relationships among the EFL teacher trainees' employment of reading strategies in their 50-minute-lesson plan, their use of reading strategies while reading EFL academic materials, and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction.

To obtain in-depth feedback on the relationships among the EFL teacher trainees' use, beliefs, and instructional practices regarding reading strategies, the data collected from Questions 1 to 5 in the SORS-EFL: Section C were triangulated with the data collected from the SORS-EFL: Sections A and B, and the 50-minute-lesson plan.

4. Results

Cronbach alpha scores for the overall SORS-EFL: Sections A and B were .787 and .798 respectively. This result helps to establish the SORS-EFL as a reliable instrument for assessing the participants' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies while reading academic materials in English, and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction.

The research question was analyzed in three phases. The first phase used a bivariate correlation analysis to compute the correlations among the overall average scores, the average scores for strategy types, and the average scores for the three SORS-EFL categories collected from the SORS-EFL: Sections A and B.

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of the participants' reading strategy use and beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction based on overall reading strategies and the three reading strategy categories (N=31)

Strategy	Use	Beliefs
Overall global reading strategies	3.98 (0.42) High	4.26 (0.36) High
Overall problem-solving reading strategies	3.85 (0.91) High	3.98 (0.67) High
Overall support reading strategies	3.49 (0.55) Moderate	3.82 (0.41) High
Overall reading strategies	**3.82 (0.35) High**	**4.05 (0.35) High**

As shown in Table 1, while the participants used overall support reading strategies at a moderate level, they strongly believed that these strategies need to be taught to students. The overall reading strategies, the overall global reading strategies, and the overall problem-solving reading strategies were, however, reported at a high level in both the participants' reading strategy use and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction.

Table 2: Pearson correlations of the participants' reading strategy use to their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction based on overall reading strategies and the three reading strategy categories (N=31)

Strategy	Correlation coefficient (r)
Overall global reading strategies	.530*
Overall problem-solving reading strategies	.270
Overall support reading strategies	.300
Overall reading strategies	.496*

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In Table 2, the correlation analysis shows a close positive correlation between the participants' overall use of reading strategies and their overall beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction with the correlation coefficient $r = .496$, $p > 0.01$. Although the global reading strategy category was the only one among the three that had a close positive correlation between the participants' use of reading strategies and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction with the correlation coefficient $r = .530$, $p > 0.01$, some individual reading strategy items had positive

correlations between the participants' use of reading strategies and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. These, under the problem-solving reading strategy category, were: PROB14 "Adjust one's reading speed" (r = .524, p >0.01) and PROB19 "Try to stay focused on what one is reading" (r = .666, p >0.01); and under the support reading strategy category they were: SUP22 "Read aloud when the text becomes hard" (r = .415, p >0.05) and SUP23 "Use reference materials such as a dictionary" (r = .568, p >0.01). Four global reading strategy instruction items had positive correlations between the participants' use of reading strategies and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. These were: GLOB2 "Check how the text content fits one's purpose" (r = .397, p >0.05); GLOB6 "Use text features (e.g. tables, figures)" (r = .435, p >0.01); GLOB9 "Check understanding" (r = .410, p >0.05); and GLOB11 "Confirm predictions" (r = .412, p >0.05).

The second phase used a bivariate correlation analysis to compute the correlations among the data collected from the lesson plan, the results from the SORS-EFL: Section A based on overall reading strategies, and the three reading strategy categories.

Table 3: Frequencies of reading strategies employed by participants when giving reading lessons based on overall reading strategies and the three reading strategy categories (N=31)

Strategy	Frequency (F)
Overall global reading strategies	84
Overall problem-solving reading strategies	9
Overall support reading strategies	52
Overall reading strategies	145

Table 3 shows that the participants reported higher employment of global reading strategies (F = 84) than of support reading strategies (F = 52) and problem-solving reading strategies (F = 9). The overall frequency (F = 145) was, however, quite limited in number and variety. With regard to individual reading strategies, the frequency with which the participants chose individual reading strategy instruction items ranged from 21 GLOB3 "Preview the text before reading" to 0 GLOB6 "Use text features (e.g. tables, figures)"; GLOB8 "Use typographical aids (e.g. bold, italics)"; PROB15 "Pause and think about what one is reading"; PROB18 "Guess the meaning of unknown words"; and PROB19 "Try to stay focused on what one is reading".

The top three most-employed reading strategies also varied across reading strategy categories. They were, in descending order, as follows: GLOB3 "Preview the text before

reading" (F = 21); SUP24 "Paraphrase for better understanding" (F = 19); and GLOB5 " Use one's prior knowledge" (F = 17).

Table 4: Pearson correlations of participants' reading strategy use to their employment of reading strategies in the lesson plan based on overall reading strategies and the three reading strategy categories (N=31)

Strategy	Correlation coefficient (r)
Overall global reading strategies	.118
Overall problem-solving reading strategies	.158
Overall support reading strategies	.078
Overall reading strategies	**.098**

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As can be seen in Table 4, the correlation analysis shows no correlation among the means and standard deviations of the participants' use of reading strategies and the frequencies of the coded data from the lesson plan, neither in the overall reading strategies, nor in any of the overall three reading strategy categories.

The third phase used a bivariate correlation analysis to compute the correlations among the data collected from the lesson plan, the results from the SORS-EFL: Section B based on overall reading strategies, and the three reading strategy categories.

Table 5: Pearson correlations of participants' beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction to their employment of reading strategies in the lesson plan based on overall reading strategies and the three reading strategy categories (N=31)

Strategy	Correlation coefficient (r)
Overall global reading strategies	.242
Overall problem-solving reading strategies	-.129
Overall support reading strategies	.045
Overall reading strategies	**.167**

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As presented in Table 5, the correlation analysis shows no correlation among the means and standard deviations of the participants' beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction and the frequencies of the coded data from the lesson plan, neither in the overall reading strategies nor in any of the overall three reading strategy categories.

The analysis of the triangulated data showed that three reading strategies (GLOB3 "Preview the text before reading", GLOB5 "Use one's prior knowledge", and GLOB7 "Use context clues") were reported as one of the most-favored three reading strategies; and seven reading strategies, namely GLOB 8 "Use typographical aids (e.g. bold, italics), GLOB11 "Confirm predictions", PROB16 "Visualize information", PROB18 "Guess the meaning of unknown words", SUP22 "Read aloud when the text becomes hard", SUP27 "Translate from English to one's native language", and SUP28 "Think about information in both English and one's mother tongue" were reported as some of the least-favored reading strategies across most of the triangulated instruments.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study adds to the previous literature on EFL teachers' reading strategy instruction. By examining the 31 EFL teacher trainees' responses to the SORS-EFL and the reading lesson plan, the analysis shows that the metacognitive awareness of certain reading strategies influences their beliefs about the necessity of teaching such reading strategies, but neither metacognitive awareness nor beliefs have a strong influence on the teacher trainees in their instructional practices.

The data analyzed revealed that the EFL teacher trainees were strategic EFL readers (Chamot, 2004; Grabe, 2009; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). They not only had a metacognitive awareness of reading strategies used while reading academic materials in English, but they also believed in the necessity of reading strategy instruction. That their metacognitive awareness of reading strategies was closely related to their overall beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction showed that the more the EFL teacher trainees used reading strategies, the stronger were their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. This shows that the EFL teacher trainees believe that teaching reading strategies is important in developing student reading comprehension.

As to instructional practices regarding reading strategies, the EFL teacher trainees employed reading strategies in the 50-minute-lesson plan to quite a limited extent and with variable frequency. The EFL teacher trainees tended to employ some of the same reading strategies very often (GLOB3, GLOB5, and SUP24), while completely ignoring some other often-effective reading strategies (GLOB6, GLOB8, PROB15, PROB18, and PROB19). The triangulation of the data across the instruments, which revealed that the EFL teacher trainees shared only three most-implemented (GLOB3, GLOB5, and GLOB7) and seven least-implemented (GLOB8, GLOB11, PROB16, PROB18, SUP22,

SUP27, and SUP28) reading strategies, also confirms the finding that there was no positive relationship among their reading strategy instructional practices, their reading strategy use, and beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction.

Considering the results, one can conclude that the study has found a mismatch among the EFL teacher trainees' instructional practices regarding reading strategies, their metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, and their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. In most instances, although the EFL teacher trainees presented themselves as being highly aware of reading strategies used while reading academic materials in English and having a strong belief about the necessity of reading strategy instruction, in reality their instructional practices regarding reading strategies were quite limited in number and variety.

The incongruence between the EFL teacher trainees' beliefs and their instructional practices in this study is similar to the findings in the studies conducted by AD-Heisat, Mohamad, Krishnasamy, and Issa (2009); Khonamri and Salimi (2010); El-Okda (2005); and Zavala (n.d.). These researchers also did not find a clear relationship between teacher beliefs and instructional practices. Contextual factors and classroom life, unfamiliarity with the right way to teach reading strategies explicitly, difficulties associated with the teaching of reading strategies (AD-Heisat, Mohamad, Krishnasamy & Issa, 2009), lack of confidence with their level of reading comprehension or knowledge of teaching reading, and ignorance of a clear purpose for teaching reading (Zavala, n.d.) are factors mentioned to explain the inconsistency.

In this study the inconsistency was also not unexpected, and several possibilities may explain it. First of all, although the EFL teacher trainees may have used reading strategies and believed that it was necessary to teach certain reading strategies, their lack of knowledge about the right way to teach such strategies may have been an obstacle to doing so. In other words, the EFL teacher trainees may have lacked sufficient exposure to reading strategy instructional practices. This lack may have resulted from their educational background. Although most participants had either their academic major or minor in English, only three of them had an undergraduate degree in education. Thai EFL undergraduate student teachers are generally required to attend reading methodology courses, and so they are likely to be trained in current practices about teaching reading. Thus, without education degrees, it is possible that the majority of the EFL teacher trainees in this study had had no or very little exposure to instructional practices regarding reading strategies.

This lack of sufficient exposure might also have resulted from their teaching experience. Only three of the participants had had more than five years teaching experience, and nine of them had no teaching experience. Among those who had teaching experience, six taught part-time at a tutoring school. So their instructional

practices might have been influenced by their lack of teaching experience in EFL classrooms.

The findings of this study present a number of implications for classroom pedagogy. The main one concerns EFL teacher trainees and their reading strategy instructional practices. Although EFL teacher trainees may be aware of reading strategy use and believe that effective EFL reading instruction should include the teaching of strategic reading, they may not teach reading strategies fully when giving reading lessons, partly because of their lack of knowledge about a variety of reading strategy instructional activities. Therefore, it is necessary for programs concerned with EFL teacher professional development to train their participants in how to implement reading strategy instruction.

Teacher educators can play a very important role in modeling appropriate reading strategies in EFL reading methodology courses. Moreover, EFL teacher trainees should also be given the opportunity to experiment with meaningful reading strategy instructional activities, either in their practice teaching in real classrooms or with their classmates, in order to maintain or improve their teaching of reading strategies. Giving them the opportunity to practice teaching might help them see the benefits of reading strategy instruction and persuade them that such strategies can be taught (Hall, 2005). Observing reading classes taught by experienced EFL teachers or teacher educators can help EFL teacher trainees determine which strategies need to be taught and how to do so. Practice-teaching, together with observing reading classes, should equip EFL teacher trainees with a variety of reading strategy instructional activities, enabling them to meet their future EFL students' reading strategy instructional needs and encouraging them to make the necessary effort to use EFL texts for maximal development of comprehension skills (Anderson, 1999).

Another important aspect of an EFL reading methodology course that should not be overlooked is the need to train EFL teacher trainees to both implicitly and explicitly teach appropriate reading strategies to their students. Nunan (1999) suggests teachers integrate strategy instruction into the process of the language lesson instead of introducing it separately. However, EFL teachers do not need to teach their students the name of every strategy that appears in the research literature; they instead need to teach them how to use strategies that they find effective for the kinds of tasks they want to accomplish (Chamot, 2004). This notion is supported by Cohen (1990), who states that not all the strategies facilitate successful comprehension of a text. Reading strategies must, thus, be used with flexibility, depending on the purpose for and the contexts in which one is reading.

Like other EFL students, Thai students also face difficulties of reading comprehension. Most Thai students cannot comprehend academic materials in English thoroughly

because they are not aware of the existence of various types of reading strategies, thus they cannot apply the available reading strategies appropriately in their reading process.

Being more proficient readers, EFL teachers' self-awareness of their own reading strategies, which is a part of their own reading experience, can be a valuable source of their beliefs about the necessity of reading strategy instruction. As teachers' beliefs have been found crucial to their instructional practices, to help Thai students handle their difficulties of reading academic materials in English, teacher educators should pay more attention to the need to equip Thai EFL teacher trainees with education-based or research-based principles on instructional practices regarding reading strategies. Such principles can help form a solid belief system about reading strategy instruction among Thai EFL teachers. Thus, they will have greater confidence and be more willing to experiment with various reading strategy instructional activities through their continued experience in teaching. The end result will surely be that Thai students are more aware of the existing reading strategies - intentional, carefully-planned strategies to monitor or manage reading (Global Reading Strategies), strategies used while working directly with a text (Problem-Solving Reading Strategies), and basic support strategies to aid in comprehending a text (Support Reading Strategies). According to Baker and Brown (as cited in Carrell, 1998), self-awareness of one's own reading strategies is a pre-requisite for self-regulation—the ability to monitor and check one's own cognitive activities while reading. When Thai students are motivated to use reading strategies with flexibility depending on their purposes, their comprehension of academic materials in English can be improved, helping them to become more proficient readers.

Finally, the limitations in this study must be acknowledged. The reason why the correlation among the EFL teacher trainees' use of strategies, their beliefs, and the instructional practices did not exist might also stem from the following limitations. First, as the reading lesson plan that represented the practical part of reading strategy instruction focused on only one text within a 50-minute-class period, it was not possible to teach all of the 28 reading strategies. The strategies employed in the lesson plan can be influenced by the topic, the text type, and the length of the selected text, "The History of the Internet" as well as the time constraint of the lesson plan. Second, as the data were collected on program orientation day prior to any course instruction, the participants, especially those who had no teaching experience and those who taught in tutoring schools, might not have had any experience in writing a lesson plan. Therefore, many reading strategies, especially some support and problem-solving strategies might be too local and might not have been included in the lesson plan. For these reasons, future studies should focus on EFL teacher trainees' actual practice teaching, in real classrooms or with their classmates, to identify what reading strategy instruction they implement and how they implement it. Case studies with a long period of practice

teaching observations would also seem to be valuable in order to more fully understand the complex relationship between teacher beliefs and practice in classroom context.

References

AD-Heisat, M. A. A., Mohamad, S, Krishnasamy, K. A. S., & Issa, J. (2009). The use of reading strategies in developing students' reading competency among primary school teachers in Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(2), 310-319.

Aebersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (2000). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Akkakoson, S., & Setobol, B. (2009). Thai EFL students' use of strategies in reading English texts. *The Journal of KMUTNB*, *19*(3), 329-342.

Alderson, J. C. (2001). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, N. J. (1999). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Anderson, N. J. (2002, April). *The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning*. Retrieved May 8, 2010, Retrieved August 25, 2010.from http:// www. cal.org/resources/digest/0110anderson.html

Anderson, N. J. (2003). *ACTIVE skills for reading: Book 1-4*. Singapore: Heinle & Heinle.

Beckman, P. (2002). Strategy instruction. *The ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education (ERIC EC)*. Retrieved May 8, 2010, from http://www. hoagies gifted.org/eric/e638.html

Boonkit, K. (2006). *Academic English reading: Strategy-based instruction*. Retrieved August 25, 2010, from http://www.arts.su.ac.th/Research/Main Research/---/Kamonpan. pdfBorg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. ELT Journal, *55*(2), 186-188.

Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, *55*(2), 186-188.

Carrell, P. L. (1998, July 4), The language teacher: Can reading strategies be successfully taught? *The Language Teacher Online*, *22*(2). Retrieved August 25. 2010, from http://www.jalt- publications.org/tlt/files/98/mar/ carrell.html

Carrell, P. L. (2002). Some causes of text boundedness and schema interference in ESL reading. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 101-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*(1), 14-26.

Chavangklang, P. (2008). *Assessing reading strategy training using a CALL-based approach for Thai EFL students' hypertext reading*. Unpublished master's thesis, Suranaree University of Technology, Graduate School.

Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. New York: Newbury House.

Devine, T. G. (2002). *Teaching reading comprehension: From theory to practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

El-Okda, M. (2005, September). EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. *The Reading Matrix*, *5*(2), Retrieved August 25, 2010, from www.readingmatrix.com/articles/okda/article.pdf

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow: Longman.

Hall, L. A. (2005). Teachers and content area reading: Attitudes, beliefs and change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 403-414.

Jensen, L. (2001). Planning lessons. In M. Celce- Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 403-407). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *24*(1), Retrieved August 28, 2011, from http://jlr.sagepub.com/content/24/1/83

Khonamri, F., & Salimi, M. (2010). The interplay between EFL high school teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices regarding reading strategies. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *4*(1), 96-107.

Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: a cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuzborska, I. (2011). Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading instruction from two teachers' perspectives. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *23*(1), 102- 128.

Li, H., & Wilhelm, K. H. (2008). Exploring pedagogical reasoning: Reading strategy instruction from two teachers' perspectives. *The Reading Matrix*, *8*(1), 96-110.

Lihua, Y. (2010). A study of ethnic Mongolian University EFL teachers' beliefs and decision making. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *33*(2), 60-75. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from http://www.celea.org.cn/teic/90/10060805.pdf

Livingston, J. A. (1997). *Metacognition: An overview*. Retrieved March 12, 2009, fromhttp://www.gse.buffalo.edu/fas/shuell/CEP564/Metacog.html

Mohamed, A. R., Chew, J., & Kabilan, M. K. (2006). Metacognitive reading strategies of good *Malaysian Chinese learners. Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *2*, 21-41.

Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. J*ournal of Developmental Education*, *25*(3), 2-10.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(2), 249-259.

Monos, K. (n.d.). *A study of the English reading strategies of Hungarian University students with implications for reading instruction in an academic context*. Retrieved August 25, 2010, from www.melta.org.my/ Doc/MonosK_Eng_reading_strategies.pdf

Nunan, D. (1999) *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Oxford, R. (1994, October). *Language learning strategies: An update*. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from http://www.cak.org/resources/digest/oxford01.html

Pajares, F. (1993). Preservice teachers' beliefs: A focus for teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 15*(2), 45-54. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/Pajares1993ATE.html

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29*(2), 177-95.

Phakiti, A. (2006). Theoretical and pedagogical issues in ESL/EFL teaching of strategic reading.*University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 1*, 19-50.

Pintrich, P. R. (2002). *The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing: Theory into practice*. Retrieved December 8, 2008, from http://findarticle.com/p/articles/mi_mONQM/is_4_41/ai_94872708

Poole, A. (2005, September, 22). Gender differences in reading strategy use among ESL college students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 36*(1), 7-20.

Richards?, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System, 29*(4), 431-449.

Tercanlionglu, L. (2004). Postgraduate students' use of reading strategies in L1 and ESL contexts: Links to success. *International Education Journal, 5*(4), 562-570.

Xianming, X. (2007). A study of first-year college students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 1*(1), 93-107.

Yoosabai, Y. (2009). *The effects of reciprocal teaching on English reading comprehension in a Thai high-school classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Srinakarinwirot University, Graduate School.

Zavala, G. (n.d.). *Importance of EFL teachers' attitude: A case on reading instruction*. Retrieved August 25, 2010, from fel.uqroo.mx/adminfile/files/.../ Quijano_ Zavala__Gandy_ Griselda.pdf

Zhang, L. J., & Wu, A. (2009). Chinese senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 21*(1), 37-59.

Assistant Professor Tipamas Chumworatayee, PhD teaches both post- and undergraduate courses at the Language Institute, Thammasat University. She obtained her Ph.D. from Department of Reading, College of Education, Texas Woman's University, USA. Her main interests include EFL reading strategy instruction, EFL reading strategy awareness-raising, and EFL teacher education.

E-mail: ctipamas@hotmail.com

Appendix A: Instruments

Part 1: Survey of EFL Reading Strategies (SORS-EFL)
Background Information

Gender: □ Male □ Female
Age: _____ Nationality: _____
Bachelor's degree in _____
Number of years of teaching experience: _____
Type of school you are presently teaching in
□ Government
□ Private
□ Other_____
Level of school you are presently teaching in
□ Primary
□ High School
□ University
□ Other_____

There are three sections to this survey.

Section A: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Reading Strategies
Section B: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Beliefs about the Necessity of Reading Strategy Instruction
Section C: An Open-Ended Questionnaire

Section A: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Reading Strategies

The purpose of section A is to collect information about the various strategies you use when you read academic materials in English, such as textbooks for homework or examinations, journal articles, comprehension exercises, or other supplementary readings related to course contents.

All the items below refer to your reading of school-related academic materials (i.e., textbooks for homework or examinations, journal articles, comprehension exercises, or other supplementary readings related to course contents). Each statement is followed by five numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and each number means the following:

"1" means that "I never or almost never do this."
"2" means that "I do this only occasionally."
"3" means that "I sometimes do this." (About 50% of the time)
"4" means that "I usually do this."
"5" means that "I always or almost always do this."

After reading each statement, circle the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) which applies to you. Note that there are no right or wrong responses to any of the items on this survey.

		Never				*Always*
1	I have a purpose in mind when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I review the text to know about its length, organization and main idea.	1	2	3	4	5
4	When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I use my prior knowledge (e.g., knowledge about the theme of the text, or grammar knowledge) to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I check my understanding when I come across new information.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text rather than passively accept everything.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
17	When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never				*Always*
18 When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	1	2	3	4	5
19 I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	1	2	3	4	5
20 I take note of the key expressions and ideas while reading to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
21 When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
22 I use reference materials (e.g., a dictionary) to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
23 I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
24 I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	1	2	3	4	5
25 I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
26 When reading, I translate from English into my native language.	1	2	3	4	5
27 When reading, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue.	1	2	3	4	5

Section B: A Survey of EFL Teacher Trainees' Beliefs about the Necessity of Reading Strategy Instruction

The purpose of section B is to collect information about the various strategies you believe are necessary to be taught to EFL students in your reading lessons when you teach them to read academic materials in English, such as textbooks for homework or examinations, journal articles, comprehension exercises, or other supplementary readings related to course contents.

All the items below refer to teaching your EFL students' reading of school-related academic materials (i.e., textbooks for homework or examinations, journal articles, comprehension exercises, or other supplementary readings related to course contents). Each statement is followed by five numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and each number means the following:

"1" means that "I believe it is not important to do this."
"2" means that "I believe it is important to do this only occasionally."
"3" means that "I believe it is important to sometimes do this." (About 50% of the time)
"4" means that "I believe it is important to usually do this."
"5" means that "I believe it is important to always or almost always do this."

After reading each statement, circle the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) which applies to you. Note that there are no right or wrong responses to any of the items on this survey.

I believe it is necessary for students in my EFL reading lessons to be taught to

		Never				*Always*
1	…have a purpose in mind when they read.	1	2	3	4	5
2	…think about whether the content of the text fits their reading purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
3	…review the text to know about its length, organization and main idea.	1	2	3	4	5
5	…use their prior knowledge (e.g., knowledge about the theme of the text, or grammar knowledge) to help them understand what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
6	…use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase their understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
7	…use context clues to help them better understand what they are reading.	1	2	3	4	5
8	…use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.	1	2	3	4	5
9	…check their understanding when they come across new information.	1	2	3	4	5
10	…try to guess what the content of the text is about when they read.	1	2	3	4	5
11	…check to see if their guesses about the text are right or wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
12	…critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text rather than passively accept everything.	1	2	3	4	5
13	…read slowly and carefully to make sure they understand what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
14	…adjust their reading speed according to what they are reading.	1	2	3	4	5
15	…stop from time to time and think about what they are reading.	1	2	3	4	5
16	…try to picture or visualize information to help remember what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
17	…re-read the text to increase their understanding when text becomes difficult.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never				*Always*
18 …guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases when they read.	1	2	3	4	5
19 …try to get back on track when they lose concentration.	1	2	3	4	5
20 …take note of the key expressions and ideas while reading to help them understand what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
21 …underline or circle information in the text to help them remember it.	1	2	3	4	5
22 …read aloud to help them understand what they read when text becomes difficult.	1	2	3	4	5
23 …use reference materials (e.g., a dictionary) to help them understand what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
24 …paraphrase (restate ideas in their own words) to better understand what they read.	1	2	3	4	5
25 …go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	1	2	3	4	5
26 …ask themselves questions they like to have answered in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
27 …translate from English into their native language when reading.	1	2	3	4	5
28 …think about information in both English and their mother tongue when reading.	1	2	3	4	5

Section C: An Open-Ended Questionnaire

1. While reading academic materials in English, what three strategies do you use most often when you have difficulties in reading? Why are they useful?
2. How can you help students who have difficulties reading academic materials in English to improve their reading ability? What three strategies do you believe are most necessary to be taught to help them? Why?
3. How were you taught to read in English? Did your teacher teach you any reading strategies? Is what your teachers taught you still useful nowadays when you read academic materials in English? Why or why not?
4. In your opinion, what is involved in the process of reading academic materials in English? In other words, how is it that we are able to read academic materials in English?
5. In your opinion, what might make one a good reader of academic materials in English?
6. In your opinion, what might make academic materials in English difficult to read?
7. What is your opinion of the teaching of EFL reading in Thailand, and aspects such as curriculum, teaching materials, teaching methods, and evaluation?

Part 2: A Reading Lesson Plan

Directions: You are assigned to teach a reading lesson using the following passage. Decide what objectives you could teach and write a complete lesson plan for a 50-minute-class period.

The History of the Internet

The 1990s saw great changes in the way people communicate. People could send mail without going to the post office, and go shopping without leaving home. Words like email and download became part of people's vocabulary. The cause of this great change was the Internet.

The idea for the Internet began in the early 1960s in the United States. The Department of Defense[1] wanted to connect their computers together in order to share private information. In 1969, the ARPAnet[2] (an early form of the Internet) first connected computers at four American universities[3]. One computer successfully sent information to another. In 1972, scientists shared ARPAnet with the world. They created a way to send person-to-person messages using ARPAnet. This was the beginning of e-mail.

Over the next few years, there was a lot of progress made in the world of computing, but most people were not using the Internet. Then, in the 1980s, personal computers became more common. In the early 1990s, two important things happened: the birth of the World Wide Web in 1991, and the creation of the first Web browser[4] in 1993. The Web made it easier to find information on the Internet[5], and to move from place to place using links. The Web and browser made it possible to see information as a web site with pictures, sound, and words.

Today, millions of people connect to the Internet to send e-mail, visit web sites, or store information on servers[6]. Computers are now an important part of our lives and are changing how we learn, work, shop, and communicate.

---

[1]Department of Defense, the part of the U.S. government that works to protect the country.

[2]ARPAnet Advanced Research Projects Agency network, a part of the U.S. government.

[3]four American universities. These universities were the Stanford Research Institute, UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, and the University of Utah.

[4]browser, a computer program, for example Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet Explorer, used to view web pages.

[5]the Internet, the much larger successor to the ARPAnet, which no longer exists.

[6]server, a large computer that keeps information such as e-mail, and sends it to other computers connected to it.

A 50-Minute-Lesson Plan
Language Focus: Reading (The History of the Internet)

Class Level: Lower-intermediate

Time:

No. of Students:

Aims (what the teacher intends to do):

Objectives (what the students are expected to do):

Previous classwork:

Anticipated problems:

Step	Time Frame (minutes)	Teacher Activity	Student Activity