Exploring the Reading Instruction in Foundation English Courses for EFL Non-English Major Undergraduates

MINTRA PURIPUNYAVANICH

Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
Author email: mintra.p@chula.ac.th

Article information	Abstract
	This study explored English reading instruction in foundation courses for non-English major undergraduates in Thai universities. 163 teachers completed an online questionnaire and eight teachers participated in semi-structured online interviews. Key findings revealed that building reading comprehension, teaching reading strategies, and building vocabulary were prioritized. Approximately 70% of the participants dedicated over half of class time to while-reading activities, followed by post-reading tasks at 63.19%. The study also found a balanced approach to reading instruction, with 45.55% of the activities being regularly teacher-led and 44.54% student-led. Balanced selection of materials that met the course requirements and students' preferences and interests was also observed. Commercial 4-skill course books were the most commonly used materials. While the questionnaire data identified students' limited vocabulary, negative attitudes to English reading, and low English proficiency as main challenges in teaching reading, 50% of the interviewees reported students' inability to read English as their biggest challenge. Furthermore, over 60% of the participants did not incorporate extensive reading (ER) in their instruction, mainly due to concerns that students would not enjoy it, uncertainty about assessment methods, and time constraints. The study highlights current reading instruction practices and provides implications for improving English reading education for non-English majors in higher education.

INTRODUCTION

English reading skills are crucial for students globally as they facilitate academic progress and achievement (Anderson, 1999; Grabe & Yamashita, 2022). English reading ability also helps learners develop their English knowledge and competency (Grabe, 2009). As non-English majors constitute the majority of English learners in English classrooms around the world, teachers' practices of English reading instruction deserve our attention and justify an in-depth exploration.

In Thailand's tertiary education, there is no national curriculum; thus, Thai universities have autonomy to design their curricula and courses as well as select textbooks, resulting in varied course offerings, content, and instructional materials across institutions. At the university

level, although English has been a required subject at some institutions (Darasawang, 2007), recently some universities (e.g., Kasetsart and Thammasat) have begun to eliminate requirements for their non-English major undergraduates to enroll in English courses, indicating a decrease in the importance of English language studies at the policy level.

English is offered through general English and English for Academic or Specific Purposes courses, and reading skills are typically taught in such courses. Foundation English (FE) courses, also known as fundamental or general English courses, generally cover reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and are usually offered in the first or second year. At universities where English is still compulsory, the number of required credits may vary depending on the universities' policies. For instance, for non-English major undergraduates, 12 credits of English courses are required at Chulalongkorn and Srinakharinwirot Universities, while six credits are required at Burapha University. Class duration for FE courses varies by university. Universities such as Chulalongkorn, Kasetsart, Srinakharinwirot, Burapha, and Khon Kaen provide 180 minutes per week, while Rangsit offers one 80-minute class per week. This variation illustrates the differing time allocations for FE courses across Thai universities.

A few empirical studies on teaching L2 English reading have examined classroom-based instructional practices at universities in Thailand, identifying promising approaches to enhancing students' reading proficiency (e.g., Akkakoson, 2013; Apairach, 2023; Barr & Chinwonno, 2016). However, a comprehensive understanding of university teachers' instructional priorities, teaching practices, and the challenges they face in FE courses remains limited. In addition, a few studies (e.g., Puripunyavanich, 2021, 2022; Sek et al., 2021; Tamrackitkul, 2010; Tantipidok, 2023) have demonstrated the extensive reading (ER) implementation in FE courses. Nonetheless, they primarily investigated its effectiveness and implementation challenges (Chang & Renandya, 2017; Thongsan & Waring, 2024; Waring & Chu, 2017; Waring & Husna, 2019), leaving insights into barriers to ER adoption in FE courses faced by teachers unexplored. To address these gaps, this study aims to investigate Thai university teachers' reading instruction practices, the challenges they encounter, and their rationales for not implementing ER. A deeper understanding of L2 reading pedagogy and challenges in teaching reading in FE courses can refine instructional practices and lead to training programs development for university teachers. Finally, researching the reasons behind why ER is not widely implemented in some FE courses can provide valuable insights into barriers and potential solutions for integrating ER more effectively.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents both a theoretical framework which guides the key aspects of the study and a literature review which analyzes previous studies exploring similar topics.

Teaching English reading as a foreign language

The main goal of teaching students to read in a foreign language is to make them become independent readers of the foreign language, so that they will not need the teacher's help (Nuttall, 2005). In EFL reading classes, instruction typically follows three phases: pre-reading,

while-reading, and post-reading (Stoller et al., 2013). When investigating the reading instruction in FE courses, it is important we are clear about what the three stages involve. During pre-reading, teachers activate students' background knowledge, introduce key vocabulary, and encourage content predictions. In the while-reading phase, students independently read the passage. Post-reading involves comprehension questions, vocabulary exercises, and writing or speaking activities, where students share their opinions about the text.

Anderson (2008) compiled top-five lists of priorities for teaching reading suggested by four scholars—Julian Bamford, Lynn Erler, Bill Grabe, and Fredricka Stoller—specializing in teaching and researching second language reading. These lists provide some guidelines for teachers.

Table 1
Top-five lists of priorities for second language reading teachers
[adapted from Anderson, 2008, pp. 132–135]

Julian Bamford	Lynn Erler	Bill Grabe	Fredricka Stoller
1. Teachers should make students want to read as reading skills can be improved through practice.	1. Reading tasks should be various.	1. Teachers should explicitly teach vocabulary and vocabulary learning strategies.	1. Students should read a lot both in and out of class as it helps students develop and enhance their reading skills.
2. Numerous reading materials that match students' proficiency levels should be provided.	2. The reasons for reading should include students' interests.	2. Teachers should regularly and consistently teach reading in class to enable students to become fluent readers.	2. Students should be given choices in the readings that they do as this could enhance their engagement in reading.
3. The reading materials should be interesting, enjoyable and relevant to students.	3. Teachers should work out how L1 can support students' learning of L2.	3. Discourse structure awareness helps readers read more fluently.	3. Teachers should be reading role models and discuss what their students are reading and have learned from their reading.
4. Students should learn L2 with a system that builds their vocabulary.	4. Texts should be at appropriate proficiency levels.	4. Teachers should teach reading strategies to help students tackle difficult texts.	4. Rereading same passages for different purposes can promote meaningful reading and reading fluency.
5. Teachers should create a reader community for teachers and students to share their reading to enhance reading motivation.	5. Teachers should teach strategies, including metacognitive strategies, if needed.	5. Students should read a lot to meet vocabulary and discourse structures and get opportunities to use the strategies learned.	5. Teachers should guide their students in understanding reading purposes and the use of strategies.

Some common priorities can be extracted from such lists. They include reading a lot, building vocabulary, providing plenty of reading materials that are appropriate to students' English proficiency levels and match their interests, teaching reading strategies, promoting reading fluency, and discussing the reading done.

Furthermore, teachers should emphasize the actual act of reading by letting their students read (Nuttall, 2005; Stoller, 2015). Table 1 shows that Bamford, Grabe, and Stoller all agree that students should read a lot to become better and fluent readers. To enable reading, students must connect the text with the spoken language that they know and interpret it by themselves. According to Nuttall (2005), if teachers read aloud or translate the text, they take over the reading process, as they will be the ones who read and comprehend the text. This suggests that teachers should rethink and reconsider their own practice in reading classes for effective instruction.

Teaching L2 English reading in undergraduate courses in Thailand

As stated in the introduction, English reading is taught in foundation English, English for Academic Purposes, and English for Specific Purposes courses offered to non-English major undergraduates at higher education institutions in Thailand. This study, however, focuses on the reading instruction in foundation English courses only.

Stoller (2015) noted that L2 reading classes often prioritize analyzing short difficult texts, with an emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, and translation. Activities such as answering comprehension questions, teaching vocabulary, and grammar exercises are dominant, reflecting the intensive reading (IR) approach. This method, commonly employed in Thailand, focuses on teaching reading skills, strategies, and phonology through close text analysis (Anderson, 2008). IR is useful when complemented by extensive reading (ER) for language and fluency development (Nation & Macalister, 2021).

In reading classes in Thailand, common instructional practice often involves teachers translating English texts into Thai and explaining unfamiliar words, which is widely seen as ineffective; thus, incorporating metacognitive strategies into the English curriculum to foster independent learning has been proposed (Sitthitikul, 2010, 2020). Additionally, studies (e.g., Akkakoson, 2013; Apairach, 2023; Barr & Chinwonno, 2016) show that various approaches such as Project-based Reading Instruction (PRI), critical literacy practice strategy instruction, strategy instruction, and the implementation of extensive reading have been used and proven to improve non-English major undergraduates' L2 reading in both foundation and reading courses. While Barr and Chinwonno (2016), Apairach (2023), and Tantipidok (2023) investigated reading instruction within FE courses, Akkakoson (2013) examined reading instruction in a dedicated reading course.

Barr and Chinwonno (2016) implemented Project-Based Reading Instruction (PRI) with 32 tourism management undergraduates, integrating multiple stages such as conducting research and analysis of cultural differences, and students' self-reflection on their learning. Their findings indicated that PRI enhanced both English reading ability and intercultural competence. However, the small sample size and discipline-specific context raise concerns about the generalizability of these findings. Additionally, while students reported increased curiosity about other cultures, the study did not measure long-term retention or real-world application of intercultural competence, leaving its practical impact uncertain.

Apairach (2023) applied critical literacy practices in an FE course for 32 first-year education students, utilizing the Strategy Instruction and Critical Literacy Lesson Frameworks. While the study demonstrated improvements in student engagement and discussion quality, it also revealed challenges related to students' inferential reading skills and the difficulty of lesson texts. These issues suggest that while critical literacy fosters analytical thinking, its effectiveness may be constrained by students' linguistic proficiency. Furthermore, the reliance on student self-reports limits the objectivity of the findings, as there is no measure of long-term reading development.

Tantipidok (2023) studied the impact of ER on reading comprehension and motivation in 109 education major undergraduates over 10 weeks. Students selected their own graded readers and read online via Xreading. Post-reading activities included book quizzes, self-logs, and group discussions to assess comprehension. The results showed that ER significantly enhanced both reading comprehension and motivation and effectively improved students' reading skills.

Akkakoson (2013) employed a quasi-experimental design with 164 engineering and technology students, offering a comparative perspective between strategy-based and traditional reading instruction. His findings strongly support the effectiveness of explicit strategy instruction, particularly in enhancing meta-cognitive awareness and comprehension monitoring. However, the greater gains observed among high-proficiency students suggest that lower-proficiency learners may struggle with autonomous strategy application, raising questions about the accessibility of this approach for diverse student populations. Additionally, while the study established short-term effectiveness, it did not assess whether students maintained or transferred their strategic reading skills beyond the course.

Taken together, these studies highlight the potential of alternative reading instruction methods but also underscore key pedagogical challenges. While Barr and Chinwonno (2016) demonstrated that Project-based Reading Instruction enhanced reading ability and intercultural competence, Apairach (2023) found that critical literacy instruction improved engagement and analytical thinking. However, scalability and effectiveness of such approaches across varying proficiency levels remain uncertain. Although Tantipidok (2023) highlighted the benefits of extensive reading in boosting reading comprehension and motivation, the study focused on short-term outcomes as ER had been implemented for only 10 weeks. Akkakoson (2013) provided strong evidence for the effectiveness of strategy-based reading instruction, particularly in developing metacognitive awareness. However, lower-proficiency students struggled with autonomous strategy application, raising concerns about its accessibility. Future research should consider longitudinal studies, more diverse samples, and objective assessments of reading development to determine the most effective and inclusive instructional approaches. Also, it should be noted that while these studies have explored a variety of reading instruction methods, they have not investigated the teachers' priorities for teaching English reading and their emphases on the three stages of teaching reading passages (i.e., pre-, while-, and post-reading activities), the proportion of teacher-led and student-led activities, instructional materials selection, and barriers to ER implementation. Such gaps, thus, remain to be filled in.

Challenges in L2 reading

Various challenges in L2 reading have been identified. First, students may not read the text if they think it is not interesting and too difficult (Chinpakdee, 2024). Furthermore, knowing that their comprehension will not be evaluated (Chinpakdee, 2024; St Clair-Thompson et al., 2018) makes students underestimate the importance of reading and discourages them from reading. Research also shows that a lack of clear reading purposes (Chinpakdee, 2024; St Clair-Thompson et al., 2018), insufficient background and vocabulary knowledge (Rajab et al., 2012), reading anxiety (Torudom & Taylor, 2017), and time constraints (St Clair-Thompson et al., 2018) demotivate students and make them avoid reading.

Reading challenges are not only faced by non-English majors, but also English major undergraduates. Chinpakdee (2024) identified three reading challenges faced by 21 English major undergraduates in Thailand: comprehension issues, incomplete reading, and total avoidance of reading. Comprehension problems arose from insufficient vocabulary, grammar, and reading experiences, along with difficulty identifying key ideas. Incomplete reading stemmed from loss of motivation due to unfamiliarity with reading long texts and unclear purposes for reading. Some students avoided reading entirely, even in Thai, unless required for tests or group activities.

Notably, the aforementioned studies report only student-related challenges in L2 reading, indicating a gap for further investigation on challenges related to teaching and managing L2 reading instruction.

Extensive reading and its implementation issues

Extensive reading (ER) involves learners reading large amounts of content suitable for their language proficiency levels and interests (Anderson, 2008; Day & Bamford, 2002; Nation & Waring, 2020). Over the course of 14 years, ER has been implemented in FE courses in Thailand (Puripunyavanich, 2021, 2022; Sek et al., 2021; Tamrackitkul, 2010; Tantipidok, 2023). Despite its positive impacts on language development, reading attitudes, knowledge construction, and cognitive abilities, research has shown evidence of ER implementation issues.

Renandya et al. (2021) identified the top concerns that teachers have about implementing ER, including time constraints—the lack of relevant reading materials, support from school leaders, motivation, and personal experience with ER; limited ER knowledge and professional development opportunities; delayed impact of ER; legitimacy issues; and the ER principles being highly demanding. ER practitioners in Asia have also reported other issues such as lack of knowledge to set up and manage an ER program (Waring & Husna, 2019), students' lack of interest in reading (Chang & Renandya, 2017; Thongsan & Waring, 2024; Waring & Chu, 2017), difficulties with monitoring students' reading, students' inability to read independently (Chang & Renandya, 2017), and unfamiliarity with an online reading platform (Puripunyavanich, 2022). Waring and Puripunyavanich (2025) reported motivating students to read and designing engaging post-reading activities as top areas for further ER training among 259 ER practitioners in Japan, Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam, indicating that students' motivation issues are

their main concerns. While issues faced by ER practitioners have been examined, teachers' reasons for not implementing ER in FE courses still remain unexplored, suggesting a gap for further research.

Research questions

This research aims to investigate what is happening in foundation English courses for non-English major undergraduate students when Thai EFL university teachers teach English reading. The research questions that guide this study are as follows:

1. What do Thai EFL university teachers prioritize when teaching reading in foundation English courses to non-English major undergraduate students?
2. What are their current practices of teaching reading in such courses?
3. What are the main challenges faced when teaching reading in such courses?
4. Does extensive reading become a component in such courses? If not, what makes the teachers not include ER?

METHODOLOGY

Research design

A mixed methods design where quantitative and qualitative approaches complement each other was used (Dörnyei, 2007). An online descriptive questionnaire was used to capture characteristics and trends in reading instruction (Gray, 2014), while semi-structured interviews followed to triangulate and elaborate questionnaire findings. These research instruments are explained in the instruments section.

Research context

This study explored university teachers' English reading instruction in foundation English courses for non-English major undergraduates in an English as a foreign language (EFL) context. In Thailand, English language instruction has been categorized into English major and non-English major programs. At most universities, non-English major undergraduates are required to enroll in FE courses which are either offered by the university's language institute or the Faculties of Arts or Humanities and Social Sciences.

Participants and sampling methods

Participation in the questionnaire and individual interviews was on a voluntary basis. Participants were recruited through purposive and snowball sampling methods. 163 teachers completed the questionnaire, while eight respondents joined the interviews. They were Thai full-time or part-time teachers teaching at higher education institutions supervised by the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation (MHESI; see the list of higher education institutions in Appendix A), and were teaching or had taught foundation English courses for non-English major undergraduates.

The participants were grouped into institutional types following the list of higher education institutions as shown in Table 2. Over 50% worked at autonomous universities, while only around 3% worked at private institutes. The highest percentages of the participants (28.22%) had taught reading for 6–10 years. 61.35% (*n* = 100) of the participants did not implement extensive reading (ER), while 38.65% (*n* = 63) did. The reasons for not doing ER are presented in the Results section.

Table 2
Questionnaire participants' demographic background

Affiliation Information							
Institution type	Autonomous universities	Public universities	Rajabhat universities (Former teacher's colleges)	Rajamangala universities (Former technical colleges)	Private universities	Private institutes	Total
% (*n*)	50.92% (83)	8.59% (14)	14.72% (24)	4.29% (7)	17.79% (29)	3.68% (6)	100% (163)
Years of Teaching Reading							
Years	1–5	6–10	11–15	16–20	20+	Total	
% (*n*)	21.47% (35)	28.22% (46)	19.02% (31)	15.34% (25)	15.95% (26)	100% (163)	
Implementation of ER	Yes = 38.65% (*n* = 63)			No = 61.35% (*n* = 100)			

Eight full-time teachers who completed the questionnaire and implemented ER in their reading instruction were selected through purposive sampling for interviews. They consented to data use, with anonymity assured. Table 3 shows that participants had taught reading for over five years and were based in all four regions of Thailand—Northern, Northeastern, Central, and Southern.

Table 3
Interview participants' demographic background

	Pseudonym	Years teaching reading	Institution (Region)
1.	Warit	6–10 years	Autonomous university (Eastern)
2.	Nada	6–10 years	Rajabhat university (Northeastern)
3.	Natcha	6–10 years	Rajamangala university (Southern)
4.	Picha	6–10 years	Rajabhat university (Central)
5.	Bhurin	6–10 years	Private university (Central)
6.	Lalin	11–15 years	Autonomous university (Northern)
7.	Airin	11–15 years	Autonomous university (Southern)
8.	Praewa	16–20 years	Private institution (Central)

Research instruments

There were two research instruments: an online questionnaire and semi-structured individual interviews. The full questionnaire consisted of 48 questions in five parts: Part 0: Participant's confirmation of qualification (one item), Part 1: Participant's profile (four items), Part 2: Teaching English reading in foundation courses for non-English majors (14 items), Part 3A: The implementation of extensive reading (28 items), and Part 3B: Not implementing extensive reading (one item). This paper only reports the data of Parts 1, 2, and Part 3B, while Part 3A is reported in Puripunyavanich (in press). There were 27 multiple-choice items, nine checkbox

items, six short-answer items, three 5-point Likert Scale items, and three 3-point Likert Scale items. Additionally, the interview questions were divided into two parts: Part 1: Teaching English Reading (five questions) and Part 2: The Implementation of Extensive Reading (12 questions). Five interview questions in Part 1 were used in this study.

The researcher developed the questionnaire by drawing on the key components of teaching L2 English reading in the work of L2 reading scholars such as Anderson (2008), Grabe and Stoller (2002), Nuttall (2005), Stoller (2015), and Stoller et al. (2013) mentioned in the literature review section. Part 3A, focusing on ER implementation, was mostly adopted from Puripunyavanich and Waring (2024).

Five experts in L2 reading, ER, and English teaching validated the instruments employing the Item Objective Congruence method (Rovinelli & Hambleton, 1976). The questionnaire was distributed in Thai and piloted with 31 teachers, showing a high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.924. Relevant questionnaire and interview items are provided in Appendix B.

Data collection and analysis

Prior to conducting the study, the author obtained ethical approval from her university. A Google Forms questionnaire was used to collect the data. The Forms link was distributed online via emails and postings on Facebook, the website of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, and in LINE groups between March and May 2024. Quantitative data were analyzed employing descriptive statistics in SPSS version 29 to calculate percentages, means, and standard deviations.

In June 2024, semi-structured Zoom interviews were conducted in Thai with eight questionnaire respondents who consented to participate. The interviews, lasting 40–72 minutes, were recorded for transcription and translation. Gender-reflective pseudonyms were used to ensure confidentiality and report participants' responses in this article. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time and assured that their information would be kept confidential.

Content analysis was employed to code and categorize qualitative data from questionnaires and interviews, converting responses into percentages. A research assistant verified the analysis, and member checking ensured data validity through interviewee confirmation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

RESULTS

To answer the four RQs, this section is divided into four parts: priorities for teaching reading, current practices of teaching reading, challenges in teaching reading, and reasons for not doing extensive reading. The overall findings will be discussed in the discussion and implications section.

Part 1: Priorities for teaching reading

RQ1 What do Thai EFL university teachers prioritize when teaching reading in foundation English courses to non-English major undergraduate students?

Participants rated their priorities on a 5-Likert scale ranging from 5 (extremely important) to 1 (not important). Twenty priorities in Table 4 were grouped in five categories: (1) *Building general or linguistic knowledge before or while reading a specific text,* (2) *Building general reading skills,* (3) *Involving students in reading, selecting materials, sharing opinions* (4) *Preparing for exams,* and (5) *Building desired outcomes from having read*. Of all five categories, Category 5 was mainly emphasized (M = 4.27, SD = 0.57), followed by Category 2 (M = 4.23, SD = 0.65), and Category 1 (M = 4.12, SD = 0.62).

When examining more closely, the top three priorities included *building reading comprehension* (M = 4.61, SD = 0.60), *teaching students reading strategies* (M = 4.50, SD = 0.70), and *activating students' prior knowledge to arouse their curiosity* (M = 4.26, SD = 0.74). Notably, the participants did not prioritize *giving students opportunities to read a lot in class* (M = 3.46, SD = 1.01) and out of class (M = 3.57, SD = 1.01) which ranked bottom on the list.

Table 4
Priorities for teaching English reading

Priorities*	M	SD
1. Building general or linguistic knowledge before or while reading a specific text		
4. Building vocabulary (e.g., explicit teaching of vocabulary and vocabulary learning strategies)	4.22	0.76
5. Teaching grammar and sentence structure from the reading passages	3.79	0.87
14. Teaching the context behind the reading	4.09	0.88
15. Ensuring that students understand the purpose of their reading	4.23	0.80
16. Activating students' prior knowledge to arouse their curiosity	4.26	0.74
Average	**4.12**	**0.62**
2. Building general reading skills		
6. Raising awareness of text and paragraph structure, cohesion, and coherence	4.09	0.86
13. Teaching students reading strategies	4.50	0.70
17. Building students' critical thinking skills through analyzing author's viewpoint or purpose	4.13	0.85
18. Building students' critical thinking skills through identifying fact vs. opinion	4.21	0.84
Average	**4.23**	**0.65**
3. Involving students in reading, selecting materials, sharing opinions		
7. Taking students' interests into consideration when designing or selecting reading materials and activities	4.10	0.87
8. Giving students choices in what they read	3.85	0.91
9. Giving students opportunities to read a lot in class	3.46	1.01
10. Giving students opportunities to read a lot out of class	3.57	1.01

Priorities*		M	SD
11. Giving students opportunities to comment on what they have read in class		4.21	0.81
12. Ensuring that there are plenty of reading materials at various proficiency levels that the students can select from to read independently		3.85	0.98
	Average	**3.84**	**0.75**
4. Preparing for exams			
19. Preparing students for their midterm and final exams		3.97	0.94
20. Preparing students for standardized English tests		3.65	1.06
	Average	**3.81**	**0.83**
5. Building desired outcomes from having read			
1. Building reading comprehension		4.61	0.60
2. Building fluency		4.05	0.74
3. Building reading confidence		4.15	0.81
	Average	**4.27**	**0.57**

Item numbers follow the numbers in the questionnaire.

Interview participants highlighted three priorities for teaching reading, namely building vocabulary, building reading comprehension, and teaching reading strategies, reflecting the key focused areas demonstrated in Table 4.

Five participants—Nada, Natcha, Airin, Picha, and Praewa—focused on building vocabulary. Picha expressed her reason for prioritizing this aspect.

> Picha: I usually focus on teaching vocabulary first because it's the key to reading… I want the students to try guessing the meanings of words, using context clues.

Four participants—Lalin, Airin, Bhurin, and Praewa—stressed building reading comprehension. Bhurin elaborated on this aspect.

> Bhurin: When teaching reading, I mainly emphasize that students should be able to analyze, interpret, and ask questions about the content they're reading. What's really important is understanding the main ideas in the material.

Two participants—Lalin and Warit—prioritized teaching reading strategies. Warit explained his practice of teaching reading strategies.

> Warit: First, I start by teaching reading strategies, like skimming and scanning, to help the students find the main idea. While reading, I ask them to figure out meanings by using different tools to help. After finishing the reading, I ask them to write a 2–3-sentence summary to ensure they understand the content.

The interviews enabled the researcher to discover that three participants equally emphasized two priorities and all of them commonly prioritized building reading comprehension, mirroring the first priority listed in Table 4. Both Airin and Praewa focused on building vocabulary and

reading comprehension, while Lalin emphasized teaching reading strategies and building reading comprehension.

> Airin: When I teach reading in class, I focus on teaching vocabulary and reading comprehension. Then, I observe how well the students understand the content after reading.

> Praewa: I focus on vocabulary and comprehension because I want the students to learn new words and understand that sometimes vocabulary can change meaning depending on the context. I think, at least, they should understand what they're reading so they can find the main idea of the text.

> Lalin: I emphasize teaching reading strategies to help students understand what they're reading. I don't teach them to translate the text, but show them how to use the reading techniques.

Part 2: Current practices of teaching reading

RQ2 What are their current practices of teaching reading in such courses?

This part includes five topics: time proportion, three stages of teaching reading, in-class activities, reading materials, and considerations for selecting reading materials.

Time proportion

Although the data reveal that the average weekly class time for FE courses was 216 minutes (3 hours 36 minutes) per week, 52.15% of the participants reported that their class time lasted three hours. Thus, a 3-hour class per week seems quite common for FE courses.

Table 5 indicates that in each hour of class time, 100% of the participants taught *reading* in FE courses, with 33.13% allocating around 21–30 minutes per class period, while 23.31% taught reading around 31–40 minutes. The highest percentages of the participants also taught *writing* (22.70%) and *speaking* (28.22%) around 21–30 minutes per class period, likely due to the time-intensive nature of these skills. *Vocabulary* and *language focus* were generally taught for under 30 minutes. *Pronunciation* received the least attention, with 36.20% of the participants spending not more than 20 minutes on teaching it.

Table 5

Number of participants allocating time to teaching each component in class

Component	5–10 mins	11–20 mins	21–30 mins	31–40 mins	41–50 mins	51–60 mins	N/A
1. Reading	4.29%	20.86%	33.13%	23.31%	6.75%	11.66%	-
2. Writing	9.20%	19.02%	22.70%	22.09%	6.13%	12.88%	7.98%
3. Listening	14.11%	31.90%	27.61%	9.20%	1.84%	5.52%	9.82%
4. Speaking	9.82%	24.54%	28.22%	18.40%	3.07%	6.13%	9.82%
5. Vocabulary	17.79%	40.49%	20.86%	14.11%	2.45%	2.45%	1.84%

Component	5–10 mins	11–20 mins	21–30 mins	31–40 mins	41–50 mins	51–60 mins	N/A
6. Language focus (grammar)	15.95%	34.97%	30.67%	9.82%	4.91%	1.23%	2.45%
7. Pronunciation	33.13%	36.20%	12.27%	5.52%	1.23%	0.61%	11.04%

Three stages of teaching reading

The percentages in Table 6 represent the proportion of participants who allocated a specific range of time to each stage of teaching a reading passage, rather than a distribution of time across all three stages. That is to say, the participants might focus on more than one stage with overlapping time allocations, which could exceed 100% when combined.

In practice, when teaching a reading passage, almost 70% of the participants emphasized doing while-reading activities as they spent over 50% of their lesson time on such activities, followed by doing post-reading activities (63.19%).

Table 6
Number of participants allocating time to each stage of teaching a reading passage

Stages	Percentage of time allocation			
	76–100%	51–75%	26–50%	0–25%
1. Pre-reading activities (e.g., pre-teaching vocabulary, the context, and background; predicting the content; giving students a purpose to read)	24.54%	27.61%	28.22%	19.63%
2. While-reading activities (e.g., letting students guess unknown words from the context, identify the text type, and build comprehension)	25.77%	44.17%	25.15%	4.91%
3. Post-reading activities (e.g., checking understanding; reviewing vocabulary)	27.61%	35.58%	25.77%	11.04%

To help us better understand the teachers' practices of teaching reading, eight interviewees were asked to reflect on what worked well in their current practices. The interview data revealed their reading instruction practices in the pre-, while-, and post-reading stages.

Warit and Lalin focused on teaching reading strategies in different reading stages. Warit emphasized teaching reading strategies in the pre-reading stage. His case also showed that allowing students to share ideas freely without judging them right or wrong fostered a safe, supportive environment, which in turn boosted student engagement.

> Warit: Teaching pre-reading strategies works well. I have students preview the topic and brainstorm together. I let them know that there are no right or wrong answers— they can just share freely. This makes them engage and creates a supportive environment.

Lalin highlighted teaching reading strategies in the while-reading stage.

> Lalin: Demonstrating how to use reading strategies works very well because it helps my students understand what they're reading better and builds their confidence in reading.

Natcha who emphasized the pre-reading stage shared her practice as follows:

> Natcha: I've tried to engage my students by giving them pre-reading questions and letting them discuss.

Praewa focused on the while-reading stage, underscoring providing constructive, non-critical feedback for mistakes to increase reading confidence.

> Praewa: What I do well is encouraging students to read more attentively, which boosts their reading confidence. When they mistranslate something, I don't criticize them. Instead, I give gentle suggestions like, 'Let's adjust this part,' so they don't fear making mistakes.

Although all interviewees implemented ER, Nada was the only interviewee who mentioned her integration of ER when asked about what worked well in her teaching reading practice. Her excerpt illustrates that ER successfully helped her change students' attitudes toward English reading.

> Nada: What I do well is shifting students' attitudes through implementing ER. Many non-English majors see English as difficult, so they don't want to learn it. But after doing ER, they become more confident and willing to read than if we just forced them to read from a textbook.

Besides focusing on while- and post-reading stages, with in-class individual silent reading, group reading, and creating post-reading mind maps, Picha's teaching approach also incorporated collaborative learning by allowing students to work in mixed proficiency groups, aiming to enhance students' reading comprehension.

> Picha: I have students read individually for 5–10 minutes, then brainstorm answers to questions like "Who did what, where, and how?" in mixed proficiency groups, so they can help each other out. If all strong students work together, the weak students will struggle. Afterward, they create mind maps summarizing the main points of each chapter.

In-class activities

Results in Table 7 were grouped into teacher-led (i.e., the teacher doing the activity) and student-led (i.e., the students doing the activity) activities. Both teacher-led and student-led activities were nearly equally emphasized in reading classes, with teachers and students

playing important and balanced roles. On average, 45.55% of the activities were regularly teacher-led, while 44.54% were regularly student-led, showing shared responsibilities in reading instruction.

As for the teacher-led activities, nearly 70% of the participants regularly *taught students to summarize reading passages*, while about 50% regularly *provided summaries themselves*. Around 60% occasionally translated texts into Thai. The participants' emphasis on these three activities indicated their priority for building and enhancing their students' reading comprehension.

For student-led activities, 65.03% regularly *encouraged silent reading*, and almost 60% regularly *had students share opinions and discuss the passages*, fostering engagement. Notably, the practice of reading aloud was still evident at the university level as it was sometimes done by the teacher (56.44%) and by the students (49.08%).

Table 7

In-class activities

When teaching reading in class, I...	%		
	Regularly	*Sometimes*	*Almost never*
1. Teacher-led activities			
1. read the text aloud for my students	33.74	56.44	9.82
2. translate the text into Thai for my students	28.83	61.35	9.82
3. provide a summary of the text to my students	50.31	37.42	12.27
6. teach the students to summarize main points of the reading passages	69.33	29.45	1.23
Average	**45.55**	**46.17**	**8.28**
2. Student-led activities			
4. ask the students to read the text aloud to the class	16.56	49.08	34.36
5. let the students read the text silently themselves	65.03	31.29	3.68
7. have the students discuss the reading passages	56.44	38.04	5.52
8. ask the students to share their opinions about the reading passages	57.67	36.81	5.52
9. assign the students to read 1–2 reading passages in the textbook in each class	26.99	58.28	14.72
Average	**44.54**	**42.70**	**12.76**

* Item numbers follow the numbers in the questionnaire.

Reading materials

Table 8 illustrates that 32.25% of the participants regularly used materials mainly for intensive reading and almost never used graded reading materials (63.19%) when teaching reading in the FE courses. The top three most regularly used materials *include a commercial 4-skill course book by publishers* (54.60%), *supplementary materials created by the teacher(s) at their university* (39.88%), and *a course book designed to teach reading* (39.26%). This result shows that commercial course books produced by leading ELT publishers are predominantly used at universities in Thailand.

Table 8
Reading materials used in the foundation English courses

Reading materials	%		
	Regularly	Sometimes	Almost never
1. Materials mainly for intensive reading			
1. a commercial 4-skill course book by publishers such as Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson, etc.	54.60	34.36	11.04
2. a course book designed to teach reading by publishers such as Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson, etc.	39.26	35.58	25.15
3. an in-house course book developed by the teacher(s) at my university	38.65	22.70	38.65
4. supplementary materials created by the teacher(s) at my university	39.88	36.81	23.31
5. my own materials (e.g., worksheets)	25.77	53.37	20.86
6. reading passages from test preparation materials (e.g., TOEFL IELTS or TOEIC or previous tests)	12.27	42.94	44.79
7. academic books or articles	15.34	37.42	47.24
Average	**32.25**	**37.60**	**30.15**
2. Graded reading materials often used for doing ER			
10. an online reading program	10.43	20.86	68.71
11. graded readers or other story books	6.75	35.58	57.67
Average	**8.59**	**28.22**	**63.19**
3. Non-graded reading materials			
8. magazines, newspapers, online articles, etc.	21.47	56.44	22.09
9. comics or manga	3.68	21.47	74.85
12. story books	5.52	20.86	73.62
Average	**10.22**	**32.92**	**56.85**

* Item numbers follow the numbers in the questionnaire.

Considerations for selecting reading materials

The results in Table 9 are grouped into materials selected to meet course requirements (i.e., materials specified in the course syllabus) and materials selected to meet students' preferences and interests. When choosing materials, a balance between the two categories was observed with the materials required for the course having a slightly higher average mean score (M = 4.33, SD = 0.57). However, the results seem to suggest that the participants cared about their students as they selected the materials that would *cover the content that they thought their students needed to know about* (M = 4.42, SD = 0.68), *make the course more interesting* (M = 4.39, SD = 0.71), and were more relevant for students (M = 4.37, SD = 0.72).

Table 9

Considerations for selecting reading materials

I tend to choose materials that…		*M*	*SD*
1. Materials selected to meet course requirements			
1. cover the content I think my students need to know about		4.42	0.68
2. build on the topics in the course book		4.25	0.73
	Average	**4.33**	**0.57**
2. Materials selected to meet students' preferences and interests			
1. make the course more interesting for students		4.39	0.71
2. make the course more relevant for students		4.37	0.72
3. motivate students		4.31	0.78
4. the students are interested in (even if I'm not)		4.09	0.81
	Average	**4.29**	**0.62**

Part 3: Challenges in teaching reading

RQ3 What are the main challenges faced when teaching reading in such courses?

Although participants were asked to type one biggest challenge they faced in teaching reading, some listed more than one challenge. Their responses were coded and grouped in four categories: student-related (i.e., issues stemming from students' skills, attitudes, behaviors, and motivation), teacher-related (i.e., issues tied to teachers' preparation, practices, and obstacles), management-related (i.e., structural or institutional barriers that affect teaching reading), and others. Table 10 shows that student-related challenges dominate, comprising 85.03% of the total issues, followed by management-related challenges (8.02%), others (4.28%), and teacher-related (2.67%).

In the student-related category, *students' limited vocabulary* (24.60%) stood out as the most significant concern, followed by *negative attitudes* to *English reading* (12.83%) and *low English proficiency* (10.70%). Furthermore, it seems that *students' reliance on translation tools* (9.63%) has also become a challenge, especially in the age of AI. Notably, no common teacher-related challenge was reported. As for the management-related category, *mixed ability classes* were reported as the biggest challenge (4.28%).

Table 10

The biggest challenge in teaching English reading

Challenges		*n**	%
1. Student-related			
	1. Limited vocabulary	46	24.60
	2. Negative attitudes to English reading	24	12.83
	3. Low English proficiency	20	10.70
	4. Reliance on translation tools	18	9.63
	5. Limited reading skills	14	7.49
	6. Negative attitudes to studying English	8	4.28
	7. Inability to read in English	7	3.74
	8. Lack of motivation to study English	4	2.14
	9. Lack of confidence in reading aloud	4	2.14

Challenges	n*	%
10. Dislike of reading long texts	2	1.07
11. Students being distracted by social media during class time	2	1.07
12. Lack of analytical thinking skills	2	1.07
13. Mispronunciation	1	0.53
14. Students studying English just to pass exams	1	0.53
15. Limited critical reading skills	1	0.53
16. Students being quiet in class	1	0.53
17. Limited background knowledge	1	0.53
18. Students having no time to review English lessons	1	0.53
19. Lack of confidence in translating texts from English to Thai	1	0.53
20. Lack of concentration	1	0.53
Total	**159**	**85.03**
2. Teacher-related		
21. Teachers having to adjust teaching content every year	1	0.53
22. Difficulty with building a positive attitude toward reading	1	0.53
23. Difficulty with checking all students' comprehension	1	0.53
24. Difficulty with verifying correct answers that students asked in class	1	0.53
25. Not knowing how and what to teach when teaching reading	1	0.53
Total	**5**	**2.67**
3. Management-related		
26. Mixed ability class	9	4.81
27. Issues related to materials (e.g., difficult texts, boring contents, main emphasis on grammar, not comprehension)	3	1.60
28. Class time limitation	2	1.07
29. Large class size	1	0.53
Total	**15**	**8.02**
4. Others		
30. N/A (Participants typed a dash.)	8	4.28
Total	**8**	**4.28**
Grand total	**187**	**100.00**

* n refers to number of responses.

Although interviewees were asked to identify the one biggest challenge that they faced in teaching reading, they shared more than one challenge. Their challenges were related to students, the teacher, and management, and most of them were similar to those shown in Table 10. For instance, *negative attitudes* to *English reading* and *studying English* as well as *students' inability to read in English* were reported as student-related challenges.

Lalin, Nada, Picha, and Praewa reported students' negative attitudes to English reading.

> Lalin: I think the greatest challenge for my students is their attitudes toward reading. They don't really see it as a skill, but just another lesson. They tend to prioritize speaking and writing skills more than reading. They feel that reading isn't as important.

> Nada: The biggest challenge is that many of my students don't like reading, so I have to put in a lot of effort into motivating them. When I ask them to read, they'll say, 'I don't understand what I'm reading,' 'I don't know the vocabulary,' or 'I can't do it.' So, I really have to work on motivating them, helping them feel that it's not as difficult as they think.

Picha: The biggest challenge is students' attitudes. Some students put up a wall with the teacher from the start. As I mentioned, students are very diverse and need to be open-minded first. But some students just aren't open to learning English. Some of them say, "I'll take a D, I don't want an A."

Praewa: The biggest challenge is the attitude of students who don't like reading. They feel that reading is difficult to understand as they don't know much vocabulary. This creates an attitude where they think they can't do it and it discourages them from reading.

Bhurin mentioned students' negative attitudes to studying English.

Bhurin: The majority of my students hate English, feeling that it's difficult. When they encounter difficult words and can't translate them, they don't want to continue reading.

Airin, Picha, Natcha, and Warit encountered students' inability to read in English, a challenge which might not be highly expected at the university level but certainly deserves our attention.

Airin: The main challenge is that about 10% of the students I teach in the foundation course can't read because their vocabulary is quite limited. So, what can we do when they can't read? We don't have the time to teach phonics or blending sounds.

During the interview, Natcha expressed her despair, feeling overwhelmed by her situation, which demonstrated a shocking problem in teaching reading at the university level.

Natcha: The students don't know any vocabulary and can't even read basic words. Sometimes, I just don't know what to do. It's overwhelming because, at university, I expect them to have at least some basic vocabulary from high school or vocational studies. But when I asked how they studied, some said they didn't learn anything at all. There are students like this—it's real—and it shocked me.

Natcha's following excerpt accentuated how common it was to have a class with many students not being able to read in English.

The percentage of students who really can't read at all varies between 10% and 90% per section, depending on the major. If I'm lucky, the class might only have about 10–20% struggling, but most of the time, that's pretty rare.

Warit reported a unique case, indicating that his students could not read, but instead they remembered words as pictures.

Warit: In most sections that I teach, there will be around 5–10% of students who can't read in English. They cannot read and lack confidence to talk in English. They can only read short words with 2–3 letters like "the", "do", "you", etc. because they remember the words as pictures.

While Natcha, Airin, and Warit elaborated that their students could not read due to their limited vocabulary knowledge, knowing the vocabulary did not seem to guarantee that students would be able to read and interpret the text as illustrated in Picha's case.

> Picha: Although some of my students know the vocabulary, they still can't read or interpret the text properly.

Management-related challenges involved teaching materials and mixed ability classes. While the materials were outdated and irrelevant in Warit's case, Natcha expressed a difficulty with selecting reading materials suitable for a diverse group of students.

> Warit: The main challenge for me is teaching materials, especially reading texts. They are not up-to-date and the topics are not relevant to the students.

> Natcha: The biggest challenge is choosing reading materials that are suitable for a diverse group of students, considering both their fields of study and their language proficiency levels.

Like Natcha, Bhurin taught a mixed ability class and further indicated a challenge in selecting activities for his students with different reading skills and proficiencies.

> Bhurin: The challenge is that my students have different reading skills and proficiencies, with some being very good and others not as strong. This means that when selecting activities for them, we need to have more variety to suit students' diverse levels.

However, one interviewee, Lalin, reported a teacher-related challenge in achieving a teaching objective, which was not mentioned by any questionnaire respondents. Lalin's excerpt provided evidence of students' use of AI and translation tools in translating and doing the reading for the students, which has become more common in the digital era. Such use took away an opportunity for students to practice using reading strategies. While students' reliance on translation tools was categorized as a student-related challenge in Table 10, it was considered a teacher-related challenge in Lalin's case as it caused teacher disappointment in being unable to fulfill her teaching goal.

> Lalin: The biggest challenge is feeling like I haven't achieved my objective in teaching reading strategies because students rely on translation tools or AI to help them translate and don't actually apply the strategies learned. This is probably the main challenge that hinders both practical use and the learning process.

Part 4: Reasons for not doing extensive reading

RQ4 Does extensive reading become a component in such courses? If not, what makes the teachers not include ER?

61.35% (*n* = 100) of the participants did not implement extensive reading as part of teaching a foundation course while 38.65% (*n* = 63) did. Participants were asked to select all reasons that applied for not doing ER. Reasons were categorized in four groupings: teacher-related, management-related, motivation- and attitude-related, and others as shown in Table 11. 54.07% of the responses were teacher-related with the *teacher's perspective thinking that their students would not like to do ER* (15.93%) as a top reason. This reason might be linked to challenges such as *students' negative attitudes to English reading* and *inability to read in English* reported in Table 10. Furthermore, 33.33% of the responses were management-related with key issues that stopped the participants from implementing ER, including *time constraints* (14.81%), and *lack of relevant materials* (13.33%).

Table 11
The main reasons for not doing ER according to the teacher

Reasons		*n*	%
1.	**Teacher-related**		
	1. I don't think my students would like to do ER.	43	15.93
	2. I don't know how to assess ER.	41	15.19
	3. I don't know how to do ER in my class.	38	14.07
	4. I don't know what ER is.	24	8.89
	Total	**146**	**54.07**
2.	**Management-related**		
	5. I don't have time.	40	14.81
	6. I don't have relevant reading materials.	36	13.33
	7. I don't have funding.	5	1.85
	8. I don't have support from my colleagues who teach the same course(s).	5	1.85
	9. I don't have support from university leaders.	4	1.48
	Total	**90**	**33.33**
3.	**Motivation- and attitude-related**		
	10. I don't have motivation.	11	4.07
	11. I don't think doing ER is useful.	4	1.48
	Total	**15**	**5.56**
4.	**Others** **Total**	**19**	**7.04**
	Grand total	**270**	**100.00**

The 19 Other responses in Table 11 were divided into five categories in Table 12. 57.89% of the responses were management-related reasons, followed by student-related reasons (21.05%). Items 6, 7, and 8 in the *management-related* category seem interconnected and causal. *The lack of ER integration into the curriculum*, one of the management-related reasons, prevented the participants from doing ER as their teaching time was consumed by core materials and they were obligated to follow the prescribed content and activities, which excluded ER. *Students' lack of motivation to do the reading* (10.53%) ranked top on the student-related reasons list.

Table 12
Other reasons for not doing ER

Reasons	n	%
1. **Student-related**		
1. Students are not motivated to do the reading.	2	10.53
2. Students' English proficiency is low and are not interested in non-major subjects.	1	5.26
3. Students already have a lot of assignments.	1	5.26
Total	**4**	**21.05**
2. **Teacher-related**		
4. I haven't designed my instruction to integrate ER.	1	5.26
5. I can't motivate students to do ER.	1	5.26
Total	**2**	**10.53**
3. **Management-related**		
6. ER is not integrated into the curriculum.	4	21.05
7. There is no time to do ER as the core material already requires most of the time.	4	21.05
8. All teachers are required to use the same content and activities.	2	10.53
9. I need to consult other course teachers before deciding to do ER.	1	5.26
Total	**11**	**57.89**
4. **Attitude-related**		
10. ER may not be suitable for students across all disciplines.	1	5.26
Total	**1**	**5.56**
5. **Others**		
11. I haven't tried to do ER yet.	1	5.26
Total	**1**	**5.26**
Grand total	**19**	**100.00**

Notably, management-related reasons in Table 12 constituted the largest proportion of all reasons for not implementing ER. In order to encourage teachers to integrate ER into their teaching, such issues must be tackled. Such issues are discussed and implications are proposed in the following section.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The study's findings shed light on Thai university teachers' reading instruction in foundation English courses for non-English major undergraduates, particularly their priorities, practices, and challenges in teaching reading. The findings also revealed their reasons for not adopting ER in such courses.

Teachers' priorities for teaching reading

Based on the quantitative and qualitative data, this study found that participants prioritized building students' reading comprehension, teaching reading strategies, and building vocabulary. Notably, some interviewees emphasized two priorities equally, with one of them being building reading comprehension. This underscores the central role of reading comprehension in teaching reading, particularly for non-English major undergraduates. These findings align with L2 reading scholars' perspectives on L2 reading instruction where comprehension activities such as

answering questions (Stoller, 2015) and completing reading comprehension exercises (Anderson, 2008) are fundamental components of intensive reading instruction.

The study highlights that providing students opportunities to read extensively is a low priority for many participants. This aligns with Grabe and Stoller's (2002, p. 76) observation that "reading a lot is not the emphasis of most reading curricula," despite its importance for developing reading skills. Prominent L2 reading scholars, including Nuttall (2005), Stoller (2015), Bamford, and Grabe (Anderson, 2008), emphasize that reading a lot is essential for students to become better and fluent readers. Thus, teachers are encouraged to integrate ER into their teaching, as research demonstrates its benefits for enhancing reading comprehension (e.g., Jeon & Day, 2016; Sek et al., 2021) and vocabulary acquisition (e.g., Ng et al., 2019; Thongsan, 2023).

Current practices of teaching reading

The study found that a 3-hour weekly class was common in FE courses at universities in Thailand. In each hour of class time, 100% of the participants taught reading, indicating their emphasis on building reading skills. Approximately 33% dedicated 21–30 minutes to teaching reading as shown in Table 5, with nearly 70% spending over half of the lesson time on while-reading activities, and around 63% on post-reading tasks as demonstrated in Table 6. By allocating a significant amount of time to while-reading and post-reading activities, these findings suggest that university teachers prioritize reading comprehension. It should also be noted that if these figures are accurate, it means that the total class time is greater than 100%. This could result from participants' allocating overlapping percentages or misunderstanding of the questions. The total class time being greater than 100% could potentially be considered a limitation in the survey design, and thus, the future survey should ensure that participants allocate a fixed amount (100%) appropriately across different stages of teaching reading rather than letting participants independently allocate percentages that may overlap.

Interview data highlighted the effectiveness of teaching reading strategies during the pre- and while-reading stages, which improved comprehension. This aligns with Akkakoson's (2013) study, showing that explicit strategy instruction significantly improved students' reading comprehension, especially for high-proficiency students. These findings emphasize the importance of integrating reading strategies early to enhance comprehension development.

In addition, creating a safe and supportive classroom environment through encouraging open idea-sharing and avoiding criticism during pre- and while-reading activities was evident in two interviewees' cases. Such approaches were reported to boost student engagement and confidence. Teachers, thus, should promote open communication and avoid criticism to enhance participation, comprehension, and critical thinking skills in students.

The interview data also revealed that a collaborative learning approach was used by one participant to teach reading to mixed-ability non-English major students, allowing stronger students to support weaker ones. This strategy enhances reading comprehension and demonstrates the benefits of mixed-proficiency group work in fostering engagement and skill development. Additionally, extensive reading, used by Nada, improved students' attitudes as

students were allowed to choose materials matching their interests and proficiency. This boosted their confidence and motivation. Research confirms ER's effectiveness in enhancing reading motivation (Puripunyavanich, 2021; Sek et al., 2021; Tamrackitkun, 2010; Tantipidok, 2023), highlighting the value of personalized, interest-driven reading activities in L2 reading instruction.

Furthermore, the findings in Table 7 showed a balanced approach in reading instruction, with 45.55% of activities being regularly teacher-led and 44.54% student-led. Teachers regularly taught students to summarize the main points, provided summaries, and occasionally translated texts, indicating their desire to build and increase students' comprehension. Their implementation of such activities mirrors their top priority for teaching reading—building reading comprehension—shown in Table 4. It is also worth noticing that through regularly teaching students to summarize the main points in the texts, teachers do their job in helping their students become independent readers, which is the key goal of teaching reading in a foreign language (Nuttall, 2005). Through this activity, students learn how to summarize the essence of the reading by themselves. Findings also revealed that students frequently engaged in silent reading, sharing their opinions about the reading passages, and discussions, indicating that reading skills can serve as a springboard to other skills such as speaking, analytical thinking, or even critical thinking depending on how post-reading tasks are designed. These results emphasize the shared responsibilities of teachers and students and suggest that both teacher-led and student-led reading activities be integrated into reading instruction to enhance comprehension as well as foster engagement and active participation.

The findings in Table 8 also revealed that FE teachers in universities predominantly teach reading either with commercial 4-skill course books or course books designed to teach reading from leading ELT publishers for a global market. This suggests they favor commercially produced and internationally focused materials over local materials. However, their additional use of teacher-created resources and in-house books reflect efforts to meet local needs. Based on this finding, universities should provide training in materials development to help teachers create effective resources suitable for their own context. Also, using a combination of commercial course books with global content and teacher-produced materials with locally relevant content could enhance student engagement and learning outcomes in reading instruction.

The findings in Table 9 also indicated a balance between materials required by the course syllabus and those deemed relevant to students' preferences and interests. However, the high scores for criteria such as covering the necessary content, meeting students' interests, and making the course more relevant for students highlight the participants' strong student-focused approach, suggesting their prioritization of enhancing students' learning experiences and engagement. Thus, teachers should aim for a balanced approach in materials selection, combining pedagogical goals with students' needs and interests.

Challenges in teaching reading

The questionnaire and interview data from university teachers in this study revealed challenges that were mostly similar. The questionnaire data in Table 10 indicated that student-related challenges overwhelmingly dominated, accounting for approximately 85% of the total challenges. Students' limited vocabulary, negative attitudes to English reading, low English proficiency, reliance on translation tools, and limited reading skills were the top five challenges. Students' limited vocabulary knowledge seems to be a common challenge for both non-English major (e.g., Rajab et al., 2012) and English major undergraduates (e.g., Chinpakdee, 2024). Also, such student-related challenges might be causal in that some non-English majors have insufficient vocabulary knowledge, low English proficiency, and limited reading skills, so they had negative attitudes to reading English and had to rely on translation tools.

The interview data elaborate on the questionnaire data. Some interviewees reported issues with attitudes to studying and reading English, showing that their students disliked English and took the FE courses because they were mandatory. Also, they disliked reading, feeling that it was not important. These findings support Warden and Lin's (2000) argument that many students in Asia study English simply because they are required to. Additionally, half of the interviewees identified students' inability to read in English, often linked to limited vocabulary, as a major issue. This finding corroborates earlier studies which pinpointed insufficient vocabulary as a key obstacle to comprehension (Kheirzadeh & Tavakoli, 2012; Rajab et al., 2012). However, one interviewee noted that vocabulary knowledge alone did not guarantee comprehension, as some students struggled to grasp meaning despite knowing the words. Although students' English reading difficulties might not be highly expected at the university level, the study's findings indicate that it is a concerning issue. Airin and Warit reported that about 10% of foundation-level students struggled, while Natcha observed rates varying from 10–90%. These findings emphasize the need for targeted interventions to address reading difficulties and prevent academic setbacks.

The growing reliance on translation tools highlights a challenge in teaching reading in the age of AI, as evident in both questionnaire and interview data. One interviewee noted that students' reliance on AI and translation tools limited their practice of reading strategies. Hyde et al. (2024, p. 723) identify overreliance on AI as a key issue, emphasizing the need for educators to guide its use "to complement, not replace, human effort and intelligence in the learning process". They recommend fostering critical thinking through assigning tasks that require students' explanations of decisions and encouraging students to use AI for exploration rather than as a source of answers. In contrast to the interviewee's assertion, studies show students' positive perceptions of using AI tools in English reading, suggesting we should not dismiss AI tools for the development of English reading out of hand. Studies have revealed that AI tools can help improve students' reading skills and enhance their motivation and confidence in reading (Daweli & Mahyoub, 2024), reduce previewing tasks, save time, provide more learning information, and increase students' confidence in interpreting English texts (Chea & Xiao, 2024).

Furthermore, managing mixed-ability classes was a significant challenge in the management-related category. Two interviewees emphasized the difficulty of selecting appropriate reading

materials and activities for students with diverse proficiency levels, highlighting the need for differentiated instruction and adaptive teaching strategies.

To improve learning, teachers should prioritize vocabulary building, context-based understanding, and independent reading strategies to help students become independent readers. Differentiated instruction helps address varied proficiency levels in mixed ability classes and engage students with suitable materials. Bamford and Erler stress using level-appropriate materials for L2 learners, while Erler and Grabe advocate teaching reading strategies for managing difficult texts (Anderson, 2008). Furthermore, encouraging intrinsic motivation through interactive, meaningful reading tasks further supports student engagement. By implementing these approaches, teachers can effectively support struggling students, enhance reading skills, and meet academic expectations.

Reasons for not doing extensive reading

The findings reveal that 61.35% of participants did not implement extensive reading (ER) in their FE courses, while 38.65% did. Top five barriers shown in Table 11 were teacher- and management-related. *I don't think my students would like to do ER* ranked first on the list of reasons. This teacher perception could stem from challenges that the participants reported in Table 10 such as students' negative attitudes to English reading, limited vocabulary and reading skills, and low English proficiency. Studies investigating ER implementation in Asia (e.g., Chang & Renandya, 2017; Thongsan & Waring, 2024) have reported students' lack of interest in reading as a top challenge. Other key teacher-related reasons include *teachers not knowing how to assess or do ER, time constraints and lack of relevant reading materials*. These issues reflect the top concerns that teachers have about implementing ER identified by Renandya et al. (2021), indicating a knowledge gap and suggesting a need for training.

Nineteen respondents reported additional reasons in Table 12, nearly 58% of which were management-related, highlighting the *lack of ER integration in the curriculum* as a key barrier. Participants faced pressure to cover prescribed content and materials, aligning with one of the barriers that Renandya and Jacobs (2002) identified. To overcome this barrier, the Extensive Reading Foundation (ERF, 2011) recommends embedding ER into the curriculum and instruction timetable. However, for this integration to succeed, effective curriculum change requires collaboration between teachers and administration (Robb, 2022).

Students' low motivation, low proficiency, and busy schedules further hindered ER implementation, emphasizing the need for systemic changes to encourage reading. Together, these findings underscore the need for professional development training to educate teachers on ER implementation and assessment, as well as the need for better curriculum design which encourages reading. To encourage more teachers to implement ER in FE courses, professional development should focus on overcoming management-related barriers, including time constraints and assessment issues to guide them on implementing, managing, and assessing ER in their FE courses. Curriculum redesign and strategies to boost student motivation and interest are also essential to integrate ER effectively into such courses.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

While this study offers valuable insights into reading instruction in foundation English courses for non-English major undergraduates across Thailand, there are some limitations. First, the relatively small sample size (*n* = 163) may affect the findings' generalizability; thus, future research should include more participants to enhance the robustness and applicability of the study's findings. Since this study focused on exploring the reading instruction from the teacher's side, it did not collect the data from students, so the data reported here came from the teachers' perceptions and experience. Exploring students' perceptions, experience, and difficulties faced in the English reading instruction in FE courses would enhance our understanding of such instruction at the tertiary education level. As for the use of the instructional materials, this study only investigated what materials Thai FE teachers used but did not explore why they preferred using commercial course books to localized materials. As a result, a further exploration of this issue could provide insights into the use of instructional materials in FE courses and needs for materials development training.

CONCLUSION

This study explored Thai university teachers' priorities, current practices, and challenges in teaching reading, as well as reasons for not implementing ER. Participants primarily prioritized building reading comprehension, teaching reading strategies, and building vocabulary, with nearly 70% spending over half of class time on while-reading activities. A balanced approach was noted in reading instruction and material selection. Both commercial textbooks and teacher-created materials were used. Key challenges in teaching reading included students' limited vocabulary, negative attitudes to English reading, low English proficiency, and inability to read English. Over 60% of the participants did not employ ER due to concerns about student interest, assessment methods, and time constraints. The study recommends incorporating ER into instruction to improve students' comprehension, vocabulary, and motivation. It also suggests teacher training be provided to equip teachers with the skills to effectively develop their reading materials and integrate ER in FE courses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE AUTHOR

Mintra Puripunyavanich, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of English at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI), Thailand. She is a co-founder and Immediate Past Chair of the Thailand Extensive Reading Association (TERA). Her areas of research interest include extensive reading, L2 reading, and materials development.
mintra.p@chula.ac.th

REFERENCES

Akkakoson, S. (2013). The relationship between strategic reading instruction, student learning of L2-based reading strategies and L2 reading achievement. *Journal of Research in Reading, 36*(4), 442–450. https://doi.org/10.1111/jrir.12004

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

Anderson, N. J. (2008). *Practical English language teaching: Reading*. McGraw-Hill.

Apairach, S. (2023). Going the extra miles in a reading lesson: Insights from a Thai EFL classroom. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 16*(1), 320–338. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/263444

Barr, P. S., & Chinwonno, A. (2016). The effects of project-based reading instruction on English reading ability and intercultural communicative competence of undergraduate students. *Journal of Education Naresuan University, 18*(3), 27–44. https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/edujournal_nu/article/view/66586

Chairat, P. (2015). Attitudes and motivation of non-English major students towards learning English as a foreign language: A case study. *ASEAN Journal of Education, 1*(1), 69–84. https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/AJE/article/view/180801/128332

Chang, A. C-S., & Renandya, W. (2017). Current practice of extensive reading in Asia: Teachers' perceptions. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 17*(1), 40–58. https://readingmatrix.com/files/16-4vj138u3.pdf

Chea, P., & Xiao, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The power and damage of AI-assisted tools on academic English reading skills. *Journal of General Education and Humanities, 3*(3), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v3i3.242

Chinpakdee, M. (2024). EFL Teachers' expectations and students' reading-related difficulties at the university level. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 17*(2), 48–68. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/274072

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Darasawang, P. (2007). English language teaching and education in Thailand: A decade of change. In N. D. Prescott (Ed.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, literacies, and literatures* (pp. 187–204). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Daweli, T. W., & Mahyoub, R. A. M. (2024). Exploring EFL learners' perspectives on using AI tools and their impacts in reading instruction: An exploratory study [Special issue on CALL]. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ),* (10), 160–171. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call10.11

Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 136–141. https://doi.org/10125/66761

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Researching methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.

Extensive Reading Foundation. (2011). *Guide to extensive reading*. ER Foundation. https://erfoundation.org/guide/ERF_Guide.pdf

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Pearson Education Limited.

Grabe, W., & Yamashita, J. (2022). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Hyde, S. J., Busby, A., & Bonner, R. L. (2024). Tools or fools: Are we educating managers or creating tool-dependent robots? *Journal of Management Education, 48*(4), 708–734. https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629241230357

Jeon, E. Y., & Day, R. R. (2016). The effective of ER on reading proficiency: A meta-analysis. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 28*(2), 246–265. https://doi.org/10125/66901

Kheirzadeh, S., & Tavakoli, E. (2012). The causes of reading difficulty: The perception of Iranian EFL post-graduate and under-graduate students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(1), 147–152. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.1.147-152

Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2021). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Nation, I. S. P., & Waring, R. (2020). *Teaching extensive reading in another language*. Routledge.

Ng, Q. R., Renandya, W. A., & Chong, M. Y. C. (2019). Extensive reading: Theory, research and implementation. *TEFLIN Journal, 30*(2), 171–186. https://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/171-186

Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Macmillan Education.

Puripunyavanich, M. (2021). Revealing university students' attitudes toward online extensive reading in Thailand. *rEFLections, 28*(2), 267–292. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v28i2.254070

Puripunyavanich, M. (2022). The implementation of a large-scale online extensive reading program in Thailand—From decision-making to application. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 15*(1), 320–360. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/256726/174231

Puripunyavanich, M. (in press). Exploring EFL teachers' implementation of extensive reading in undergraduate foundation English courses. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*.

Puripunyavanich, M., & Waring, R. (2024). Investigating the implementation of extensive reading in four Asian countries. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 36*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10125/67475

Rajab, A., Zakaria, W, & Rahman, H. A., (2012). Reading anxiety among second language learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 66*, 362–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.279

Renandya, W. A., Ivone, F. M., & Hidayati, M. (2021). Extensive reading: Top ten implementation issues. *JACET Journal, 65*, 11–21. https://doi.org/10.32234/jacetjournal.65.0_11

Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2002). Extensive reading: Why aren't we all doing it? In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 295–302). Cambridge University Press.

Robb, T. (2022). Encouraging schools to adopt extensive reading: How do we get there? *Reading in a Foreign Language, 34*(1), 184–194. https://doi.org/10125/67419

Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1976, April 19–23). *On the use of content specialists in the assessment of criterion-referenced test item validity* [Paper presentation]. The 60th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, United States. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED121845

Sek, S., Katenga, J. E., & Mushunje, A. T. (2021). Reading comprehension of Thai students improved by extensive reading when learning English as a foreign language. *Human Behavior, Development and Society, 22*(3), 95–104. https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/hbds/article/view/249550/168951

Sitthitikul, P. (2010). Curriculum context analysis to support meaningful EFL reading in Thailand. *Journal of English Studies, 5*, 56–71.

Sitthitikul, P. (2020). Proposed directions for the meaningful learning in the Thai EFL context. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–8.

St Clair-Thompson, H., Graham, A., & Marsham, S. (2018). Exploring the reading practices of undergraduate students. *Education Inquiry, 9*(3), 284–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2017.1380487

Stoller, F. L. (2015). Viewing extensive reading from different vantage points. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 27*(1), 152–159. https://doi.org/10125/66707

Stoller, F. L., Anderson, N. J., Grabe, W., & Komiyama, R. (2013). Instructional enhancements to improve students' reading abilities. *English Teaching Forum, 51*, 2–11. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1014068.pdf

Tamrackitkun, K. (2010). *Extensive reading: An empirical study of its effects on EFL Thai students' reading comprehension, reading fluency and attitudes* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Salford]. University of Salford Institutional Repository. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/40033812.pdf

Tantipidok, P. (2023). Promoting EFL Thai undergraduates' reading comprehension and reading motivation through extensive reading. *Interdisciplinary Research Review, 18*(5), 16–21. https://ph02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jtir/article/view/248500/169609

Thongsan, N. C. (2023). Vocabulary uptake and retention from reading a graded reader. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 16*(2), 154–167. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/266939/180216

Thongsan, N. C., & Waring, R. (2024). Challenges in implementing extensive reading in Thailand. *rEFLections, 31*(2), 457–477. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v31i2.274278

Torudom, K., & Taylor, P. (2017). An investigation of reading attitudes, motivation and reading anxiety of EFL undergraduate students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 10*(2), 47–70. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/111714

Warden, C.A., & Lin, H. J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(5), 535–545. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb01997.x

Waring, R., & Chu, V. A., (2017, August 5–7). *Setting up and managing an ER program in Vietnam* [Paper presentation]. The Fourth World Congress on Extensive Reading, Tokyo, Japan. https://bit.ly/36T1ymY

Waring, R., & Husna, N. (2019). Expectations and experiences of Indonesian teachers who have, and have not, done extensive reading. *TEFLIN Journal, 30*(2), 153–170. http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/153-170

Waring, R., & Puripunyavanich, M. (2025). Perceptions of extensive reading practitioners in four Asian countries. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 37*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10125/67479

Appendix A

The List of Higher Education Institutions Under Supervision of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation in Thailand

A. Autonomous Universities (27 universities, no.1–27)

No.	Name
1	Chulalongkorn University
2	Kasetsart University
3	Khon Kaen University
4	Chiang Mai University
5	Thaksin University
6	King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi
7	King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok
8	Suranaree University of Technology
9	Thammasat University
10	Burapha University
11	University of Phayao
12	Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University
13	Mahamakut Buddhist University
14	Mahidol University
15	Mae Fah Luang University
16	Walailak University
17	Srinakharinwirot University
18	Silpakorn University
19	Suan Dusit University
20	Prince of Songkla University
21	Princess Galyani Vadhana Institute of Music
22	King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang
23	Maejo University
24	Chitralada Technology Institute
25	Srisavarindhira Thai Red Cross Institute of Nursing
26	National Institute of Development Administration
27	Chulabhorn Royal Academy

B. Public Universities (10 universities, no.28–37)

No.	Name
28	Kalasin University
29	Nakhon Phanom University
30	Princess of Naradhiwas University
31	Naresuan University
32	Mahasarakham University
33	Ramkhamhaeng University
34	Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University
35	Ubon Ratchathani University
36	Pathumwan Institute of Technology
37	Institute of Community Colleges

C. Rajabhat Universities (38 universities, no.38–75)

No.	Name
38	Kanchanaburi Rajabhat University
39	Kamphaengphet Rajabhat University
40	Chandrakasem Rajabhat University
41	Chaiyaphum Rajabhat University
42	Chiang Rai Rajabhat University
43	ChiangMai Rajabhat University
44	Thepsatri Rajabhat University
45	Dhonburi Rajabhat University
46	Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University
47	Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University
48	Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University
49	Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University
50	Bansomdejchaopraya Rajabhat University
51	Buriram Rajabhat University
52	Phranakhon Rajabhat University
53	Phranakhon Si Ayutthaya Rajabhat University
54	Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University
55	Phetchaburi Rajabhat University
56	Phetchabun Rajabhat University
57	Phuket Rajabhat University
58	Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University
59	Yala Rajabhat University
60	Roi Et Rajabhat University
61	Rajabhat Rajanagarindra University
62	Rambhai Barni Rajabhat University
63	Lampang Rajabhat University
64	Loei Rajabhat University
65	Valaya Alongkorn Rajabhat University under the Royal Patronage
66	Sisaket Rajabhat University
67	Sakonnakhon Rajabhat University
68	Songkhla Rajabhat University
69	Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University
70	Suratthani Rajabhat University
71	Surindra Rajabhat University
72	Muban Chombueng Rajabhat University
73	Udon Thani Rajabhat University
74	Uttaradit Rajabhat University
75	Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University

D. Rajamangala Universities (nine universities, no.76–84)

No.	Name
76	Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep
77	Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan-ok
78	Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi
79	Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon
80	Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin

No.	Name
81	Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna
82	Rajamangala University of Technology Srivijaya
83	Rajamangala University of Technology Suvarnabhumi
84	Rajamangala University of Technology Isan

E. Private Universities (42 universities, no.85–126)

No.	Name
85	Bangkok University
86	Bangkokthonburi University
87	Bangkok Suvarnabhumi University
88	The Eastern University of Management and Technology
89	Krirk University
90	Kasem Bundit University
91	Christian University of Thailand
92	Chaopraya University
93	Chalermkarnchana University
94	Shinawatra University
95	Saint John's University
96	Tapee University
97	Mahanakorn University of Technology
98	Thonburi University
99	Dhurakij Punbit University
100	North Bangkok University
101	North-Chiang Mai University
102	Stamford International University
103	Asia-Pacific International University
104	Nation University
105	Pathumthani University
106	Payap University
107	Phitsanulok University
108	Fatoni University
109	The Far Eastern University
110	The University of Central Thailand
111	Northeastern University
112	Rangsit University
113	Rattana Bundit University
114	Ratchathani University
115	Rajapruk University
116	Vongchavalitkul University
117	Western University
118	Sripatum University
119	Siam University
120	University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce
121	Huachiew Chalermprakiet University
122	Hatyai University
123	Assumption University
124	Eastern Asia University
125	Southeast Asia University
126	Southeast Bangkok University

F. Private Institutes (11 institutes, no.127–137)

No.	Name
127	Kantana Institute
128	Panyapiwat Institute of Management
129	Learning Institute for Everyone
130	Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology
131	Mahachai Institute of Automotive Technology
132	Suvarnabhumi Institute of Technology
133	Institute of Entrepreneurial Science Ayothaya
134	Rajapark Institute
135	Vidyasirimedhi Institute of Science and Technology
136	Pacific Institute of Management Science
137	Arsom Silp Institute of the Arts

G. Colleges (17 colleges, 138–154)

No.	Name
138	Chiangrai College
139	Saint Louis College
140	Dusit Thani College
141	Thong Sook College
142	Phanomwan College of Technology
143	Southern College of Technology
144	Siam Technological College
145	Nakhonratchasima College
146	Raffles International College
147	St Teresa International University
148	College of Asian Scholars
149	Pitchayabundit College
150	International Buddhist College
151	Northern College
152	Santapol College
153	Saengtham College
154	Lampang Inter-Tech College

Remark: This list was updated on March 14, 2023.

Reference:

Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research, and Innovation. (2023). Higher education institutions under the supervision of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research, and Innovation in the first semester of the 2023 academic year. https://info. mhesi.go.th/stat_aca_uni.php?search_year=2565&download=7222&file_id=202301191105. xlsx.

Questionnaire on Teaching English Reading

Part 1: Participant's Profile (4 Qs) ข้อมูลผู้ร่วมวิจัย (4 คำถาม)

1. What is the category of your university? [Please check the category of your university/college in this file: https://bit.ly/3Otmclm. If you are a part-time teacher, please select the category for the university at which you teach the highest number of sections of foundation English courses for non-English majors.] มหาวิทยาลัยของท่านอยู่ในประเภทใด [กรุณาตรวจสอบประเภทมหาวิทยาลัย/วิทยาลัยของท่านได้ในไฟล์ https://bit.ly/3Otmclm หากท่านเป็นอาจารย์พิเศษ ให้เลือกสถานศึกษาที่ท่านมีจำนวนตอนเรียนที่สอนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานสำหรับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษมากที่สุด]

      a. Autonomous universities (no.1–27) มหาวิทยาลัยในกำกับของรัฐ (no.1–27)
      b. Public universities (no.28–37) มหาวิทยาลัยรัฐ (no.28–37)
      c. Rajabhat universities (no.38–75) มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏ (no.38–75)
      d. Rajamangala universities (no.76–84) มหาวิทยาลัยราชมงคล (no.76–84)
      e. Private universities (no.85–126) มหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน (no.85–126)
      f. Private institutes (no.127–137) สถาบันเอกชน (no.127–137)
      g. Colleges (no.138–154) วิทยาลัย (no.138–154)

2. Do you have a language teaching qualification (e.g., a degree in English language teaching, TESOL, applied linguistics or curriculum design) ท่านมีวุฒิด้านการสอน เช่น ปริญญาด้านการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ TESOL ภาษาศาสตร์ประยุกต์ หรือการออกแบบหลักสูตรหรือไม่

      a. Yes มี
      b. No, but I have attended workshop(s)/lecturer(s) on how to teach English reading. ไม่มีแต่เคยเข้ารับการอบรมและฟังบรรยายเกี่ยวกับการสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ
      c. No ไม่มี

3. How long have you been **teaching English**? ท่าน**สอนภาษาอังกฤษ**มาเป็นระยะเวลาเท่าไหร่

      a. 1–5 years ปี
      b. 6–10 years ปี
      c. 11–15 years ปี
      d. 16–20 years ปี
      e. More than 20 years ปี

4. How long have you been teaching **English reading**? ท่านสอน**การอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ**มาเป็นระยะเวลาเท่าไหร่

      a. 1–5 years ปี
      b. 6–10 years ปี
      c. 11–15 years ปี
      d. 16–20 years ปี
      e. More than 20 years ปี

Part 2: Teaching English Reading in Foundation Courses for Non-English Majors (14Qs) การสอนอ่านภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานสำหรับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษ (14 คำถาม)

Remark: The following items focus on your **current practice of teaching English reading** to non-English majors in a **foundation English course** which focuses on four skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

หมายเหตุ: คำถามในส่วนที่ 2 จะมุ่งเน้นด้านการสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของท่านในปัจจุบันที่สอนให้กับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานซึ่งเน้น 4 ทักษะ คือ การอ่าน การเขียน การฟัง และการพูด

1. Time proportion: 3Qs สัดส่วนเวลา: 3 คำถาม

*Remark: Questions 1.1 and 1.2 focus only on the actual teaching, not testing or classroom management such as calling roll or collecting assignments.

หมายเหตุ: คำถามข้อ 1.1 และ 1.2 มุ่งเน้นเฉพาะเวลาที่ใช้ในการสอน ไม่รวมถึงการทดสอบหรือการบริหารจัดการในชั้นเรียน เช่น การเช็คชื่อเข้าเรียนหรือการเก็บชิ้นงาน

1.1 How long is the class time for a foundation English course at your university? คาบเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานที่มหาวิทยาลัยของท่าน 1 คาบ มีจำนวนกี่นาที

      a. 50 minutes นาที
      b. 60 minutes นาที (1 hour ชั่วโมง)
      c. 70 minutes นาที
      d. 80 minutes นาที
      e. 90 minutes นาที (1.5 hours ชั่วโมง)
      f. 120 minutes นาที (2 hours ชั่วโมง)
      g. 150 minutes นาที (2.5 hours ชั่วโมง)
      h. 180 minutes นาที (3 hours ชั่วโมง)

1.2 How many classes of a foundation English course do the students take per week?

      a. 1 class คาบ
      b. 2 classes คาบ
      c. 3 classes คาบ
      d. 4 classes คาบ
      e. 5 classes คาบ

1.3 How many minutes do you spend on teaching the following components in class? Check the time length or not applicable box for each component. ท่านใช้เวลากี่นาทีในการสอนองค์ประกอบดังต่อไปนี้ในคาบเรียน 1 คาบ เลือกช่องเวลาหรือ "ไม่ได้สอน" ในแต่ละองค์ประกอบ

Component องค์ประกอบ	5–10 min นาที	11–20 min นาที	21–30 min นาที	31–40 min นาที	41–50 min นาที	51–60 min นาที	Not applicable ไม่ได้สอน
1. Reading การอ่าน							
2. Writing การเขียน							
3. Listening การฟัง							
4. Speaking การพูด							
5. Vocabulary คำศัพท์							
6. Language focus (grammar) ไวยากรณ์							
7. Pronunciation การออกเสียง							

2. Aims: 2Qs วัตถุประสงค์: 2 คำถาม

Extremely important (5), very important (4), important (3), not so important (2) not important (1)
สำคัญอย่างยิ่ง (5), สำคัญมาก (4), สำคัญ (3), ไม่ค่อยสำคัญ (2), ไม่สำคัญ (1)

2.1 My **main** aims of teaching reading are to_____. วัตถุประสงค์**หลัก**ในการสอนการอ่านของท่านคือ เพื่อ....	5	4	3	2	1
1. build students' reading skills พัฒนาทักษะการอ่านของผู้เรียน					
2. help students get a deep understanding of the text that they are reading for the class ช่วยผู้เรียนให้เข้าใจเนื้อหาของบทอ่านที่พวกเขากำลังอ่านในชั้นเรียนได้อย่างลึกซึ้ง					
3. build students' language knowledge such as vocabulary and grammar พัฒนาความรู้ทางภาษาของผู้เรียน เช่น คำศัพท์และไวยากรณ์					
4. build students' motivation for reading in English สร้างแรงจูงใจในการอ่านเป็นภาษาอังกฤษให้กับผู้เรียน					
5. use reading as a springboard for the development of other skills: speaking, listening, and writing มุ่งพัฒนาทักษะอื่น ๆ ได้แก่ การพูด การฟัง และการเขียน โดยผ่านการสอนการอ่าน					
6. encourage students to be able to seek knowledge by themselves ส่งเสริมให้ผู้เรียนสามารถแสวงหาความรู้ได้ด้วยตนเอง					
7. recommend reading strategies so that students can use them as tools for reading แนะนำกลวิธีการอ่านเพื่อให้ผู้เรียนสามารนำไปเป็นเครื่องมือในการอ่าน					
8. build students' English pronunciation ability through reading aloud พัฒนาความสามารถในการออกเสียงภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนผ่านการอ่านออกเสียง (reading aloud)					
9. improve students' translation skills (English to Thai and vice versa) พัฒนาทักษะการแปลของผู้เรียน (อังกฤษ-ไทย และไทย-อังกฤษ)					

2.2 If you have other aims besides the ones in the previous question, please state them. [Short answer—optional] หากท่านมีวัตถุประสงค์อื่น ๆ นอกเหนือจากในข้อ 2.1 กรุณาระบุ [คำตอบสั้น ๆ – ไม่บังคับ]

3. Priorities for teaching reading: 1Q ระดับความสำคัญในการสอนการอ่าน: 1 คำถาม

Extremely important (5), very important (4), important (3), not so important (2) not important (1)
สำคัญอย่างยิ่ง (5), สำคัญมาก (4), สำคัญ (3), ไม่ค่อยสำคัญ (2), ไม่สำคัญ (1)

3. Please rate your priorities for teaching reading to students in your **foundation course for non-English majors**. กรุณาระบุระดับความสำคัญในการสอนการอ่านให้กับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน	5	4	3	2	1
1. Building reading comprehension การพัฒนาความเข้าใจในการอ่าน					
2. Building fluency การพัฒนาความคล่องแคล่วในการอ่าน					
3. Building reading confidence การพัฒนาความมั่นใจในการอ่าน					
4. Building vocabulary (e.g., explicit teaching of vocabulary and vocabulary learning strategies) การพัฒนาคำศัพท์ (เช่น การสอนคำศัพท์และการสอนกลวิธีการเรียนรู้คำศัพท์อย่างชัดเจน [explicit teaching])					
5. Teaching grammar and sentence structure from the reading passages การสอนไวยากรณ์และโครงสร้างประโยคจากบทอ่าน					
6. Raising awareness of text and paragraph structure, cohesion, and coherence การสร้างความตระหนักรู้เกี่ยวกับโครงสร้างข้อความและย่อหน้า ความต่อเนื่องของเนื้อหาในแต่ละประโยค และความเชื่อมโยงของเนื้อหาในภาพรวม					
7. Taking students' interests into consideration when designing or selecting reading materials and activities การคำนึงถึงความสนใจของผู้เรียนเมื่อออกแบบหรือเลือกสื่อการอ่านและกิจกรรมการอ่าน					
8. Giving students choices in what they read การให้ผู้เรียนเลือกสิ่งที่พวกเขาอ่านด้วยตัวเอง					
9. Giving students opportunities to read a lot **in class** (e.g., assigning students to read other texts such as books, graded readers or articles) การเปิดโอกาสให้ผู้เรียนได้อ่านหนังสือเป็นจำนวนมาก**ในชั้นเรียน** (เช่น มอบหมายให้ผู้เรียนอ่านหนังสือ หนังสืออ่านนอกเวลา [graded reader] หรือบทความ)					
10. Giving students opportunities to read a lot **out of class** (e.g., assigning students to read other texts such as books, graded readers or articles) การเปิดโอกาสให้ผู้เรียนได้อ่านหนังสือเป็นจำนวนมาก**นอกชั้นเรียน** (เช่น มอบหมายให้ผู้เรียนอ่านหนังสือ หนังสืออ่านนอกเวลา [graded reader] หรือบทความ)					
11. Giving students opportunities to comment on what they have read in class การเปิดโอกาสให้ผู้เรียนได้แสดงความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับสิ่งที่อ่านในชั้นเรียน					
12. Ensuring that there are plenty of reading materials at various proficiency levels that the students can select from to read independently การจัดให้มีสื่อการอ่านจำนวนมากและมีระดับภาษาหลายระดับเพื่อให้ผู้เรียนได้เลือกอ่านได้อย่างอิสระ					
13. Teaching students reading strategies (e.g., making predictions, identifying main ideas, guessing the meaning of unknown words from context, and scanning and skimming) การสอนกลวิธีการอ่านให้กับผู้เรียน (เช่น การคาดเดา การระบุแนวความคิดหลัก การเดาความหมายของคำศัพท์ที่ไม่รู้จักจากบริบท การอ่านเร็ว ๆ แบบข้ามคำเพื่อจับใจความสำคัญ และการสแกนหาคำสำคัญเพื่อหาข้อมูลเฉพาะ)					

3. Please rate your priorities for teaching reading to students in your **foundation course for non-English majors**. กรุณาระบุระดับความสำคัญในการสอนการอ่านให้กับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน	5	4	3	2	1
14. Teaching the context behind the reading (e.g., by giving background information about the topic, the author, or relevant cultural information) การสอนบริบทของการอ่าน (เช่น การให้ข้อมูลพื้นฐานเกี่ยวกับหัวข้อ ผู้แต่ง หรือข้อมูลทางวัฒนธรรมที่เกี่ยวข้อง)					
15. Ensuring that students understand the purpose of their reading การตรวจสอบให้แน่ใจว่าผู้เรียนเข้าใจวัตถุประสงค์ของการอ่าน					
16. Activating students' prior knowledge to arouse their curiosity การกระตุ้นความสนใจและพื้นความรู้เกี่ยวกับสิ่งที่อ่านเพื่อให้ผู้เรียนทำความเข้าใจและเกิดความสนใจ					
17. Building students' critical thinking skills through analyzing author's viewpoint or purpose การพัฒนาทักษะการคิดอย่างมีวิจารณญาณให้กับผู้เรียนโดยการวิเคราะห์มุมมองผู้แต่งหรือวัตถุประสงค์					
18. Building students' critical thinking skills through identifying fact vs. opinion การสร้างทักษะการคิดอย่างมีวิจารณญาณให้กับผู้เรียนโดยการแยกแยะระหว่างข้อเท็จจริงและความคิดเห็น					
19. Preparing students for their midterm and final exams การเตรียมความพร้อมผู้เรียนสำหรับการสอบกลางภาคและปลายภาค					
20. Preparing students for standardized English tests (e.g., TOEFL, IELTS, or TOEIC) การเตรียมความพร้อมผู้เรียนสำหรับการสอบแบบทดสอบภาษาอังกฤษมาตรฐาน เช่น TOEFL, IELTS หรือ TOEIC					

4. Your practice of teaching reading: 6Qs การสอนการอ่านของท่าน: 6 คำถาม

Remark: This part looks at your in-class reading instruction which focuses on teaching students the language so they learn new vocabulary, grammar, phonology, reading skills and strategies through reading texts.

หมายเหตุ: คำถามในส่วนนี้เป็นคำถามเกี่ยวกับการสอนการอ่านในชั้นเรียนของท่านซึ่งเน้นการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อให้ผู้เรียนได้เรียนรู้คำศัพท์ ไวยากรณ์ ระบบเสียง ทักษะและกลวิธีการอ่านผ่านการอ่านบทอ่าน

4.1 What is the percentage of reading-lesson time dedicated to each stage of teaching a reading passage? ขอให้ท่านระบุอัตราร้อยละของการทำกิจกรรมต่อไปนี้ในเวลาที่ท่านสอนการอ่านในคาบเรียนภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน	76–100%	51–75%	26–50%	0–25%
a. Pre-reading activities (e.g., pre-teaching vocabulary, the context, and background; predicting the content; giving students a purpose to read) กิจกรรมก่อนการอ่าน (เช่น การสอนคำศัพท์ บริบท ความเป็นมาก่อนเริ่มทำการอ่าน การคาดเดาเนื้อหา การแนะนำข้อมูลเบื้องต้น การช่วยผู้เรียนกำหนดวัตถุประสงค์ในการอ่าน)				
b. While-reading activities (e.g., letting students guess unknown words from the context, identify the text type, and build comprehension) กิจกรรมขณะอ่าน (เช่น การให้ผู้เรียนเดาคำที่ไม่รู้จักจากบริบท ระบุประเภทบทอ่าน และสร้างความเข้าใจ [building comprehension])				
c. Post-reading activities (e.g., checking understanding; reviewing vocabulary) กิจกรรมหลังการอ่าน (เช่น การตรวจสอบความเข้าใจ การทบทวนคำศัพท์ เป็นต้น)				

4.2 What percentage of your reading lesson do you spend on the following components? ท่านใช้เวลาในการทำสิ่งต่อไปนี้เวลาที่ท่านสอนการอ่านเป็นอัตราร้อยละเท่าไหร่	76–100%	51–75%	26–50%	0–25%
a1 Reading aloud การให้ผู้เรียนได้อ่านออกเสียงในชั้นเรียน				
a2 Reading silently การให้ผู้เรียนได้อ่านในใจในชั้นเรียน				
5. Pre-, while-, post-reading activities that support the reading การทำกิจกรรมก่อน ขณะ และหลังการอ่าน				

Regularly (3), sometimes (2), almost never (1)
อย่างสม่ำเสมอ (3), เป็นบางครั้ง (2), แทบจะไม่เคย (1)

4.3 When teaching reading in class, I _____. เมื่อสอนการอ่านในชั้นเรียน ข้าพเจ้า...	3	2	1
1. read the text aloud for my students อ่านออกเสียงให้ผู้เรียนฟัง			
2. translate the text into Thai for my students แปลบทอ่านเป็นภาษาไทยให้กับผู้เรียน			
3. provide a summary of the text to my students ให้บทสรุป (summary) ของบทอ่านกับผู้เรียน			
4. ask the students to read the text aloud to the class ให้ผู้เรียนอ่านออกเสียงให้ทั้งชั้นเรียนฟัง			
5. let the students read the text silently themselves ให้ผู้เรียนอ่านบทอ่านด้วยตนเองในใจ			
6. teach the students to summarize main points of the reading passages สอนผู้เรียนสรุปใจความสำคัญจากสิ่งที่อ่าน			
7. have the students discuss the reading passages ให้ผู้เรียนอภิปรายเกี่ยวกับสิ่งที่อ่าน			
8. ask the students to share their opinions about the reading passages ให้ผู้เรียนได้แสดงความคิดเห็นในสิ่งที่อ่าน			
9. assign the students to read 1–2 reading passages in the textbook in each class มอบหมายให้ผู้เรียนอ่านบทอ่าน 1–2 บทอ่านในหนังสือเรียนในแต่ละคาบเรียน			
4.4 What reading materials do you use when teaching reading in the foundation English course(s)? ท่านใช้สื่อการอ่านอะไรบ้างในการสอนการอ่านในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน	3	2	1
1. a commercial 4-skill course book by publishers such as Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson, etc. หนังสือเรียน 4 ทักษะที่พิมพ์โดยสำนักพิมพ์ เช่น Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson เป็นต้น			
2. a course book designed to teach reading by publishers such as Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson, etc. หนังสือเรียนที่ถูกออกแบบมาเพื่อสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษที่พิมพ์โดยสำนักพิมพ์ เช่น Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson เป็นต้น			
3. an in-house course book developed by the lecturer(s) at my university หนังสือเรียนที่เขียนโดยคณาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยของข้าพเจ้า			
4. supplementary materials created by the lecturer(s) at my university เอกสารเสริม (supplementary materials) ที่สร้างขึ้นโดยคณาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยของข้าพเจ้า			
5. my own materials (e.g., worksheets) สื่อการอ่านที่ข้าพเจ้าเขียนขึ้นเอง เช่น ใบงาน			
6. reading passages from test preparation materials (e.g., TOEFL IELTS or TOEIC or previous tests) บทอ่านจากสื่อสำหรับการเตรียมสอบ เช่น หนังสือเตรียมสอบ TOEFL IELTS หรือ TOEIC หรือข้อสอบเก่า			
7. academic books or articles หนังสือหรือบทความวิชาการ			
8. magazines, newspapers, online articles, etc. นิตยสาร หนังสือพิมพ์ บทความขนาดสั้นและยาวจากอินเทอร์เน็ต			
9. comics or manga หนังสือการ์ตูน			

4.4 What reading materials do you use when teaching reading in the foundation English course(s)? ท่านใช้สื่อการอ่านอะไรบ้างใน**การสอนการอ่านในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน**	3	2	1
10. an online reading program (e.g., Xreading, Raz-kids.com, Scholastic Kids press, er-central) โปรแกรมการอ่านออนไลน์ เช่น Xreading.com, Raz-kids.com, er-central.com			
11. graded readers หนังสืออ่านนอกเวลา (graded readers)			
12. story books หนังสือนิทาน			

Extremely important (5), very important (4), important (3), not so important (2) not important (1)
สำคัญอย่างยิ่ง (5), สำคัญมาก (4), สำคัญ (3), ไม่ค่อยสำคัญ (2), ไม่สำคัญ (1)

4.5 When choosing reading materials to use in my foundation English courses, I tend to choose materials that _____. เวลาเลือกสื่อการอ่านที่ใช้ในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน ข้าพเจ้ามักจะเลือกสื่อการอ่านที่...	5	4	3	2	1
1. cover content I think my students need to know about ครอบคลุมเนื้อหาที่ข้าพเจ้าคิดว่าผู้เรียนต้องรู้					
2. the students are interested in (even if I'm not) ผู้เรียนสนใจ (แม้ว่าข้าพเจ้าอาจไม่สนใจก็ตาม)					
3. will motivate students จะสร้างแรงจูงใจให้กับผู้เรียน					
4. build on the topics in the course book ต่อยอดหัวข้อในหนังสือเรียน					
5. make the course more interesting for students ทำให้วิชามีความน่าสนใจมากขึ้นสำหรับผู้เรียน					
6. make the course more relevant for students ทำให้วิชามีความเกี่ยวข้องกับผู้เรียนมากขึ้น					

4.6 Identify the biggest challenge that you often face when teaching English reading in foundation course(s) to non-English major students? Please explain. [Short answer] ระบุความท้าทายที่ใหญ่ที่สุดที่ท่านมักจะประสบตอนสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษในรายวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานสำหรับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษ 1 ข้อ พร้อมคำอธิบาย [คำตอบสั้น ๆ]

5. Future training: 1Q Identify one training topic related to teaching English reading that you would like to learn about the most. [Short answer] **การฝึกอบรมในอนาคต:** 1 คำถาม โปรดระบุหัวข้ออบรมเกี่ยวกับการสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษที่ท่านอยากเรียนรู้มากที่สุด 1 หัวข้อ

6. Implementation of extensive reading: 1Q **การนำการอ่านอย่างกว้างขวางไปใช้:** 1 คำถาม

Remark: Extensive reading (ER) refers to any in-class and out-of-class reading practice that gets students to read extensively. When doing ER, students read a lot of materials (usually longer texts) that match their proficiency levels and interests in order for them to learn new information and/or to enjoy the texts, build reading fluency and comprehension skills. Also, they would read the same way they read in their first language which is without using a dictionary.

หมายเหตุ: การอ่านอย่างกว้างขวาง (ER) หมายถึงการฝึกการอ่านทั้งในชั้นเรียนและนอกชั้นเรียนที่ให้ผู้เรียนอ่านเป็นจำนวนมาก เวลาทำการอ่านอย่างกว้างขวาง ผู้เรียนจะอ่านสื่อการอ่านเป็นจำนวนมาก (โดยปกติจะอ่านบทอ่านที่ยาว) ที่ตรงกับระดับความสามารถทางภาษาและความสนใจของผู้เรียน เพื่อให้ผู้เรียนได้เรียนรู้ข้อมูลใหม่ ๆ และ/หรือเพลิดเพลินไปกับการอ่าน สร้างความลื่นไหลในการอ่านและทักษะความเข้าใจ (comprehension skills) เวลาที่ทำการอ่านอย่างกว้างขวาง ผู้เรียนจะอ่านแบบเดียวกันกับที่อ่านหนังสือในภาษาแรกของตน ซึ่งเป็นการอ่านแบบไม่จำเป็นต้องใช้พจนานุกรม

Do you integrate extensive reading into teaching reading in your foundation English course(s)?
ท่านนำการอ่านอย่างกว้างขวางไปใช้ในการสอนการอ่านในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐานหรือไม่

   a. Yes > Go to Part 3A ใช้ > ตอบคำถามใน Part 3A
   b. No > Skip Part 3A and go to Part 3B ไม่ใช้ > ตอบคำถามใน Part 3B

Part 3B: Not Implementing Extensive Reading 1Q ไม่ใช้ ER 1 คำถาม

1. What are the main reasons for not doing ER when teaching the foundation English courses?
(Check all that apply.) อะไรคือเหตุผลหลัก ๆ ที่ทำให้ท่านไม่ใช้การอ่านอย่างกว้างขวาง (ER) เวลาสอนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ
พื้นฐาน (เลือกทุกข้อที่เกี่ยวข้อง)

☐ I don't know what ER is. ข้าพเจ้าไม่รู้ว่า ER คืออะไร
☐ I don't know how to do ER in my class. ข้าพเจ้าไม่รู้ว่าจะทำ ER อย่างไรในชั้นเรียนของข้าพเจ้า
☐ I don't know how to assess ER. ข้าพเจ้าไม่รู้ว่าจะประเมิน ER อย่างไร
☐ I don't have time. ข้าพเจ้าไม่มีเวลา
☐ I don't have relevant reading materials. ข้าพเจ้าไม่มีสื่อการอ่านที่เกี่ยวข้องสำหรับการทำ ER
☐ I don't have funding. ข้าพเจ้าไม่มีเงินทุนสนับสนุน
☐ I don't have motivation. ข้าพเจ้าไม่มีแรงจูงใจ
☐ I don't have support from university leaders. ข้าพเจ้าไม่ได้รับการสนับสนุนจากผู้บริหาร
☐ I don't have support from my colleagues who teach the same course(s). ข้าพเจ้าไม่ได้รับการ
สนับสนุนจากเพื่อนอาจารย์ที่สอนวิชาเดียวกัน
☐ I don't think my students would like to do ER. ข้าพเจ้าไม่คิดว่าผู้เรียนจะอยากทำ ER
☐ I don't think doing ER is useful. ข้าพเจ้าไม่คิดว่าการทำ ER มีประโยชน์
☐ Other อื่น ๆ

> Go to Exit A > ไปทางออก A

Exit A
Thank you for completing the survey.

Please pass on this survey to other Thai university lecturers who teach foundation English
courses to non-English major students: https://bit.ly/3HNDWUz.

ข้อความสำหรับทางออก A
ขอขอบคุณที่ช่วยตอบแบบสอบถามนะคะ

ผู้วิจัยใคร่ขอความอนุเคราะห์จากท่านในการช่วยส่งต่อแบบสอบถามนี้ให้กับอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยท่านอื่นที่สอนวิชาภาษา
อังกฤษพื้นฐานให้กับผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษ https://bit.ly/3HNDWUz ขอบคุณค่ะ

Interview Questions

This study employed the interview questions in Part 1 which asked the participants about their practices in teaching English reading in the foundation class(es) for non-English majors.

Part 1: Teaching English Reading

1. What do you usually emphasize when teaching English reading in your class? ท่านมักจะเน้น สอนอะไรเวลาสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษในชั้นเรียนของท่าน

2. What do you think about your approach to teaching reading? Please explain. (E.g., What is going well in your class when teaching reading? Or is there anything you'd like to change?) ท่านคิดว่าแนวทางการสอนการอ่านของท่านในปัจจุบันมีประสิทธิผลมากน้อยเพียงใด โปรดอธิบาย (เช่น อะไรที่ท่านรู้สึก ว่าทำได้ดี หรือมีอะไรที่ท่านอยากปรับเปลี่ยนหรือไม่)

3. What is the biggest challenge that you often face when teaching reading in foundation English courses? Please explain. อะไรคือความท้าทายที่ใหญ่ที่สุดที่ท่านประสบเวลาสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ ในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน

4. What do you perceive as the greatest challenge for your non-English major students when studying reading in foundation English courses? อะไรที่ท่านมองว่าเป็นความท้าทายที่ใหญ่ที่สุดสำหรับ ผู้เรียนที่ไม่ใช่เอกภาษาอังกฤษเวลาเรียนการอ่านเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษพื้นฐาน

5. What would you like to improve on regarding teaching English reading? ท่านต้องการพัฒนาอะไร เกี่ยวกับการสอนการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ