Strategies Used in EFL Reading Comprehension: The Case Study of Seven Chinese High School Students

Bo Wang

Ph. D., Department of English and Applied Linguistics

De La Salle University, the Philippines

E-mail: wang@dlsu.edu.ph

Xuejiao Leng (Corresponding Author)

MA, Program of Education in Graduate School

University of Perpetual Help, the Philippines

E-mail: wenxin82688@gmail.com

Abstract

Reading skill plays an important role in the English education in China especially when English reading is tested on an exam paper. Using a delayed retrospective questionnaire, this paper aims at eliciting EFL reading strategies from seven Chinese high school students. The results show that most of the students are able to adopt cognitive strategies, in their reading progress, such as memorizing, using background knowledge, underlining the key information, and finding clues from the context. However, low-proficiency students tend to use fewer strategies than high-proficiency students due to either limited English competence or a lack of self-confidence. In addition, all of them also adopt testing strategies such as skimming and scanning, but very few have an awareness of meta-cognitive strategy that refers to self-reflection on effective EFL learning method. Pedagogical implications are discussed, and possible suggestions are proposed for this EFL community.

Keywords: EFL reading, reading strategy, high school education

1. Introduction

High schools in China refer to a special community where students are educated to get a

score as high as possible in the College Entrance Examination. Thus, those EFL learners tend to acquire English in a particular way that discriminates themselves from learners in other contexts, although they might share the common goal to improve English proficiency. Improving English proficiency among Chinese high school students is highly exam-oriented, while in other contexts, learners may focus on communicative competence. On the basis of this reality, those high school students employ distinct strategies in their reading comprehension practice in order to gain higher scores. Hence, it's very important to investigate the relation between their processing and their results (Alderson & Bachman, 2000) in reading comprehension activities.

However, reading strategy is not the only factor during reading processing that determines the reading result. Another important factor is English proficiency. No matter how hard an elementary school student tries, he or she can never succeed in reading an English text of the College Entrance Examination, so there is no doubt that the result is, to a large extent, influenced by language proficiency. In the prerequisite of similar proficiency, students may exhibit different abilities to solve problems in reading comprehension due to the various strategies they employ. Strategies are the techniques they might exploit in order to finish a task. They do contribute to the final results of students' reading comprehension. By adopting the qualitative approach of delayed retrospection, the present study will look into strategies used by Chinese high school students in their reading practice.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Reading Comprehension

Two concepts are distinguished in reading comprehension: process and result (or product). It is claimed that reading process is not static but dynamic (Alderson & Bachman, 2000). This distinction illuminates two separate components of reading comprehension, enabling the following studies on reading to be designed in terms of the two separate concepts.

For reading process, many researchers argue that reading can be realized in terms of bottom up mode, top down mode, and interactive mode (Brown, 2001; McCormick, 1988). Bottom-up is assumed to be a passive process with which readers tend to comprehend a text at linguistic level. Top-down is considered to be active, with which readers are able to bring their previous knowledge to understanding a current text. Researchers believe that both of the modes are necessary for a reader, so a combination of them, namely interactive reading, is a good choice for readers. Furthermore, researchers (e.g., Yukie, 2013) believe that multiple levels of reading process also exist: surface code (linguistic structure of the text), propositional text base (meaning of the text), and situation model (events occur or ideas described in the text).

For reading result, there are a number of testing methods, such as cloze, multiple-choice questions, summary, recall, and so on. However, those methods are often criticized. The multiple-choice question, for instance, was argued to make the readers focus only on the microlinguistic level, ignoring the true idea that the author originally intended to explicate (Urquhart & Weir, 1998). From another perspective, the multiple-choice also tends to distract

readers from understanding the text in the correct way. Another possible consequence is that the readers may guess to obtain a correct answer, so unreliable data might be generated (Bernhardt, 1991).

Other studies on reading comprehension may investigate it from other specific perspectives. Nilgun and Buket (2009) conducted a study aiming at clarifying the relationships between reading comprehension and cognitive awareness skills, and the results reveal a positive and meaningful correlation between meta-cognition inventory awareness, cognitive methods sub-dimensions, and reading comprehension. Ma and Lin (2015) investigate the relative and overall contribution of four sub-components of lexical knowledge to reading comprehension: vocabulary size, word association knowledge, collocation knowledge, and morphological knowledge, and they find that the four lexical sub-components contribute significantly to reading comprehension performance after other two variables, motivation and self-efficacy, are controlled.

In the present study, Chinese high school students' reading process is investigated in the form of a questionnaire and stimulated retrospection, and their task is a passage with multiple-choice questions. The reason why multiple-choice questions are still used though there are many criticisms is that reading comprehension is assessed in the form of multiple-choice questions in College Entrance Examination in China context, and the teaching goal of English reading in high schools is to promote students' ability to choose correct answers to those multiple-choice questions. It will be discussed in the following part that how this multiple choice question oriented reading is conducted and how this ability helps improve students' overall English proficiency.

2.2 EFL Reading Strategy

First of all, it should be clearly distinguished between the concept of reading skill and reading strategy. Those are two confusing terms frequently mixed up, so teachers and students tend to conceptualize the two terms as the same. As a matter of fact, reading skills are applied automatically while reading strategies are employed intentionally and effortfully (Afflerbach et al., 2008). Based on this benchmark, readers' behavior such as translation can be considered as both skill and strategy because when readers apply translation technique automatically and unconsciously, it is attributed to their skills while when readers use this method intentionally and pay an effort to some degree, it should be a strategy. Reading strategies have also been further categorized by researchers.

A number of reading strategies such as translation, inferring, monitoring, and planning can be identified, which are assumed the techniques or abilities that facilitate students in reading comprehension (Oxford & Crookall, 1989). It is commonly acknowledged that those techniques can be divided into cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy, compensation strategy, and testing strategy. According to Chamot and Kupper (1989), cognitive strategies, including using prior knowledge, identifying the structure, self-questioning, summarizing, taking notes, translating, inferring, and so on, are the approaches that readers apply to understand the task materials, whereas metacognitive strategies, involving thinking about learning process, planning for learning, monitoring learning tasks, evaluating learning results,

are actually learning strategies and have a great influence on readers' achievement. It is also suggested to use compensation strategies to facilitate comprehension, such as linguistic clues, including guessing words according to affixes, syntactic clues and semantic clues, and contextual clues, i.e., using the structure of passage (Oxford, 1990). Testing strategies are the right techniques suitable for exam takers with a very clear purpose, which would improve reading efficiency and testing results significantly. Actually, testing strategies may overlap with any of the previous three strategies. Shang (2010) investigates Taiwan EFL learners' application of cognitive, metacognitive, and compensation strategies, and the results show that metacognitive strategy is the most frequently used, followed by compensation strategy and then cognitive strategy. What's more, it is found a positive relationship between using reading strategy, which, however, is unrelated to reading achievement, and their perceptions of self-efficacy. Block (1992) investigates skilled and less skilled EFL readers in terms of comprehension-monitoring process. He finds that skilled readers use more background knowledge while less skilled readers pay most of their effort to lexical problems.

Researchers also focus on specific reading strategies and attempt to verify the positive influence of the particular strategy on reading comprehension. For instance, Nasri and Biria (2017) conducted a study looking into the effect of integrating two strategies, multiple and focused strategies, on improving reading comprehension and lexical development, and the results reveal that readers significantly benefit from multiple strategies but not from focused strategy. In addition, this study also asserts that the integration of the two strategies does improve reading comprehension and lexical development. Sun (2001) examines the influence of input modification on EFL reading comprehension of Koran high school students in terms of simplification and elaboration. The result shows that elaboration is more effective or at least equally effective comparing to simplification in reading comprehension. Instructing by elaborate input would promote students' reading ability with unmodified materials. Such specific strategy investigation provides a special angle that possibly generates fruitful academic attainments.

As for the interaction between L1 and L2, the linguistic threshold hypothesis is proposed, which states that "Good first-language readers will read well in the foreign language once they have passed a threshold of foreign language ability" (Alderson, 1984, p.4). More effective L1 readers may excel less effective readers in terms of eye movement and strategic techniques. From another perspective, researchers are also interested in the effect of teaching reading strategies to students. Salataci and Akyel (2002) examine the effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading with Turkish EFL students as their participants, and their results confirm the effective influence of reading strategy instruction on both L1 and L2 reading strategies and reading comprehension in L2. Song (1998) examines the effects of reading strategy training on Korean undergraduate students, finding that the students' EFL reading is enhanced by strategy training, and the degree of effectiveness varies between students with different language proficiency. It can be learned from this research that when employing the same strategy, students in different language levels tend to end up with different results.

In drilling the Chinese high school students' ability to solve problems of English reading

comprehension in the context of the College Entrance Examination, this study investigates the reading strategies of two groups of students: one with relatively high English proficiency and the other with relatively low English proficiency. Then it discusses the question on how students of the two groups can improve their English reading efficacy.

Based on the previous literature and the context of the current study, two research questions are proposed:

1). What are the strategies that Chinese high school students with relatively high/ low English proficiency usually use in reading for answering multiple-choice questions?

2). How can Chinese high school students of low English proficiency improve their reading comprehension ability?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

Eight students in Grade 12 from a high quality senior high school in Dezhou City, China are selected as the participants and the consent forms were obtained before the study being conducted. However, one of them was excluded because of the failure to submit his questionnaire. They are divided into two groups on the basis of their English proficiency which is measured by their previous final term examination. The demography is presented in Table 1. The names used in this study are all pseudonyms.

Table 1. Demography of the Participants

Name	Gender	Age	Proficiency
1. Deng	Male	17	low
2. Chen	Female	17	high
3. Lee	Female	17	high
4. Hu	Female	18	high
5. Ping	Female	18	low
6. Lin	Male	17	low
7. Ji	Female	18	high

3.2 Instruments

Reading text. One passage with 4 multiple choice questions from the reading section of

College Entrance Examination, 2020 is employed as the reading stimulus, and the participants are required to finish all the multiple choice questions within ten minutes, which is the average time a student usually spends in reading a passage of 400 words in an English examination.

Questionnaire. A set of 3-option-questions (always, sometimes, never), which are modified from the questionnaire employed by Tsai (2010), are input into a software named Wenjuanxing (Questionnaire Star), and a link is created and sent to the participants via Wechat. There are 20 questions in total and the 20th question is an open question aiming to draw additional possible strategies from the participants. In addition, age and gender are also included in the questionnaire to collect their demographic information. In order for the participants to understand the questions accurately, all the questions are translated into Chinese, and the open question is answered in Chinese.

Interview. Based on the answers that the participants have provided, some questions are asked to each student via Wei-chat. The author sent audio messages to the participants who answered the questions with audio messages as well. This is an entire online interaction between the researcher and participants.

3.3 Data Collecting Procedure

This study adopts a qualitative approach using retrospective questionnaire which attempts to elicit the participants' internal processing of the provided reading exercise. First, a reading exercise with 4 multiple choice questions from the reading section of the College Entrance Examination, 2020 is distributed to the participants through Wechat app and their answers to the four questions are collected after ten minutes. Then, a questionnaire (see Appendix A) is distributed to the participants through Wechat as well, and they are required to fill in their answers on their phones and submit them as soon as they finish the questionnaire.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire are analyzed through a qualitative approach. In an attempt to answer the first research question, reading strategies from the questionnaire are induced in terms of two themes: strategies that are common between high and low-proficiency students, and strategies that distinguish high-proficiency students from low-proficiency students. The data from the open question are analyzed using discourse analysis to elicit more ideas on reading strategies, and at the same time, to find out why the low English proficiency students are not able to do so well in reading comprehension. Finally, the implications of teaching reading are also discussed.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Common Strategies

Table 2. Questions with answers in a common feature

No.	Questions (When reading)	Common Features
3	Are you able to memorize the content you have read?	No "never"
5	Will you try to understand the article with the help of your background knowledge?	No "never"
9	Will you mark the key points to facilitate your understanding?	No "never"
11	Will you count all the key points in the passage?	No "always"
15	Will you find out clues from the passage when you can't understand?	No "never"

Out of the 20 three-option-questions in the questionnaire, five questions turned out to have one option that no participants chose, which shows the universal feature among the participants both in high and low proficiency. In question 3: when reading, are you able to memorize the content you have read? None of the participants choose the answer "never", indicating that all of them can manage to keep some information in mind regardless of the amount. To succeed in making the right decision on the answers to the questions after reading, students must make a link between the questions and the information from the passage. In this process, they keep questions or information from the passage in mind, and try to find out the connections between the two. In question 5: when reading, will you try to understand the article with the help of your background knowledge? None of them choose the answer "never", which means all of them to some extent do not isolate the passage from their existing knowledge in their mind, which may affect their understanding positively in most cases while in a few other cases, it might have a negative effect on the comprehension because background knowledge may also mislead. In question 9: when reading, will you mark the key points to facilitate your understanding? None of them choose the answer "never", and to make it more specific, 5 participants choose "always" and only two of them choose "sometimes", meaning that marking during reading is a common strategy for all of the students. In question 11: when reading, will you count all the key points in the passage? None of the participants chose the answer "always", indicating that the purpose of their reading activity was not to obtain the complete information but to pick out useful information related to the multiple-choice questions. If the key points of the passage have nothing to do with the

questions, they tend to be ignored. In question 15: will you find out clues from the passage when you can't understand? None of the participants chose "never", indicating that when intra-sentence does not work for comprehension, they all tend to adjust their method and try to make it with an inter-sentence strategy. Judging from the five questions above, all students use cognitive strategies for facilitating their reading comprehension which are always question-oriented due to the particular purpose of the reading activity in their context.

4.2 Strategies Distinguishing High and Low English Proficiency Students

Table 3. Questions with answers distinguishing between high and low proficiency

No.	Questions (When reading)	High Proficiency	Low Proficiency
1	Will you link the information in the current paragraph to that in the last?	3 "always" 1 "sometimes"	2 "sometimes" 1 "never"
2	Will you guess what information is going to emerge in the following parts of the passage?	3 "always" 1 "never"	2 "sometimes" 1 "never"
17	Will you use grammar to analyze the difficult sentences?	3 "always" 1 "sometimes"	3 "never"
18	Will you translate the difficult part into Chinese?	1 "always" 3 "sometimes"	1 "sometimes" 2 "never"

Due to the different levels of English proficiency and degree of confidence, students may adopt different strategies in their reading. In question 1: when reading, will you link the information in the current paragraph to that in the last? Two participants of low proficiency choose "sometimes" and one chooses "never". In contrast, three of the high-proficiency participants choose "always" and one chooses "sometimes". In question 2: when reading, will you guess what information is going to emerge in the following parts of the passage? Again, two participants of low proficiency choose "sometimes" and one chooses "never". In contrast, three of the high-proficiency participants choose "always" and one chooses "never". The distinction in those two questions manifests that students of low proficiency lack the ability to understand with the help of context, while students of high proficiency are usually capable of making use of the context to help them understand the target information. One possible reason can be low proficiency students' focus on detailed information or one particular sentence. Since they spend most of their efforts trying to understand the individual sentences,

fewer chances are provided for them to oversee the passage or make connections between sentences or paragraphs. On the contrary, high-proficiency students tend to have more chances to link information between sentences and paragraphs. In question 17: will you use grammar to analyze the difficult sentences? All the participants of low proficiency choose "never", while for the high-proficiency participants, three choose "always" and one chooses "sometimes", indicating that the ability of grammar application can be the key variable to predict whether the student is in high English level or not. In question 18: Will you translate the difficult part into Chinese? Two of the low proficiency participants choose "never" and one choose "sometimes". In contrast, three of the high proficiency participants choose "sometimes" and one choose "always". This result shows the same implication as in question 17 that low-proficiency students are less capable of analyzing complex sentences, and they are more likely to fail to understand them.

4.3 Individual cases

There are cases that choose many special answers, making them distinctive from others. Ping is one of the low proficiency participants who gives the answers telling herself apart from other low proficiency students. Then the author asked her some questions based on the answers she had provided in the questionnaire.

A=author P=participant

1) A: In Question 13, you choose you never make a quick survey before you read the passage. Could you explain why you never make a quick survey?

2) P: Because the vocabulary is not enough to understand the meaning, I am unable to extract information in a quick browse.

3) A: What are your general steps in reading a passage?

4) P: Read the tile first, then read through the passage, marking the details and key points, and looking for answers in the original text.

5) A: If there is no title, will you make a quick survey of the whole passage to get the topic?

6) P: I don't think I can.

This interview through Wei-chat finds the essential reason why this participant always shows a difference from others. In Utterance 2 and 4, the ungrammaticality proves her weakness in English linguistic competence, and her low proficiency has definitely ruined her confidence in learning English and also in taking English exams, which can be manifested in Utterance 6. She is in such a lack of confidence that even making a quick survey is considered a strategy that requires more vocabulary and higher proficiency than that she already had. In Question 14, she chooses the answer making herself unique again among the participants: she never guesses the meaning of new words or the meaning of the sentences that are incomprehensible for her. In her case, the important strategy is not on how to improve her ability in reading comprehension, but how to adjust herself in terms of psychology and how to build confidence in learning English.

Chen is one of the high-proficiency participants who also chooses some answers that make herself different from all others. In Question 6: will you identify the structure of the passage, she is the only one who chooses "always". Why, in terms of structure identification, is she so unique? The reason may reside in the following conversation which is originally in a mixture of English and Chinese, and then it is transcribed in pure English.

A=author P=Participant

1) A: What do you think is the function of finding out the structure of the

passage?

2) P: To understand the article.

3) A: What do you usually do to find out the structure?

4) P: To draw a mind map in my brain. After reading the article, I usually can

find out the structure simply.

5) A: It's very intelligent of you to draw a mind map. Could you explain what a

mind map is and how you draw it in your brain?

6) P: ? Just read it.

7) A: Let's switch to Chinese to make it clear. Do you draw a mind map in your

brain to connect the pieces of information? Do you use this strategy in reading every passage?

8) P: Yes. Usually I have the structure in my mind as soon as finishing reading.

I will think about what it is trying to say in a particular paragraph when reading it, and what is the relationship between this paragraph and the previous one. Then I will read the questions before starting to read the passage, roughly learn what answers need to be searched from the passage, and underline some key information.

9) A: This is a really good method. Did your English teacher teach you this?

10) P: This is a habit developed by myself, and it seems that our English teacher

has also mentioned about it.

11) A: Great!

12) P: However, I am used to doing this no matter in reading English or

Chinese articles. Otherwise, I am likely to be confused after finishing reading. Some argumentative passages can make me annoyed and perturbed if I do not use this method.

This conversation explicates why Chen is the only one who chooses to "always" identify the structure of the passage. In Utterance 2, 4, and 6, it can be noticed that she speaks English with no grammatical mistake. However, compared to her utterances in Utterance 8, 10, and

12, she seems to be more talkative in her mother language because more words and more ideas are elicited from her mind. This phenomenon is generally caused by the learner's limited vocabulary rather than grammar knowledge. When switching to her mother language, her rich vocabulary base drives her to deliver more information. From Utterance 8, 10, and 12, it can be found that she is eager to express her experience of drawing a mind map and show her pride in developing this skill by herself. Drawing a mind map has become a habit, so it can not only be considered as a strategy she uses in reading comprehension, but also a kind of skill that she has mastered in her daily reading practice. In addition, Chen adopts this method in reading Chinese articles as well, indicating that drawing a mind map in one's brain can be a universal strategy that fits into all languages regardless of L1, L2, or L3. Chen is an excellent English learner who has a good awareness of meta-cognitive strategy, meaning she always thinks about how to learn in order to direct her learning behavior.

Another participant, Hu, presents a fresh strategy from another perspective which might be attributed to testing strategy. The following is her answer from the open question in the questionnaire. It is initially written in Chinese and is translated by the author.

1. Extensive reading: first make a browse of the questions to learn the topic of the passage.

2. The answers in the passage usually emerge in the same order as the questions, i.e. the answer to the first question appears first. After finding the answer to the first question, go and read the second question, then repeat the same procedure as in the first question.

This is a typical testing strategy that is applicable to multiple choice questions, whose aim is to not only find the answers to multiple choice questions, but also guarantee to find them efficiently and correctly. This is also a typical strategy that suits English passage very well because of its rhetorical characteristics: clear structure and linear arrangement of its contents. However, since this strategy is question-oriented, it is not so practical when the questions are few while the passage is long. Therefore, the author would like to learn about this participant's response to this issue, and the following conversation occurs in the interview.

A=author P=Participant

1) A: I like your strategy very much that you answer the questions one by one

while going through the passage. It suits our reading comprehension exercise very well. But how will you respond to passages that are long but with very few questions.

2) P: Yes teacher. This method is not so efficient for a long passage with few

questions. In this case, I will first read the title and the questions to learn the main topic. Mark the key words in the question, and then I will read the first paragraph, the last paragraph, and the first sentence of each paragraph very quickly. Finally, based on the information and key words I have learned, I will find the answers to the questions.

3) A: Another question is if there are no questions after the passage, and the passage is very long. What strategies do you have to make your reading fast?

4) P: I have no idea about how to make my reading fast if I need to read every

sentence of the passage. If I want to read fast, I think I should be more familiar with the words, the grammar, and the habits of English usage.

Judging from Utterance 2, Hu is very skillful in finding efficient reading strategies in order to solve problems. She can capture the features of English paragraphs intelligently and finish the reading comprehension efficiently. However, when being asked about possible methods in speeding up reading pure passage, she says she has no idea in Utterance 4, and she ascribes the reason to her limited knowledge of the language including vocabulary, grammar, and native phrasal expressions. In fact, all the participants tend not to have any idea about strategies for reading passages fast.

To pursue a faster speed of reading in this perspective, eye movement skill can be a good solution which is not an innate ability but can be trained. This skill has been investigated by many linguistic researchers by looking into topics such as vocabulary learning, L2 acquisition, and especially it fits reading comprehension very well in terms of promoting reading efficiency. (e.g. Kathy & Ana, 2016; Maribel, 2019).

5. Conclusion

This case study presents the particular strategies that Chinese high school students may use in their exam-oriented reading comprehension practice. The results show that most of the students are able to adopt cognitive strategy in their reading progress, such as memorizing, using background knowledge, underlining the key information, and finding clues from the context. However, low-proficiency students tend to use less strategies than high-proficiency students due to either limited English competence or the lack of self-confidence. They also adopt testing strategies for reading comprehension such as skimming and scanning that aim at finding correct answers only. For example, all of the participants tend not to figure out all the key points the passage delivers because not all contents in the passage are involved in the multiple choice questions. On the contrary, detailed secondary information might be tested by the multiple choice questions rather than key points. Finally, very few students have the awareness of meta-cognitive strategy. For instance, judging from the answers to the open question, all the participants have a unique order strategy in doing reading comprehension exercises - reading questions before reading the passage. Almost none of them reflect on the learning method in order to make further progress except Chen, who manages to weigh the beneficial consequences of whether to use mind map strategy, either in L1 or L2 reading.

It's not necessarily for the low proficiency students to employ the strategies used by the high proficiency students. Suggestions for this group of students can be, first, building confidence by immersing themselves in less difficult language environment; second, expanding vocabulary and their knowledge of grammar gradually; third, reading articles that are intriguing for them, e.g. sports news, American or British literature, entertainment reports, and so on; finally, for English education practitioners, they are supposed to drill their students' reading strategies that suit their current English level, tutor the individual student based on the individual case, and work out particular plans that fit individuals the best. Moreover, both high and low proficiency students need to be trained in terms of eye movement for the sake of raising their reading speed.

6. Limitation and Future Research

The limitation for the current study is the small size of its participants, which may not be representative of the larger population of high school students with different English proficiency levels. Hence, the generalizability of those findings might be limited. Further investigation on this topic can enroll larger size of subjects and adopt a quantitative approach for the generalizability of the results. Future research may also consider to what extent conceptual mind map strategy can help improve students' EFL reading comprehension efficiency, and to what extent eye movement skill can also promote reading proficiency.

Acknowledgements

References

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The reading teacher*, *61*(5), 364-373. https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.5.1

Alderson, J. C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1-27). London: Longman.

Alderson, J., & Bachman, F. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732935

Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). A psycholinguistic perspective on second language literacy. In J. H. Hulstijn, & J. F. Matter (Eds.), *Reading in Two Languages, AILA Review, 8*, (31-44).

Block, E. (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(2), 319-343. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587008

Nasri, M., & Biria, R. (2017). Integrating multiple and focused strategies for improving reading comprehension and l2 lexical development of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(1), 311-321. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.1p.311

Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 22*(1), 13-24. https://doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1989.tb03138.x

Conklin, K., & Pellicer-Sánchez, A. (2016). Using eye-tracking in applied linguistics and second language research. *Second Language Research*, *32*(3), 453-467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658316637401

Ma, Y. H., & Lin, W. Y. (2015). A study on the relationship between English reading comprehension and English vocabulary knowledge. *Education research international*, *2015*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/209154

Montero Perez, M. (2019). Pre-learning vocabulary before viewing captioned video: An eye-tracking study. *The Language Learning Journal*, *47*(4), 460-478. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1638623

McCormick, T. W. (1988). *Theories of reading in dialogue: An interdisciplinary study*. University Press of America.

Aksan, N., & Kisac, B. (2009). A descriptive study: Reading comprehension and cognitive awareness skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 834-837. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.149

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Toronto, Canada: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings, and instructional issues. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(4), 404-419. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb05321.x

Salataci, R., & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(1), 1-17.

Shang, H. F. (2010). Reading Strategy Use, Self-Efficacy and EFL Reading Comprehension. *Asian EFL Journal, 12*(2), 18-42.

Song, Mi-jeong. (1998). Teaching Reading Strategies in an Ongoing EFL University Reading Classroom. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8*, 41-54.

OH, S. Y. (2001). Two types of input modification and EFL reading comprehension: Simplification versus elaboration. *TESOL quarterly*, *35*(1), 69-96. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587860

Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a Second Language: Process, Product and Practice*. London: Longman.

Tsai, Y. R., Ernst, C., & Talley, P. C. (2010). L1 and L2 strategy use in reading comprehension of Chinese EFL readers. *Reading Psychology*, *31*(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710802412081

Yukie, H. (2013). Task-induced strategic processing in L2 text comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 98-125. https://doi:10125/66866

Appendix A

Gender:_____   Age: _____

When reading,

1.Will you link the information in the current paragraph to that in the last?

A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

2.Will you guess what information is going to emerge in the following parts of the passage?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

3.Will you remember the information you have read?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

4.Will you focus on key points rather than detailed information?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

5.Will you understand the passage with the help of your background knowledge?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

6.Will you identify the structure of the passage?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

7.Will you make a quick survey of the entire passage before reading?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

8.Will force yourself to understand when being hindered by difficulties?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

9.Will you mark the key points to facilitate your understanding?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

10.Will you try to memorize some parts on purpose?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

11.Will you count the number the key points in the passage?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

12.Will you infer the the content based on your initial understanding?

    A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

13.Will you consider yourself an efficient reader?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

14.Will you guess the meaning of words or sentences when you can't understand?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

15.Will you find out clues from the passage when you can't understand?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

16.Will you infer the meaning of new words by analyzing the components/affixes?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

17.Will you use grammar to analyze the difficult sentences?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

18.Will you translate the difficult part into Chinese?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

19.Will you read aloud the words or sentences?

   A.Never   B.Sometimes   C.Always

20.Please list other strategies if you have any.

Copyright Disclaimer