

University Freshmen's Changes in English Reading Motivation and Reading Strategies

Eun-hee Nam

Hankyong National University

Nam, Eun-hee. (2014). University freshmen's changes in English reading motivation and reading strategies. *Modern English Education*, 15(1), 97-123.

This study investigated the changes in the first-year students' English reading motivation and reading strategies in a Korean EFL context. Fifty-eight university freshmen taking an English class participated in the study, and two sets of questionnaires were administered. At the beginning and the end of the semester, the same questionnaires were used to compare the changes in the English reading motivation and reading strategies. One questionnaire was for the motivation to read in English, and it consisted of 30 items classified into nine dimensions. The other was for English reading strategies classified into three dimensions, and it was composed of 30 items, too. For the purpose of the study, two research questions were set as follows: 1) What are the changes in first-year students' English reading motivation after entering university? 2) What are the changes in their English reading strategies after entering university? It was found that there were 9 significant differences in English reading motivation items, and reading efficacy domain had a significant difference. As for reading strategies, 7 items had significant differences and support reading strategies domain had a significant difference. In the light of the findings, some pedagogical implications and some future directions for research in this area were suggested.

[reading motivation/reading strategy/teaching and learning English reading/
/ /]

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the Korean government has emphasized oral competence of students in English, the importance of English speaking skills is being focused in the field of English education. However, it is undeniable that English reading skills are required for Korean university students to achieve their academic goals, to get a job, and to do well in the

future work place. Of the four language skills that learners need to acquire, reading is the most available and important skills in the Korean context. As Cummins (2008) states, reading is critical to all aspects of academic achievement, and reading is a way to empowering and vitalizing students in their current lives and for their future (Hunter, 2009). Under the circumstance, English professionals are trying to find ways to encourage improvement of students' English reading proficiency. As part of their endeavors, English educators have tried to find the factors to influence students' English reading proficiency. Among the factors, motivation and strategies have been recognized as important ones in teaching and learning English.

Motivation has been widely accepted by both teachers and researchers as one of the key factors that influence the rate and success of learning of a second or a foreign language (Dörnyei, 1998). Dörnyei insists that motivation provides the primary impetus to initiate learning a second and a foreign language and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process; indeed, all the other factors involved in second and foreign language acquisition presuppose motivation to some extent. Many studies have found a positive relation between language learning motivation and language proficiency (Gardner & Smythe, 1981; Hwang, 2013; Joo, 2012; Jung, 2009; Kim, 2008; Lukmani, 1972; Noels, Clement, & Pelletier, 2001). Learner strategies, as conscious actions in learning and using a second or a foreign language, are one of the variable factors that have profound effects on how individual learners approach language learning and how successful they are (Abhakron, 2008). Ever since Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco (1976) noted that good language learners appeared to use a larger number and range of strategies than poor language learners, the implications of understanding strategy use of reading have seemed increasingly important. In the past decades, considerable attention has been paid to identifying what successful learners typically do while reading, including what types of strategies they use, how they use them, and under what conditions they use those strategies (Block, 1992; Jimenez, Garcia, & Pearson, 1996; Paris, Lipson, & Wixon, 1983; Song, 1998; Suh, 2012).

For university students in Korea, the mastery of English reading comprehension is crucial for both academic and professional success. To a great extent, this skill is often essential for acquisition of academic knowledge in general. It is true that even native speaker of English are challenged by academic reading, and are expected to use appropriate reading strategies to achieve this end. Unquestionably, reading English text as a foreign language is more challenging for non-native learners (Suh, 2012). Now, most Korean university freshmen are required to take an English class which is compulsory. This mandatory course often focuses on increasing students' reading comprehension, and the objectives of the course are to make students better English readers, and prepare them for their future employment. Under the circumstances,

understanding learners' motivation on English reading and their use of learning strategies is essential to planning appropriate language instruction. With this perspective, this study investigated the changes in the university freshmen's English reading motivation and reading strategies in a Korean EFL context. The results could serve as a reference for English educators to improve the situation of English language teaching as for freshmen's English reading motivation and strategies, and will be helpful to them in assisting their students to become proficient readers. For the purpose of the study, two research questions were set as follows:

1. What are the changes in first-year students' English reading motivation since they have been accepted to the university?
2. What are the changes in their English reading strategies since they have been accepted to the university?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Reading Motivation in Language Learning

Motivation has been identified as the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of language learning (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). In the field of second language acquisition, a great deal of research has been done in order to investigate second language learning motivation ever since Gardner and Lambert first shed light on the role of attitudes and motivation in second language acquisition (Gardner & Lambert, 1959). Without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals. It is also vital to consider appropriate curricula and good teaching to ensure student achievement. On the other hand, high motivation can make up for considerable deficiencies both in one's language aptitude and learning conditions (Dörnyei, 1998). Lifrieri (2005) asserts that when asked about the factors which influence individual levels of success in any activity-like language learning, most people would certainly mention motivation among them. Gardner (2006) says that students with higher levels of motivation will do better than students with lower levels, and adds if one is motivated, he/she has motives for engaging in the relevant activities, expands efforts, persists in the activities, attends to the tasks, shows desires to achieve the goal, enjoys the activities.

Motivation to read is said to be a multidimensional concept which makes one's choice to read come from varied reasons. Regarding reading and motivation, Gambrell (1996) defines reading motivation as students' feeling about reading and how they think of

themselves as readers. In addition, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) propose reading motivation as the individual's personal goals, values, and beliefs with regard to the topics, the processes, and the outcomes of reading. With the important role of reading motivation in reading development, a great number of researchers have focused on motivational aspects of reading that are meaningfully associated with student reading engagement, frequency of reading, reading comprehension and achievement (Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, & Blumenfeld, 1993; Guthrie, Wagner, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, & Littles, 2007; Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks, & Perencevich, 2004).

Based on their theoretical aspects of reading motivation, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) developed the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ). In their model, Wigfield and Guthrie conceptualized 11 dimensions of reading motivation which they further clustered into three categories: The first category, based on competence and efficacy constructs, includes self-efficacy, challenge, and work avoidance. The second category comprises the following: curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, competition, and grade. The third and final category includes two dimensions: social reasons for reading and reading compliance.

Wigfield and Guthrie's motivational scales were specifically developed for primary school students learning to read in their L1, and some items appearing in the MRQ are not considered directly applicable to the university students in the EFL context. Therefore, based on the theory of reading motivation proposed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997), Mori (2002) modified MRQ and designed a questionnaire relevant to the university students and the context in which students learn English as a foreign language. In her questionnaire, 9 dimensions are included: Reading Efficacy, Reading Challenge, Reading Curiosity, Reading Involvement, Importance of Reading, Reading for Grades, Reading Compliance, and Reading Work Avoidance, and Integrative Orientation. For the purpose of the study, Mori's motivation questionnaire was employed in the present study.

2. Reading Strategies in Language Learning

The term, learning strategies, refers to techniques, behaviors, actions, thought process, problem solving, or study skills taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to a new situation (Oxford & Crookall, 1989; Oxford, 1990). Cohen (1998) adds that the term, strategies, in the second/foreign-language-learning sense, has come to be applied to the conscious moves made by second-language speakers intended to be useful in either learning or using the second/foreign language. According to Chamot and O'Malley (1994), language learning strategies can be described within the cognitive model of learning. They present the

cognitive model of learning indicates that learning is an active and dynamic process in which learners select information from their environment, organize the information, relate it to what they already know, retain what they consider to be important, use the information in inappropriate contexts, and reflect on the success of their learning efforts.

Regarding reading and strategies, Barnett (1988) calls reading strategies the mental operations involved when readers approach a text effectively and make sense of what they read. Pearson and Gallagher (1983) identify better readers as having better ability to summarize and make effective use of background knowledge. They add that students also use the structure of the text, make inferences, have an awareness of the strategies they employ and in general they are better at monitoring and adjusting the strategies they use. Thus, better readers are more strategic. Furthermore, Hosenfield (1977) identifies a good reader as one who tries to keep the meaning of the passage in mind, reads in chunks, ignores less important words, tries to guess the meanings of unknown words using contextual clues, and has a good concept of himself/herself as a reader.

A large amount of research has been done on how proficient readers employ strategies while reading. Based on the various criteria, reading researchers usually divide reading strategies differently and have developed instruments to measure how many strategies readers use while reading. Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) developed an inventory in order to measure native English speaking learners' awareness and perceived use of reading strategies while reading academic or school-related materials: Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ). However, Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) appraised that the existing instruments did not take into account some of strategies that are unique to students who are literate in more than one language, and developed The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) based on MARSİ. The SORS is intended to measure the type and frequency of reading that adolescents and adult ESL students perceive they use while reading academic materials in English (e.g., textbooks, journal articles, class notes).

The SORS measures three broad dimensions of reading strategies: namely global reading strategies, problem solving strategies, and support strategies. Global Reading Strategies are those international, carefully planned techniques by which learners monitor or manage their reading (e.g., having a purpose in mind, previewing the text as to its length and organization, or using typographical aids and tables and figures). Problem Solving Strategies are actions and procedures that readers use while working directly with the text. These are localized, and focused techniques used when problems develop in understanding textual information, (e.g., adjusting one's speed of reading when the material becomes different or easy, guessing the meaning of unknown words, and reading the text to improve comprehension). Support Strategies are basic support mechanisms intended to aid the reader in comprehending the text (e.g., using a

dictionary, taking notes, underlining, or highlighting textual information). In this study, Mokhtari and Sheorey's Survey of Reading Strategies was employed.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Subjects

The subjects were 58 freshmen attending a Korean university who enrolled in an English class as a compulsory subject in 2013 spring semester. There were 37 (63.8%) male students and 21 (36.2%) female students. Because the class was General English for freshmen, the majors of the students were varied from the college of humanities to the college of social science and natural science. More specifically, the participants' majors were law (4), English (5), and creative writing and literary arts (7) which were included in the department of humanities & social science. As for the majors concerning the department of science & engineering were plant & environmental science (3), animal life and environment science (2), horticulture (7), computer & web information engineering (3), and civil, safety & environmental engineering (5). Finally, landscape architecture (2), nutrition & culinary science (3), and child & family welfare (17) in the department of natural science were included.

2. Instruments

Data for the research were collected with two sets of questionnaires; English reading motivation and reading strategies. Both of the two original questionnaires were written in English, but they were translated into Korean to help students understand clearly.

1) Reading Motivation Questionnaire

For the purpose of the study, Mori's (2002) motivational questionnaire was used to investigate the students' English reading motivation. The questionnaire was composed of 30 items altogether, and they were divided into 9 dimensions, that were Reading Efficacy, Reading Challenge, Reading Curiosity, Reading Involvement, Importance of Reading English, Reading for Grade, Reading Compliance, Reading Work Avoidance, and Reading Orientation. In the original questionnaire, there were items referring to English novel. To enhance the accuracy in conveying the meanings of the survey items, the items were revised and reworded in ways that are easier to understand for college freshmen taking General English in a Korean university (e.g., English novel was reworded to

major related texts). Each item was presented on a 5 Likert scale (1= Never or Almost never true, 2=Usually not true, 3=Somewhat true, 4=Usually true, 5=Always or Almost true). Table 1 shows the formation of the motivational questionnaire.

TABLE 1
Reading Motivation Questionnaire

Dimension	No. of Items	N
Reading Efficacy	11, 13, 17, 21	4
Reading Challenge	22	1
Reading Curiosity	1, 6, 12, 14, 16	5
Reading Involvement	2, 15, 29	3
Importance of Reading English	18,24, 26, 27	4
Reading for Grade	7	1
Reading Compliance	9, 28	2
Reading Work Avoidance	8, 23, 30	3
Reading Orientation	3, 4, 5, 10, 19, 20, 25	7
Total		30

2) Reading Strategy Questionnaire

The students' reading strategies were measured using the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002). It consists of 30 items, and each uses a 5 Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never or Almost never d this) to 5 (Always or Almost always do this). The SORS measures three broad dimensions: namely, global reading strategies, problem solving strategies, and support strategies. Table 2 shows the formation of the reading strategies questionnaire.

TABLE 2
Reading Strategy Questionnaire

Dimension	No. of Items	N
Global Reading Strategies	1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27	13
Problem Solving Strategies	7, 9, 11, 14, 16 ,19, 25, 28	8
Support Reading Strategies	2, 5 ,10, 13, 18, 22, 26, 29, 30	9
Total		30

3) Reliability of the Instruments

In order to assess the reliability of the questionnaire as instrument, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient analysis was executed. Table 3 shows the reliabilities of scales for the quality of the reading motivation and reading strategies.

TABLE 3
The Reliability of the Instruments

Questionnaire	Items	M	SD	Cronbach's Alpha
Reading Motivation	30	3.286	.735	.79
Reading Strategy	30	3.318	.789	.76

As shown in the table 3, the Cronbach's Alphas of the questionnaires were .79 and .76, respectively. The results indicated relatively high level of item reliabilities.

3. Procedures

The research was implemented for 15 weeks during the spring semester of 2013. 58 university students taking a compulsory English class were surveyed in the study about their motivation and strategies to read in English. At the beginning of the spring semester, two questionnaires in the Korean version were distributed to each student after the introduction to the course. Students were allowed to respond to two questionnaires for 30 minutes, and then they were collected.

The students attended a three-hour class once a week, with one and half hours for reading and the remaining instructional hours for speaking and listening. The reading class was proceeded in the order in which the content is presented in the textbook (i.e., Think Before you Read, Warm-up Vocabulary, Text, Quiz for Reading Comprehension, Let's Sum-up). Before reading, the class started with "Think Before you Read", and then "Warm-up Vocabulary". These sections were expected to help students predict the text. While reading, the instructor translated the text with explaining the difficult vocabularies, and analyzing the structures using the power point slides. After reading, students were asked to complete two follow-up activities, "Quiz for Reading Comprehension" and "Let's Sum-up". The purpose of these activities was to review and check what they had learned.

Most of the instructional hours were used to help students understand the text. To facilitate students' reading comprehension, activities such as listening to CD, explanation of vocabulary, grammar, and syntax were added to translating the text into Korean.

Students took a vocabulary test before entering into each new unit, and participated in a group work when asked, however, any reading strategies were not introduced and implemented through the classes.

At the end of the semester, to check the changes in English reading motivation and reading strategies, the same questionnaires were used. After the students finished the final exam, they were asked to complete the survey and return two questionnaires. To identify changes in the various domains of the students' motivation in English reading and strategies, a descriptive statistics was computed. After that, the paired samples t-tests were done to assess if the results of pre-test and post-test were significantly different from each other.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Changes in Reading Motivation

The reading motivation consisting of 30 items was analyzed into 9 dimensions. Participants responded to each of the 30 items on a five-point scale from 1 (Never or Almost never true) to 5 (Always or Almost true). In each following table, "Pre" indicates a pre-test administered at the beginning of the semester, and "Post" presents a post-test administered at the end of the semester. In the process of computing, some items negatively stated were reverse recoded. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. See Appendix A for the items on reading motivation.

1) Dimension 1: Reading Efficacy

Dimension 1 consisted of 4 items on reading efficacy. The items mostly concerned the students' control of their learning situation and their belief that they have the capabilities necessary to succeed. There was a significant difference in reading efficacy between pre- and post-tests ($t=-10.664$, $p=.002$). Table 4 shows the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-tests on 4 reading efficacy items.

TABLE 4
Changes in Reading Efficacy

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(11)	Pre	13.8	50.0	29.3	6.9	0	2.29	.795	2.366	.021*
	Post	6.9	41.4	36.2	10.3	5.2	2.67	.947		
(13)	Pre	8.6	48.3	22.4	19.0	1.7	2.57	.957	2.230	.030*
	Post	8.6	29.3	29.3	24.1	8.6	2.95	1.115		
*(17)	Pre	0	10.3	36.2	41.4	12.1	2.45	.84	2.276	.009**
	Post	3.4	22.4	41.4	29.3	3.4	2.93	.90		
(21)	Pre	0	25.9	36.2	27.6	10.3	2.78	.96	2.254	.028
	Post	3.4	44.8	20.7	25.9	5.2	3.16	1.02		

The items, (17) and (21), were reversely coded.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As shown in Table 4, in reading efficacy dimension, all of four items had significant differences during the semester. This indicates that students believe they can learn English better with efforts and attain their goals from their learning in class through the class. In other words, more students perceive they are good at reading in English, and English reading is not their weak subject. In addition, they think of junior and senior high's English reading class positively (i.e., they liked reading classes, and their grades for English reading were not very bad).

2) Dimension 2: Reading Challenge

Dimension 2 consisted of 1 item which was about reading challenge. The item involved the students' challenge, as in the orientation to learning complex ideas from text, and enjoying the difficult English passages. Table 5 shows the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-test of reading challenge.

TABLE 5
Changes in Reading Challenge

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(22)	Pre	10.3	20.7	53.4	12.1	3.4	2.78	.918	1.631	.108
	Post	1.7	22.4	51.7	19.0	5.2	3.03	.837		

* $p < .05$

There was no significant difference between the tests. Regarding the mean scores, they were 2.8-3.0, and this implies that the level of students' reading challenges continued not so high during the semester.

3) Dimension 3: Reading Curiosity

Dimension 3 included 5 items which were on reading curiosity. The items concerned students' curiosity, as in the desire to learn about the text, or a quality related to inquisitive thinking such as exploration, and learning. There was no significant difference in reading curiosity scale between pre- and post-tests ($t=-.808, p=.940$). Table 6 shows the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-tests of 5 reading curiosity items.

TABLE 6
Changes in Reading Curiosity

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(1)	Pre	1.7	6.9	39.7	43.1	8.6	3.50	.821	2.100	.040*
	Post	0	6.9	27.6	39.7	25.9	3.84	.894		
(6)	Pre	1.7	3.4	37.9	27.6	29.3	3.79	.969	.713	.468
	Post	0	5.2	34.5	48.3	12.1	3.67	.758		
(12)	Pre	10.3	56.9	22.4	8.6	1.7	2.34	.849	3.067	.003*
	Post	5.2	32.8	36.2	20.7	5.2	2.88	.975		
(14)	Pre	0	6.9	15.5	50.5	27.6	3.98	.848	2.140	.037*
	Post	0	0	10.3	51.7	37.9	4.26	.649		
(16)	Pre	5.2	34.5	44.8	12.1	3.4	2.74	.870	1.796	.078
	Post	0	25.9	48.3	22.4	3.4	3.03	.794		

* $p < .05$

3 items were significantly different between the tests (item 1, 12, 14). From the results, it was found that students came to like English reading more at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester. They revealed their stronger hope to be able to read their major books written in English through the class, and to read English newspapers and/or magazines by learning to read in English. Besides, focusing on item 6 (Even if reading were not a required subject, I would take a reading class anyway), it had high mean scores in both on the pre- and post-test (around 3.7). This shows their high English reading motivation sustained through the course.

4) Dimension 4: Reading Involvement

Dimension 4 consisted of 3 items which were about reading involvement. The items concerned the enjoyment of reading a text and the concentration when reading. There was no significant difference in reading involvement between pre- and post-tests ($t=-1.584$, $p=.254$). Table 7 shows the results of the descriptive statistics and t-tests of 3 reading involvement items.

TABLE 7
Changes in Reading Involvement

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(2)	Pre	0	0	24.1	53.4	22.4	3.98	.894	.139	.890
	Post	0	3.4	12.1	69.0	15.5	3.97	.648		
(15)	Pre	0	34.5	50.0	13.8	1.71	2.83	.729	1.815	.075
	Post	1.7	19.0	51.7	24.1	3.4	3.09	.801		
(29)	Pre	1.7	19.0	32.8	43.1	3.4	3.28	.874	-.861	.393
	Post	0	19.0	27.6	46.6	6.9	3.41	.879		

* $p<.05$

As shown in the table 7, among the three items, item 2 had very high mean scores not only on the post-test but also on the pre-test. This shows students had high reading motivation when they get immersed in interesting stories even if they are written in English, and the motivation was high both at the beginning and the end of the semester.

5) Dimension 5: Importance of Reading English

Dimension 5 consisted of 4 items which were about the importance of reading English. The items considered students' perception that English reading is important to their success in the university or their future. There was no significant difference between pre- and post-tests ($t=1.663$, $p=.195$). Table 8 presents the results of the descriptive statistics and t- tests of 4 items of importance of reading English.

TABLE 8
Changes in Importance of Reading English

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(18)	Pre	1.7	5.2	25.9	43.1	22.4	3.84	.951	1.033	.306
	Post	0	8.6	20.7	62.1	8.6	3.71	.749		
(24)	Pre	1.7	6.9	27.6	48.3	15.5	3.69	.883	-1.110	.913
	Post	0	3.4	31.0	56.9	8.6	3.71	.676		
(26)	Pre	1.7	3.4	19.0	41.1	34.5	4.03	.917	.590	.557
	Post	3.4	0	12.1	67.2	17.2	3.95	.782		
(27)	Pre	29.3	62.1	5.2	1.7	1.7	4.16	.707	2.496	.015
	Post	58.6	36.2	1.7	3.4	0	4.50	.745		

* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 8, item 27 among 4 items had a significant difference. This shows students' perception that learning to read in English isn't a waste of time. Students responded positively to the other 3 items; the range of mean scores was from 3.1 to 4.03. This indicates that students' belief that English reading is important to their success in the university or their future sustained throughout the class without change.

6) Dimension 6: Reading for Grade

Dimension 6 consisted of 1 item which was about reading for grade. It concerned grade, as in favorable evaluations from a teacher. Table 9 shows the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-test of reading for grade.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Reading for Grade

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(7)	Pre	13.8	67.2	13.8	3.4	1.7	2.12	.751	1.783	.080
	Post	10.3	56.9	22.4	6.9	3.4	2.36	.892		

* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 9, there is no significant difference in reading for grade. The mean scores of reading for grade are as low as 2.1-2.3. This could be attributed to the fact that the English class was compulsory, and students had to take the class regardless of their

desire to get good grades.

7) Dimension 7: Reading Compliance

Dimension 7 included 2 items which were about reading compliance. The items were on responding favorably to a request made by others. There was no significant difference in reading compliance between pre- and post-tests ($t=-2.600$, $p=.234$). Table 10 presents the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-tests of 2 reading compliance items.

TABLE 10
Changes in Reading Compliance

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
*(9)	Pre	0	8.6	36.2	46.6	8.6	2.45	.776	-.932	.355
	Post	1.7	10.3	41.4	39.7	6.9	2.60	.836		
*(28)	Pre	0	12.1	32.8	39.7	15.5	2.41	.899	-.393	.696
	Post	3.4	5.2	37.9	43.1	10.3	2.42	.883		

The items, 9 and 28, were reversely coded.

* $p < .05$

According to Table 10, 2 items had no significant difference during the semester. This could also be attributed to their compulsory English class.

8) Dimension 8: Reading Work Avoidance

Dimension 8 consisted of 3 items which were about avoidance reading. The items concerned the process by which students show a behavior or response to avoid a stressful or unpleasant learning. There was no significant difference in reading work avoidance between pre- and post-tests ($t=1.027$, $p=.412$). Table 11 presents the results of the descriptive statistics and t-tests of 3 reading work avoidance items.

TABLE 11
Changes in Reading Work Avoidance

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
*(8)	Pre	3.4	32.8	41.4	15.5	6.9	3.10	.949	1.240	.220
	Post	6.9	34.5	44.8	12.1	1.7	3.33	.846		
*(23)	Pre	6.9	53.4	32.8	6.9	0	3.60	.724	.148	.883
	Post	10.3	44.6	36.2	5.2	1.7	3.59	.817		
*(30)	Pre	13.8	27.6	43.1	13.8	1.7	3.38	.952	-.293	.770
	Post	8.6	41.4	37.9	8.6	3.4	3.43	.901		

Items , (8), (23) and (30), were reversely coded.

* $p < .05$

From the table 11, even though the overall results showed no significant difference between the tests, the mean scores of all the items were consistent around 3.5 on both tests. These scores indicate that student would not avoid English reading even if it is not interesting, and even if reading assignments are required for the class. In addition, the results indicate that students essentially do not appear to experience difficulty in reading in English.

9) Dimension 9: Reading Orientation

Dimension 9 consisted of 7 items which were about reading orientation. The items concerned the tendencies of University freshmen's English reading or a general inclination to study English reading. There was no significant difference in reading orientation between pre- and post-tests ($t = -1.548$, $p = .173$). Table 12 presents the results of the descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-tests of 7 reading orientation items.

TABLE 12
Changes in Reading Orientation

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(3)	Pre	0	3.4	6.9	34.5	55.2	4.41	.773	.265	.792
	Post	0	0	5.2	51.7	43.1	4.38	.587		
(4)	Pre	1.7	15.5	50.0	22.4	10.3	3.24	.904	1.026	.309
	Post	0	13.8	37.9	43.1	5.2	3.40	.793		
(5)	Pre	0	12.1	29.3	39.7	19.0	3.66	.928	-.902	.927
	Post	0	8.6	31.0	44.8	15.5	3.67	.846		

(10)	Pre	5.2	17.2	53.4	20.7	3.4	3.00	.858	2.202	.032*
	Post	0	17.2	41.2	31.0	10.3	3.34	.890		
(19)	Pre	1.7	17	27.6	46.6	22.4	3.86	.847	-.116	.908
	Post	0	1.7	24.1	58.6	15.5	3.88	.677		
(20)	Pre	1.7	15.5	46.6	22.4	13.8	3.31	.959	-.638	.908
	Post	0	17.2	41.2	31.0	19.0	3.43	1.078		
(25)	Pre	0	5.2	17.2	50.5	27.6	4.00	.817	.369	.713
	Post	0	5.2	13.8	62.1	19.0	3.34	.890		

* $p < .05$

As the above Table 12 shows, item 10 showed a significant difference. In 7 reading orientation items, more number of students hope to get a job that uses what they studied in English reading class at the end of the semester than at the beginning the semester. On the other hand, looking at the items mean scores, item 3 had very high mean scores both at the beginning and at the end of the semester; the mean score on the pretest was 4.41 and the mean score on post-test was 4.38. This could be interpreted that students strongly perceive learning to read in English is important because they need to cope with internationalization. In addition, item 19 (By learning to read in English, I hope to learn about various opinions in the world) had relatively high mean scores (around 3.8). These results suggest that students think English is a global language, and they need to learn English reading to be global competitive members.

2. Changes in Reading Strategies

The questionnaire for reading strategies was composed of 30 items that were divided into 3 dimensions. Students responded to each of these items on a five-point scale from 1 (Never or Almost never do this) to 5 (Always or Almost always do this). In the process of computing, some items negatively stated were reverse recoded. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number. See Appendix B for the items on reading strategies.

1) Dimension 1: Global Reading Strategies

Dimension 1 consisted of 13 items which were about global reading strategies. Global reading strategies are those intentional, carefully planned techniques by which learners monitor or manage their reading, such as having a purpose in mind, previewing the text as to its length and organization, or using typographical aids and tables and figures (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). There was no significant difference in global reading strategies between pre- and post-tests ($t = -1.343$, $p = .204$). Table 13 shows the results of

the descriptive statistics and t-tests of the 13 global reading strategies.

TABLE 13
Changes in Global Reading Strategies

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(1)	Pre	1.7	12.1	48.3	34.5	3.5	3.26	.785	.853	.397
	Post	0	20.7	51.7	20.7	6.9	3.14	.826		
(3)	Pre	0	3.4	36.2	48.3	12.1	3.69	.730	1.013	.315
	Post	0	10.3	41.4	32.8	15.5	3.53	.883		
(4)	Pre	0	17.2	31.0	39.7	12.1	3.47	.921	.687	.495
	Post	6.9	12.1	36.2	29.3	15.5	3.34	1.101		
(6)	Pre	8.6	34.5	48.3	8.6	0	2.57	.775	-.748	.458
	Post	8.6	32.8	44.8	8.6	5.2	2.69	.940		
(8)	Pre	5.2	19.0	29.3	37.9	8.6	3.26	1.036	-.868	.389
	Post	3.4	12.1	32.8	43.1	8.6	3.41	.937		
(12)	Pre	1.7	31.0	36.2	25.9	5.2	3.01	.927	-2.028	.047*
	Post	1.7	19.0	34.5	27.6	17.2	3.40	1.042		
(15)	Pre	0	8.6	15.5	46.6	29.3	3.97	.898	.069	.924
	Post	1.7	3.4	29.3	29.3	36.2	3.95	.981		
(17)	Pre	3.4	10.3	29.3	48.3	8.6	3.48	.922	-1.276	.207
	Post	1.7	6.9	32.8	36.2	22.4	3.71	.955		
(20)	Pre	12.1	29.3	29.3	24.1	5.2	2.81	1.100	-1.162	.250
	Post	12.1	27.6	15.5	32.8	12.1	3.05	1.262		
(21)	Pre	3.4	22.4	58.6	12.1	3.4	2.90	.788	-1.343	.185
	Post	3.4	24.1	43.1	15.5	13.8	3.12	1.044		
(23)	Pre	0	6.9	46.6	39.7	6.9	3.47	.731	1.085	.282
	Post	0	13.8	51.7	24.1	10.3	3.31	.842		
(24)	Pre	0	0	20.7	58.6	20.7	4.00	.649	1.000	.322
	Post	0	1.7	27.6	51.7	19.0	3.88	.727		
(27)	Pre	1.7	25.9	55.2	17.2	0	2.88	.703	-2.122	.038*
	Post	3.4	27.6	20.7	41.4	6.9	3.21	1.039		

* $p < .05$

As data from Table 13 showed, 2 items (item 12 and 27, respectively) were significantly different between the tests. This implies when students are reading the text in English, more students decide closely what to read and what to ignore, and they check more to see if their guesses about the text are right or wrong at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester. Besides, of the 13 items, item 15 and item 24 maintained relatively high mean scores throughout the semester (around 3.9-4.0). This indicates students use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase their understanding

a lot, and try to guess what the content of the text is about in English reading class from the beginning to the end of semester.

2) Dimension 2: Problem Solving Strategies

Dimension 2 included 8 items on problem solving strategies. Problem solving strategies are the actions and procedures that readers use while working directly on the text. These are localized and focused techniques used when problems appear in understanding textual information. Examples of problem solving strategies include: 1) adjusting one's speed of reading when the material becomes difficult or easy, 2) guessing the meaning of unknown words, and 3) rereading the text to improve comprehension (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). There was no significant difference in problem solving strategies between pre- and post-test ($t=-1.736$, $p=.126$). Table 14 presents the results of descriptive statistics and t-tests of 8 problem solving strategies.

TABLE 14
Changes in Problem Solving Strategies

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(7)	Pre	0	3.4	31.0	41.4	24.1	3.86	.826	.510	.612
	Post	0	3.4	39.7	32.8	24.1	3.78	.859		
(9)	Pre	0	3.4	29.3	36.2	8.6	3.95	.867	-.455	.651
	Post	3.4	3.4	15.5	41.4	36.2	4.03	.990		
(11)	Pre	3.4	10.3	32.8	39.7	13.8	3.50	.978	-.574	.568
	Post	3.4	8.6	32.8	34.5	20.7	3.60	1.025		
(14)	Pre	0	6.9	29.3	43.1	20.7	3.78	.860	.323	.748
	Post	0	10.3	29.3	37.9	22.4	3.72	.932		
(16)	Pre	0	13.8	53.4	29.3	3.4	3.22	.727	-1.021	.312
	Post	0	1.7	24.1	58.6	15.5	3.40	.954		
(19)	Pre	1.7	22.4	37.9	27.6	10.3	3.22	.974	-.387	.406
	Post	0	15.1	43.1	29.3	12.1	3.38	.895		
(25)	Pre	0	10.3	24.1	44.8	20.7	3.76	.094	.000	1.000
	Post	0	6.9	27.6	48.3	17.2	3.76	.823		
(28)	Pre	1.7	10.3	25.9	48.3	13.8	3.62	.914	-2.202	.032*
	Post	0	1.7	27.6	43.1	27.6	3.97	.794		

* $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 14, out of problem solving strategies domain, item 28 was significantly different between the pre- and the post-tests. This suggests that more students guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases when they read at the end of semester than the beginning of the semester. As shown in Table 14, the mean scores ranged from 3.5 to 4.0. Especially, item 9 gained very positive responses on both pre- and post-tests. This means most students tried to get back on track when they lose concentration while reading.

3) Dimension 3: Support Reading Strategies

Dimension 3 included 9 items which were about support reading strategies. Support reading strategies are basic support mechanisms intended to aid the reader in comprehending the text such as using a dictionary, taking notes, underlining, or highlighting textual information (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). There was a significant difference in support reading strategies between pre- and post-tests ($t=-3.243, p=.012$). Table 15 presents the results of descriptive statistics and t-tests of 9 support reading strategies.

TABLE 15
Changes in Support Reading Strategies

Item No.		Frequency (%)					M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(2)	Pre	5.2	41.4	31.0	15.5	5.2	2.71	.991	-2.329	.023*
	Post	5.2	20.7	39.7	29.3	5.2	3.01	.960		
(5)	Pre	22.4	46.6	22.4	6.9	1.7	2.19	.926	-2.343	.023*
	Post	19.0	31.0	24.1	13.8	12.1	2.69	1.273		
(10)	Pre	3.4	12.1	32.8	39.7	13.8	3.47	.995	-2.259	.028*
	Post	1.7	5.2	29.3	32.8	31.0	3.86	.981		
(13)	Pre	1.7	10.3	31.0	39.7	17.2	3.60	.954	.092	.927
	Post	1.7	15.5	31.0	25.9	25.9	3.59	1.093		
(18)	Pre	3.4	15.5	34.5	37.9	8.6	3.33	.962	-2.077	.042*
	Post	0	12.1	27.6	41.4	19.0	3.67	.925		
(22)	Pre	0	6.9	37.9	44.8	10.3	3.59	.773	-.685	.496
	Post	0	6.9	36.2	37.9	19.0	3.69	.863		
(26)	Pre	13.8	51.7	25.9	5.2	3.4	2.33	.906	-1.264	.211
	Post	10.3	50.0	22.4	6.9	10.3	2.57	1.110		
(29)	Pre	1.7	17.2	22.4	37.9	20.7	3.59	1.060	.585	.561
	Post	5.2	12.1	27.6	39.7	15.5	3.48	1.063		

(30)	Pre	0	27.6	41.4	25.9	5.2	3.09	.864	.190	.404
	Post	6.9	15.5	36.2	31.0	10.3	3.22	1.060		

* $p < .05$

As shown in Table 15, items 2, 5, 10, and 18 had significant differences between the tests. These results show that the students use the three strategies more at the end of the semester; they took more notes while reading to help themselves understand what they read, when text becomes difficult, and more students read aloud to help themselves understand what they read. Furthermore, they underlined or circled much information in the text to help themselves remember it, and more students paraphrased (restate ideas in their own words) to better understand what they read. On the other hand, the pre-test mean score of item 26 was 2.33, and the post-test mean score was 2.57. This implies that less than half of students asked themselves questions they liked to have answered in the text at the beginning, and nearly half of the students did at the end of the semester. The use of this strategy was the lowest among 30 reading strategies.

V. CONCLUSION

Teaching English reading should consider various factors that could promote learners' reading proficiency. With the importance of English reading for university students, this study was to investigate the two factors which play key roles in English reading: reading motivation and reading strategies.

For the first research question (i.e., What are the changes in first-year students' English reading motivation after entering university?), the reading efficacy dimension included had a significant difference. That is, the English reading classes made students have necessity to succeed at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester. Despite a significant difference at the end of semester, half of the students still didn't think that they were good at reading in English. Students were not confident in English reading even if they had demonstrated levels of English through college entrance exam. This result reminds English educators again that building confidence in English reading is critical. On the other hand, more students liked English reading after the class and thought it is not a waste of time to learn to read in English. In addition, by learning to read in English, more students answered they hope to be able to read books in their major field in English, English newspapers and magazines. This shows their increasing curiosity and the perception of the importance of English reading both at the beginning and at the end of the semester. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in the reading orientation domain, even though the mean scores in the post-test were high.

This could be attributed to the high mean scores in the pre-test as well. This suggests that students had the positive tendencies and a high inclination to study English reading throughout the semester.

With regard to the second research question, (i.e., What are the changes in their English reading strategies after entering university?), some of the support reading strategies had a significant difference. This means students used more intentional strategies, or carefully planned techniques by which they monitor or manage their reading, such as having a purpose in mind, previewing the text as to its length and organization, or using typographical aids and tables and figures than the beginning of the semester. Most of the items included had high mean scores of over 3 to even 4.4, which were considered "moderate" or "high" level of reading strategy usage according to Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995); high (mean of 3.5 or higher), moderate (mean of 2.5 to 3.4), and low (mean of 2.4 or lower). This could be interpreted that many first-year students use useful reading strategies while reading in English both at the beginning and at the end of semester. However, 3 reading strategies had mean scores around 2.5 even increased at the end of the semester. This result shows it is required: 1) to have students read aloud to help them understand, 2) to think about whether the content of the text fits their reading purpose, and 3) to ask themselves questions they like to have answered in the text.

These days, universities are forced to put more effort in helping students prepare for the workplace. Concerning this issue, English educators have to find ways to promote learners' English reading proficiency. It is, however, challenging to motivate students who do not believe that their English reading proficiency is affected by their behaviors. As Grabe and Stoller (2002) point out, EFL learners often give up reading because of the reasons such as the lack of vocabulary skills, reading strategies, reading fluency, motivation to read, and opportunities to read extensively. In fact, this study shows most students do not believe they are good at English reading. Under the circumstance, finding a way to increase reading motivation and strategies usage is needed as Y. M. Suh (2012) mentioned. Y. M. Suh (2012) proposes instructors at the college level should carefully design their courses to encourage students to read texts in English and to provide relevant strategies for the texts that they assign. Concerning how to motivate students, it is meaningful to consider Sass's (1989) finding and suggestions. Sass (1989) asks college students to recall two recent class periods, one in which they were highly motivated, and the other in which their motivation was low. From the result, he identified the same eight characteristics emerge as major contributors to student's motivation: instructor's enthusiasm, relevance of the material, organization of the course, appropriate difficulty level of the material, active involvement of students, variety, rapport between teacher and students, and use of appropriate, concrete, and

understandable examples.

The methodology and results presented in this study will be able to contribute to understand Korean university freshmen's changes in English reading motivation and reading strategies. However, there are some limitations in the study. A relatively small number of students (n=58) participated in a four-month, which requires that future studies with a larger number of students and long-term consequences are needed. In addition, descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-tests were used to compare results in the study. For more and specific results, it is necessary to conduct studies about correlation among motivation factors, strategy factors and demographic variables.

REFERENCES

- Abhakron, J. (2008). The implications of learners strategies for second or foreign language language teaching, *ARECLS*, 2008(5), 186-204.
- Barnett, M. (1988). Teaching through context: How real and perceived strategy use affect L2 comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 150-162.
- Block, E. (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2), 319-343.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'malley, J. M., (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading: MA Addison-Wesley.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Cummins, J. (2008). Reading and the ESL student. *Orbit*, 37(2 & 3), 72-75.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, 117-135.
- Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Harold, R., & Blumenfeld, P. B. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development*, 64, 830-847.
- Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher*, 50, 14-25.
- Gardner, R. (2006). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: A research paradigm. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 237-260.
- Gardener, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272.
- Gardener, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1981). On the development of Attitude/Motivation

- Test Battery. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 37, 510-525.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. England: Pearson Education.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wagner, A. L., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 282-313.
- Guthrie, J., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal & P. Pearson (Eds.), *The handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). New York: Longman.
- Hosenfield, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful language learners. *System*, 5, 110-123.
- Hunter, A. (2009). Join the literacy club. *Principal Leadership*, 9(9), 36.
- Hwang, Jung-Hee. (2013). A case study of motivation types and motivation changes in the college EFL classroom. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 12(1), 97-121.
- Jimenez, R. T., Garcia, G. E., & Pearson, D. P. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(1), 90-112.
- Joo, Mee-Ran. (2012). A study on university freshmen's English learning motivation and strategies by majors and English skill. *English 21*, 25(3), 177-200.
- Jung, Sei-Hwa. (2009). Foreign language reading motivation and achievement. *English Language Teaching*, 21(1), 209-229.
- Kern, R. (1989). Second language reading strategy instruction: Its effects on comprehension and word inference ability. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(2), 135-146.
- Kim, Young-Sang. (2008). The impact of Korean university EFL learners' reading strategies and motivations on performance. *English Language Teaching*, 20(4), 105-129.
- Lifrieri, V. (2005). *A sociological perspective on motivation to learn EFL: The case of escuelas plurilingues in Argentina*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 22, 261-272.
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, R. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 249-259.
- Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-10.
- Mori, S. (2002). Redefining motivation to read in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14, 91-110.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1976). *The good language learner*.

- Research in Education Series No. 7. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 424-442.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.
- Oxford, R., & Burr-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning SILL. *System*, 23, 1-23.
- Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 404-419.
- Paris, S., Lipson, M., & Wixon, K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 293-316.
- Pearson, P., & Gallagher, M. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 317-344.
- Sass, E. J. (1989). Motivation in the college classroom: What students tell us. *Teaching of Psychology*, 16(2), 86-88.
- Song, Mi-Jeong. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in an ongoing EFL reading classroom. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8, 41-54.
- Suh, Young-Mee. (2012). Four Korean university EFL learners' perceptions of reading instruction and reading strategy development. *English Teaching*, 67(2), 135-158.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1995). *Dimensions of children's motivations for reading for reading: An initial study* (Research Rep. No. 34). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 420-432.
- Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 299-309.

APPENDIX A

Survey for Reading Motivation

1. By learning to read in English, I hope I will be able to read my major books in English.
2. I get immersed in interesting stories even if they are written in English.
3. Learning to read in English is important in that we need to cope with internationalization.
4. I am learning to read in English because I might study abroad in the future.
5. By being able to read in English, I hope to understand more deeply about lifestyles and cultures of English speaking countries (such as America and England).
6. Even if reading were not a required subject, I would take a reading class anyway.
7. I am learning to read in English merely because I would like to get good grades.
8. Long and difficult English passages put me off.
9. I am taking a reading class merely because it is a required subject.
10. I would like to get a job that uses what I studied in English reading class.
11. I am good at reading in English.
12. I like English reading.
13. I liked reading classes at junior and senior high schools.
14. By learning to read in English, I hope to be able to read English newspapers and/or magazines.
15. It is fun to read in English.
16. I like reading English newspapers and/or magazines.
17. English reading is my weak subject.
18. Learning to reading in English is important because it will be conducive to my general education.
19. By learning to read in English, I hope to learn about various opinions in the world.
20. I think learning to speak and/or listening is more important than learning to read in English.
21. My grades for English reading classes at junior and senior high schools were not very good.
22. I enjoy the challenge of difficult English passages.
23. I do not have any desire to read in English even if the content is interesting.
24. Learning to reading in English is important because it will broaden my view.
25. By learning to read in English, I hope to search information on the Internet.
26. Reading in English is important because it will make me a more knowledgeable person.
27. It is a waste of time to learn to read in English.
28. I would not voluntarily read in English unless it is required as homework or assignment.
29. I tend to get deeply engaged when I read in English.
30. It is a pain to read in English.

APPENDIX B

Survey for Reading Strategies

1. I have a purpose in mind when I read.
2. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.
3. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.
4. I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.
5. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.
6. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.
7. I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading.
8. I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.
9. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.
10. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.
11. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.
12. When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.
13. I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read.
14. When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.
15. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.
16. I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.
17. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.
18. I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.
19. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.
20. I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.
21. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.
22. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.
23. I check my understanding when I come across new information.
24. I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.
25. When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.
26. I ask myself questions I like to have an answer in the text.
27. I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.
28. When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.
29. When reading, I translate from English into my native language.
30. When reading, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue.

Examples: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Eun-hee Nam

Department of Liberal Arts

Hankyong National University

327 Chungang-ro, Anseong-si, Kyonggi-do 456-749, Korea

C.P.: 010-8747-8808

Email: hieuni@hanamil.net

Received 15 December 2013

Revised 6 February 2014

Accepted 18 February 2014