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Abstract

Considerable research has shown that the use of reading comprehension strategies (RCS) in the learning of second language (L2) has positive effects on students’ reading comprehension (RC) performance. However, the development of L2 reading comprehension has been a challenge to Year 6 classes in Brunei that take place in an English as a foreign language (EFL) societal environment where both students and teachers have to achieve and work through English as a medium of instruction (EMI). In this complex environment, English reading comprehension amongst students in Brunei has been identified as an area that needs to be improved. The purpose of this study was to develop a deeper understanding of the complex relationships between the learning and teaching of RCS and the lived experience of Bruneian Year 6 students and teachers in EFL/EMI settings. This was achieved through an investigation of the facilitating or hindering factors involved in learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC EFL/EMI classrooms, and an exploration of ways students and teachers manage EFL and EMI in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. Engeström’s Second Generation Activity Theory (2001) was used both as a theoretical framework and a method for analysis to generate a rich description of the complex environment in which the learning and teaching of RCS occurs.

This study employed an instrumental case study using a sequential exploratory design and a mixed method approach. A total of 477 Year 6 students and 57 teachers participated in this study. In the first phase, data were collected from the students and teachers using RCS self-report surveys. This was followed by students undertaking a reading comprehension stimulation task, students’ group interviews, teachers’ interviews and classroom observations. Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS and thematic analysis was undertaken for the qualitative data.

This study found that students and teachers were aware of the role of RCS in enhancing reading comprehension. However, the facilitating or hindering factors of EMI in EFL environment within an examination orientated education system such as students’ perceived English competencies, limited instructional resources, and teacher directed pedagogical practices led to complexities in implementing RCS in the learning and teaching of L2 RC. The findings of this research provided evidence of some of the facilitators and hindrances of the learning and teaching of L2 RC, specifically the impact of EFL/EMI in the use of RCS in the bilingual classroom, and the ways students and teachers manage the learning and teaching of L2 RC within a complex system. This study further suggests that the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons should be seen
as complex as it is closely related to EMI policies in EFL setting within an examination orientated education system.

The study adds to our understanding of RCS teaching and learning through the exploration of a context new to language learning strategies (LLS) research, that is, the use of RCS in Brunei. It contributes to the existing body of knowledge in the field of second language acquisition and teaching; and more specifically to understanding how activity theory can assist in exploring issues in second language learning. This study enriches the existing evidence about how social aspect of learning and teaching of RCS facilitate L2 reading comprehension for primary students and teachers in EFL/EMI contexts. This study also contributes to the understanding of factors and implications that may be involved in the strategies used by students and teachers within a complex system. The findings provide information for policy makers, teachers and other stakeholders in Brunei, and beyond, about the importance of RCS in delivering effective learning and teaching of L2 reading comprehension.
Declaration by author

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the policy and procedures of The University of Queensland, the thesis be made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 unless a period of embargo has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis.

Publications during candidature
No publications

Publications included in this thesis
No publications included

Contributions by others to the thesis
No contribution by others

Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree
None

iii
Acknowledgements

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.

First and foremost, thank you to Allah’s blessings and strength from the beginning to the end of my PhD journey.

During the duration of my PhD, I have received a lot of advice, support and help from many people. I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my late supervisor, Emeritus Professor Richard Baldauf (RIP). Uncle Dick, thank you for your guidance, advice and support you gave me during the 4 years of my PhD candidature. I would like to thank my supervisors, Associate Professor Dr Karen Moni and Dr Simone Smala. Karen, thank you for your inspiration, encouragement, time and extensive written and oral feedback. Your words, “do not worry, you will be there” made me feel good during ups and downs. Simone, thank you for believing in me and for all your encouragement. I also would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr Monica Cuskelly, who devoted her time to read my quantitative analysis on a good will basis. And to my thesis panel members, Dr Obaid Hamid and Dr Ian Hardy, thank you for your valuable feedback, encouragement and support throughout my PhD candidature. To the executive administrators of the School of Education, especially Michelle Weston and Dierdre, thank you for your cooperation and support despite your tight schedule.

I also would like to thank my supportive family who have given me the greatest motivation throughout the journey. To my husband, thank you for your indescribable and unstinting support and love during the highs and lows of this venture. To my Dad, thank you for your never ending prayers and support. I will always remember your last word to always plead to Allah for every wish I want. I am so sad that you were not here to join my success and happiness as you have left us during the high time of my thesis submission. To my mom, thank you for listening, giving me confidence and always pushing me to do my best. To my daughters; Iman Izzati, Nurin Batrisyia and Syasya Athirah, your words of encouragement meant a lot to me than you can ever know. To the rest of my family, my brothers, sisters, relatives, and friends (Dr Annie, Dr Roslyn, Dr Zaiham, Dr Haiza, Sufar, Izyan, Reny, Fathin, Cath, Liza, Salina, Shikin, and others) thank you for supporting me in spirit.
My special thanks to all the students and teachers who made the time to participate in this study. I owe a great debt of gratitude to the school principals and teachers concerned who graciously allowed me to observe, interview, record their classes, and participate in the study.

My greatest gratitude is extended to the financial support of the Government of Brunei Darussalam and the support and facilitation from the Brunei High Commissioner in Canberra, throughout my stay in Brisbane, Australia. My thanks also go to the Ministry of Education, Brunei, specifically the Department of Schools, for the opportunity and support given to me to do my PhD.

My thesis could not have been completed without the fullest support and encouragement from my supervisors, family, friends and relatives. Thank you ALL. Words cannot express truly how much I appreciated your prayers, love and support for me.
Keywords
English as a second language, English as a foreign language, English as a medium of instruction, English language teaching and learning, second language reading comprehension, teaching of reading comprehension, reading strategies, language learning strategies.

Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)
ANZSRC code: 200303, English as a Second Language, 50%
ANZSRC code: 130207, LOTE, ESL and TESOL Curriculum and Pedagogy, 30%
ANZSRC code: 160506, Education Policy, 20%

Fields of Research (FoR) Classification
FoR code: 2003, Language Studies, 50%
FoR code: 1302, Curriculum and Pedagogy, 30%
FoR code: 1301, Education Systems, 20%
# Table of Contents

Abstract .......................................................................................................................... i  
Declaration by Author ................................................................................................. iii  
Acknowledgements ...................................................................................................... iv  
Table of Contents ........................................................................................................ vii  
List of Figures and Tables ........................................................................................... xii  
List of Appendices ........................................................................................................ xiii  
List of Abbreviations ................................................................................................. xiv  

## Chapter 1 Background of the Study ....................................................................... 1  
1.1 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 1  
1.2 Issues of EMI in an EFL Context ......................................................................... 2  
1.3 Reading Comprehension Strategies .................................................................... 3  
1.4 Theoretical Framework ....................................................................................... 6  
1.5 Statement of the Problem .................................................................................... 7  
1.6 Research Aims and Questions ............................................................................ 8  
1.7 Outline of the Thesis .......................................................................................... 8  

## Chapter 2 Context of the Study: Brunei Darussalam ............................................. 10  
2.1 Introduction ......................................................................................................... 10  
2.2 Malay and English Roles .................................................................................... 11  
2.3 The Concepts of ESL and EFL .......................................................................... 12  
2.4 Brunei Education System .................................................................................. 14  
   2.4.1 A brief history: emergence of English .......................................................... 14  
   2.4.2 Early history: English education in Brunei ................................................ 14  
   2.4.3 The bilingual education system ................................................................. 15  
   2.4.4 21st century national education system (SPN 21) ...................................... 15  
2.5 Issues around EMI .............................................................................................. 16  
2.6 The teaching of Reading Skills in English ......................................................... 18  
2.7 Issues of English Textbooks .............................................................................. 20  
2.8 Reading Assessment in Brunei .......................................................................... 21  
2.9 Summary ............................................................................................................. 22  

## Chapter 3 Literature Review ................................................................................. 24  
3.1 Introduction ......................................................................................................... 24  
3.2 English as a medium of instruction (EMI) .......................................................... 25  
   3.2.1 Empirical studies related to the implementation of EMI ............................. 26  
3.3 Theoretical Framework: Second Language Acquisition ..................................... 30  
   3.3.1 Activity Theory in Social Cultural Theory ................................................. 31  
      3.3.1.1 Engestrom’s activity theory and its relevance to the study ................. 32  
      3.3.1.2 A review of activity theory research in the field of SLA .................. 35  
   3.3.2 Summary ..................................................................................................... 38  
3.4 L2 Reading Comprehension ................................................................................. 38  
   3.4.1 Second language reading models ............................................................... 39  
3.5 Language Learning Strategies ............................................................................ 40  
   3.5.1 Definitions of language learning strategies (LLS) .................................... 41  
   3.5.2 Classification of language learning strategies (LLS) ................................. 41  
3.6 Reading Comprehension Strategies (RCS) ......................................................... 45  
   3.6.1 Studies on the learning and using of RCS ................................................ 48  
      3.6.1.1 L2 proficiency ....................................................................................... 48  
      3.6.1.2 Gender differences ............................................................................ 51  
      3.6.1.3 Reading strategies instruction ............................................................ 53  
   3.7 The Teaching of L2 Reading Comprehension .................................................... 55  
      3.7.1 Studies of teaching and learning of L2 reading in Brunei ...................... 56
Chapter 6 Students’ Experiences of Using Reading Comprehension Strategies

6.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 102
6.2 Summary of the Analysis Procedures ......................................................................... 103
6.3 Examples of the Reading Strategies Profiles of the Readers ...................................... 104
   6.3.1 Group 1: Readers with medium and high reading achievement levels who scored
            below their expected reading levels ............................................................ 104
       6.3.1.1 Reader 2 ......................................................................................... 104
   6.3.2 Group 2: Readers with medium and low reading achievement levels who scored
            above their expected reading levels ............................................................ 105
       6.3.1.2 Reader 25 ...................................................................................... 105
6.4 Types of Readers ......................................................................................................... 107
   6.4.1 Type 1: bottom-up readers .................................................................................. 108
   6.4.2 Type 2: top-down readers .................................................................................. 109
   6.4.3 Type 3: interactive readers ................................................................................ 110
6.5 Complexities of Learning RCS .................................................................................. 111
   6.5.1 Subject: EFL students .................................................................................... 111
       6.5.1.1 Vocabulary knowledge .................................................................... 103
       6.5.1.2 Nexus between pronunciation and spelling ....................................... 115
       6.5.1.3 Grammar ......................................................................................... 116
   6.5.2 Tools and object: reading approaches and aims of using RCS ......................... 118
       6.5.2.1 Previewing the text ......................................................................... 118
       6.5.2.2 Using background knowledge ............................................................. 121
       6.5.2.3 Self-evaluating ............................................................................... 123
       6.5.2.4 Self-inference .................................................................................. 124
       6.5.2.5 Re-reading ...................................................................................... 125
6.6 Managing EFL Related Issues .................................................................................... 127
   6.6.1 Using tools to manage learning ...................................................................... 127
       6.6.1.1 A physical tool: using a dictionary ................................................... 127
       6.6.1.2 A non-physical tool: reading strategies ............................................ 128
           6.6.1.2.1 Guessing the meaning of words .............................................. 128
           6.6.1.2.2 Ignoring the words and continue reading .................................. 130
   6.6.2 Utilisation of a community to manage learning ............................................... 130
       6.6.2.1 School and home community: teachers, peers and parents ............. 131
           6.6.2.1.1 Asking for help .................................................................... 131
6.7 Summary ................................................................................................................... 133

Chapter 7 Teachers’ Perceptions of RCS and its Implementation in EFL/EMI Classroom

7.1 Introduction ................................................................................................................ 136
7.2 Participants’ Backgrounds .................................................................................... 137
7.3 Teachers’ Perceptions ............................................................................................ 140
Chapter 8 Reading Comprehension Strategies Pedagogy in EFL/EMI Contexts

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Facilitating or Hindering Factors of Teaching in EFL/EMI Contexts

8.2.1 Rules and Norms

8.2.2 Tools

8.3 Summary

Chapter 9 Discussion and Conclusion

9.1 Overview of the Study

9.2 Research Question 1a: What are the Factors that Facilitate or Hinder the Learning of RCS among Year 6 Bruneian EFL Students in EFL/EMI settings?

9.2.1 Use and relationship of RCS and students’ reading achievements

9.2.2 Use and relationship of RCS and gender

9.2.3 Use and relationship of RCS and students’ reading approaches

9.2.4 Use and relationship of RCS and teachers’ reported teaching of RCS

9.2.5 Students’ EFL issues

9.3 Research Question 1b: What are the Factors that Facilitate or Hinder the Teaching of RCS among Year 6 Bruneian ESL Teachers in EFL/EMI Settings?

9.3.1 Teachers’ perceptions of RCS and students’ conditions as EFL learners

9.3.2 The policy of EMI

9.3.3 Examination orientated education system

9.4 Research Question 2a: How do Year 6 EFL Bruneian Students Manage the EMI and EFL Issues in the Learning of RCS in L2 RC Lessons?

9.5 Research Question 2b: How do Year 6 ESL Bruneian Teachers Manage
# List of Figures and Tables

**Figure 3.1:** Vygotsky’s mediated action triangle (from Cole & Engestrom, 1993)………………………………………………………………………………………………… 32

**Figure 3.2:** The Engestrom’s (1987) second generation activity system…………………………………… 32

**Figure 3.3:** The complexities of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC among Year 6 students and teachers in EMI/EFL settings……………………………………………………… 62

**Table 3.1:** Definitions of Language Learning Strategies and its Relevance to the Study……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 41

**Table 3.2:** Oxford’s 1990 & 2013 Classifications of LLS and their Relevance to the Study……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 44

**Table 4.1:** Number of Students’ Participants According to Schools’ Zones……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 70

**Table 4.2:** The Structure of English Reading Strategies Survey (Baker & Boonkit, 2004)……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 72

**Table 4.3:** Oxford’s (1989) Criteria of Mean Scores to Understand Language Learning Strategy use……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 74

**Table 4.4:** Phases of the Study……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………. 80

**Table 5.1:** Relationship of Students’ Use of Reading Strategies and Locations (Schools Zones)……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 92

**Table 5.2:** Relationship of Students’ Use of Reading Strategies in relations to Reading Process and Locations (School Zones)……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 93

**Table 5.3:** Reported Use of Reading Strategies by Students with High, Medium, and Low Reading Achievement……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 94

**Table 5.4:** Comparisons of Means Differences between RA levels in Reading Comprehension Strategies……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 94

**Table 5.5:** Reported Strategy Group of Reading Comprehension Strategies Used by Gender……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 95

**Table 5.6:** Relationship of Students’ Reported RCS and Teachers’ Reported RCS in their Teaching ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 96

**Table 5.7:** Reported Reading Comprehension Strategies used in different Stages of Reading by RA Levels……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 97

**Table 5.8:** Comparisons of Means Differences between RA Levels and Reported RCS used with respect to the Stages of Reading……………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 97

**Table 5.9:** Comparisons of Mean Difference between Genders in Reported RCS by reading process……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 98

**Table 5.10:** Relationship of Stages of Reading with respect to Students’ Reported RCS and Teachers’ Reported RCS in their Teaching of English Reading Comprehension……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 98

**Table 6.1:** Students’ Reading Comprehension Scores and Types of RCS Used in Reading Stages……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 258

**Table 6.2:** Students’ Scores in Reading Comprehension Task and Types of Reading Approaches Used……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… 107

**Table 7.1:** Demographics of the Teacher Participants………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………. 139
List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Student Self-Report Survey
Appendix 2: Teacher Self-Report Survey
Appendix 3: Reading Comprehension Stimulation Task
Appendix 4: Students Group Guide Interview
Appendix 5: Teacher Guide Interview
Appendix 6: Classroom Observations Field Notes
Appendix 7: Ethical Clearance Approval
Appendix 8: Table 6.1: Students’ Reading Comprehension Scores and Types of RCS Used in Reading Stages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>English as a medium of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
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<td>RC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>Reading comprehension strategies</td>
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<tr>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Language learning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>Teaching English as a second language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
Background of the Study

1.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to investigate the learning and teaching of reading comprehension strategies (RCS) in second language (L2) reading comprehension (RC) lessons among Year 6 students and teachers in Brunei primary schools. English is the medium of instruction (EMI) in classroom settings for Year 6 students and teachers in the English as a foreign language (EFL) environment of Brunei.

Reading is an essential skill in modern societies that is developed through teaching and learning, and is essential to learning in schools and beyond. Sloat et al. (2007) argue that students who fail to learn to read during primary level education may not develop an ability to read well in their secondary or tertiary stages of education. Therefore, students need to acquire the complex set of reading skills early as these are seen as fundamental for acquiring knowledge, participating in social and cultural life, being successful in a job and participating in lifelong learning at all stages of life (Grabe, 2009).

Moreover, it has been argued that reading is the most significant skill needed by foreign language students for academic success in English (e.g. Dabarera, et al., 2014; Ismail, 2015; Lee, 2012). This is because of the demand for English as a world language influences its uses in many countries in the world. This demand has resulted in the emergence of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in many education systems across the world (Jensen, et al., 2013; Coleman, 2006). For example, in Asian countries English plays a dominant role in language education policies, because governments and other societal forces such as schools, teachers and parents believe that proficiency in English is the basis of educational success (Baldauf et al., 2011). English is the dominant language of business, arts, education and culture (Tamtam et al., 2012). These claims suggests that reading in English is important in the countries where English is a second language (ESL), or a foreign language (EFL), and where English is used as a medium of instruction (EMI) in those countries’ education systems.

With regard to the importance of English reading, Brunei is no exception in its push to increase the number of competent English language readers. This trend is particularly evident in the
Brunei education system where English is the medium of instruction, but in a foreign language (EFL) context.

1.2 Issues of EMI in an EFL Context

Reading is a complicated process which not only includes the recognition of words but also involves a complex process of making meaning for a variety of purposes and in a range of contexts (Baghaei & Ravand, 2015). That is, it involves readers in explicitly understanding the text and deeply analysing the content (Yahya, 2010). It involves complex processes such as seeing, attention, focusing, perceiving, recalling, sense making, synthesising, analysing, interpreting, and pronouncing (Karatay, 2010 cited in Akkaya & Demirel, 2012). This means that reading is a challenging process both in a person’s first language (L1) but more particularly in a foreign language context. In the latter, reading comprehension comprises not only recognising or understanding individual words as we read sentences in a text, but readers need to build up mental representations of text thus requiring integration across a range of sources of information, from lexical features to knowledge concerning events in a different world (Koda, 2005). Hence, the learning and teaching of reading comprehension is a complex and challenging process for students and teachers in schools. This challenge leads to issues in learning and teaching of reading comprehension (RC) when it takes place in an EFL societal environment, with both students and teachers having to achieve and work in an EMI setting.

Previous research has revealed the diversity of the challenges and the problems found in EMI settings among EFL students in primary (Garton, 2013; Pearson, 2014), secondary (Hayes, 2008; Moon, 2005; Zacharias, 2013) and tertiary education contexts (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Byun et al., 2011; Evans & Morrison, 2011; Mahmud & Mirza, 2012; Mohamed & Banda, 2008). Suggested factors that may hinder EFL teaching and learning, which are aligned with the implementation of EMI in primary or secondary schools, include students’ English proficiency (Garton, 2014; Pearson 2014), teachers’ ability to teach in the English language used in classrooms and the lack of support for students and teachers (Hayes, 2008; Moon, 2005; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2007). Other factors that may hinder the implementation of EMI in tertiary education include: students low English proficiency in negotiating English language learning (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Byun et al., 2011; Evans & Morrison, 2011; Mahmud & Mirza, 2012; Mohamed & Banda, 2008); a teacher’s or lecturer’s lack of ability to teach in English (Byun et al., 2011; Kılıçkaya, 2006; Kerklaan et al., 2008; Klasses & De Graff, 2001), and limited English language use in the classroom (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Costa & Coleman, 2012; Evans, 2008; Wu, 2006). Thus,
the findings of these previous studies have established the challenges of implementing EMI in an EFL context, suggesting that overcoming these challenges may lead to the effective development of L2 RC in EFL/EMI settings. This current study was conducted to extend the findings from these previous studies by exploring ways of students and teachers manage the EMI challenges in learning and teaching RCS in L2 RC lessons.

Numerous studies (Dang, et al., 2013; Garton, 2014; Pearson, 2014; Salli & Tsui, 2005; Pinnock, 2009; Kyeunne, 2003) have examined the factors that may contribute to success and failure of EMI implementation. For example, Dang, et al. (2013) found out that EMI classrooms have been used as a language planning tool in order to promote students’ English proficiency to achieve success in academic in English. Garton (2014) found students’ levels of proficiency and limited resources as the challenges of EMI implementation. Pearson (2014) stated that lack of English language curriculum and materials, training, school supervision and teachers’ backgrounds as the factors impacting on the effectiveness of the implementation of EMI.

However, most of these studies have been conducted in secondary or tertiary contexts, for example, a study conducted by Belhiah and Elhami (2015) in six universities in the United Arab Emirates found that the effectiveness of EMI was impacted by the students’ low proficiency in English. The findings of these studies raise questions about whether they also have an effect in primary schools in EMI/EFL contexts. However, little is known about how primary students and teachers learn and teach RCS in L2 RC in EMI and EFL contexts. There is a need to know more about how these students and teachers deal with EMI in their learning and teaching of English reading comprehension.

1.3 Reading Comprehension Strategies

EFL/ESL educators have long been in search of answers to account for the fact that some students have great difficulty in ESL/EFL reading comprehension (Oxford, 2013). Many studies have been conducted in order to determine what influences the reading comprehension process. Interest has focused on a range of issues: the role of grammar (Akbari, 2014; Kobayashi, 2002; Koda, 2005); vocabulary knowledge (Sidek & Rahim, 2015; Ma & Lin, 2015; Moghadam, et al., 2012) and reading strategies (Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2006; Sheorey & Baboczky, 2008; Zhang, 2008). This current study was conducted to extend the findings from these previous studies by exploring if the factors identified in these studies have an effect on the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC.
One of the most discussed of these issues is the impact of the kinds of strategies students have to read beyond what is stated in the text (Naseri & Zaferanieh, 2012). Oxford (2011) stated that strategies are problem-oriented actions and techniques that are utilised in order to achieve comprehension. Strategy is also considered as a goal-directed action which can be conscious, unconscious or automatic (Anastasiou & Griva, 2009). Therefore, reading strategies have been defined as “specific, deliberate, goal-directed mental processes or behaviours, which control and modify a reader’s efforts to decode a text, understand words and construct the meaning of a text” (Anastasiou & Griva, 2009, p. 283-284).

These definitions imply that comprehension can be enhanced by utilising conscious or automatic techniques or actions that are used to solve comprehension problems. This highlights the importance of reading comprehension strategies (RCS) for the teaching and learning of English reading comprehension. However, little is known about how RCS are implemented in the learning and teaching of English reading comprehension, where both students and teachers have to manage learning and teaching in both EMI and EFL contexts. Specifically, there is a need to know more about the facilitating or hindering factors of EMI and EFL in the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI by students and teachers in an EFL context, and how they manage EMI and EFL issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC in EFL/EMI contexts for the development of L2 reading comprehension.

There have been studies that highlight the possibility that using certain RCS can improve reading comprehension (Baier, 2005; Clifford, 2008; Mehrdad, et al., 2012; Nordin, et.al, 2013; Sadjirin, 2013; Sporer & Brunstein, 2009; Zhang, 2008; Zoghi, et al., 2010). According to Cogmen & Saracaloglu, 2009), the use of RCS enhances reading comprehension and overcomes comprehension difficulties at both the word and sentence level. This is because, the use of RCS also has been found to be important, especially for those EFL learners who wanted to achieve high levels of English language literacy and success in academic reading (Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2006; Malcolm, 2009; Sadjirn, 2013; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). Such findings suggest that if readers use RCS when they read, they can facilitate their comprehension. Therefore, it is necessary to understand how EFL readers manage complexities in learning appropriate RCS, in the EMI setting, to develop their L2 reading comprehension.
While research has indicated the importance of RCS in reading comprehension in particular, it is also evident from a large body of research that there are different factors that can affect strategy employment such as age, aptitude, learning styles, gender, level of language competence, and reading instruction (Lau, 2006; Lee, 2012; Ness, 2011; Zhang, 2008).

According to Chamot (2004) the use of reading strategies was also determined by language proficiency levels. Studies have revealed that less competent L2 students employ a relatively limited range of strategies, for example, poor readers display lower-level text processing skills and engage in ‘bottom-up’ strategies (Geladari, et al., 2010). Moreover, poor readers were also found to focus on decoding single words and seldom engaged in monitoring comprehension (Cotterall, 1990; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). It was also reported that competent L2 readers seemed to use higher-level semantic processes (Nassaji, 2004) and used top-down processing strategies (Geladari, et al., 2010). Competent readers are more efficient in adapting strategies to their learning needs (Green & Oxford, 1995; Nordin, et al., 2013; Oxford, 2003; Wenden, 2002). These reports indicate that language proficiency is one of the factors that may impinge on the use of RCS when attempting to learn English as a second language.

A large body of research also suggests that gender plays an important role in the number of strategies used in language learning, particularly in reading comprehension among adult learners (Green & Oxford, 1995; Lee, 2012; Saengpakdeejit, 2014; Taki & Soleimani, 2012). Moreover, several studies have found that adult females are more skilful at applying reading strategies qualitatively (Young & Oxford, 1997; Clark, et al., 2008). Lee (2012) for example, found that females tend to be more active strategy users than their male counterparts. These studies suggest that gender is also one of the contributing factors that may impact the use of RCS. However, although numerous studies have been carried out in the ESL/EFL context among adult students, there has been very little research examining gender differences in children’s RCS use (Mc Geown et al., 2013). It is also necessary to understand the complexities of students’ experiences in learning and using RCS within EMI/EFL contexts, in terms of gender differences, as this will provide insights about the importance of gender in impacting the learning of RCS in the L2 RC classrooms.

There is also consistent evidence that reading instruction plays an important role in RCS use, in order to enhance students’ reading comprehension in primary (Ness, 2011), secondary (Melanlioglu, 2014; Negari & Askani, 2014) and tertiary levels (e.g.Akkakoson, 2013; Raisi & Roustaei, 2013; Mehrdad et al., 2012). Ness (2012) thus claimed that teachers need to teach a variety of reading strategies to enhance students’ abilities in reading comprehension. This study
suggests that reading strategies instruction plays an important role in influencing students’ use of RCS in reading English text. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a deeper understanding of the teaching of RCS by EFL/EMI teachers in the L2 RC lessons.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

This study was framed within the field of second language acquisition (SLA) theory, drawing on notions that second languages are acquired by different learners, in different situations, in different ways, depending on contextual variables and the personal and socio-cultural circumstances of the learners (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009). However, while SLA deals with issues around how a second language is learned in general, one current emerging issue of SLA studies in the non-dominant English speaking countries (NESC) is of particular relevance for this study: that is issues around learning and teaching of RCS in the EFL/EMI contexts. The use of a foreign language as an educational medium is therefore linked to concepts of acquiring or learning a second language. As a consequence, it is important to take into consideration aspects of second language acquisition theories that can illuminate the focus on students’ and teachers’ experiences with English RCS, as investigated in this study. The socio-cultural perspective was chosen to describe such general aspects of second language learning in order to support the analysis of the study.

One of the focuses of SLA studies is to explore how languages are learnt and taught. In this study, the focus was to find out the facilitating or hindering factors around the learning and teaching of L2 RC in Brunei primary schools, by specifically looking at RCS classroom practices in English reading comprehension lessons. In order to frame this particular issue, a second generation of Engeström’s (2001) activity theory was used. By referring to this theory, relationships between individual backgrounds and other environmental factors can be established and explained.

Activity theory explains that activities are connected to social interactions. This concept states that activity is motivated by either social or biological needs. This theory could be useful in understanding the importance of individual background and social factors in contributing to the implementation of particular RCS in their learning and teaching of English reading comprehension. The social environment in which the interaction occurs determines the activity system which can be categorized as affordances, i.e. factors that promote learning and constraints that deter it (Allen, 2010). Hence, this theory could explain the facilitating or hindering factors in learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC and management within individual students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and the
social factors that may impact the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC within EFL and EMI contexts.

The details of the theoretical frameworks that underpin the study are discussed further in Chapter 3.

1.5 Statement of the Problem

Given the diversity of the challenges and the problems found in EMI settings among EFL teachers and students in primary, secondary and tertiary education, students and teachers face a challenging task in learning and teaching of reading comprehension in EMI in the EFL classroom where English is not the main language of everyday communication. These challenges include: students’ English proficiency, teachers’ ability to teach in English, language use in classrooms, limited provision of support for teachers and students, teachers’ limited ability to teach in English and limited English language use in the classroom.

There is a great deal of evidence supporting the important role of RCS in facilitating reading comprehension (Grabe, 2009; Nordin, et al., 2013). The importance of RCS is increasingly recognised in ESL/EFL classrooms (Fazeli, 2010). Moreover, numerous studies have highlighted the use of RCS to enhance reading comprehension and of factors affecting learners’ strategy choices. Empirical evidence has shown strong support for the significant relationship between learners’ strategy use and a variety of factors such as proficiency, achievement, reading instruction and gender.

While most of these studies have focused on adult learners, limited studies have focused on primary schools students’ use of RCS in EFL in an EMI learning environment. Given that primary EFL students and their teachers have to achieve the learning and teaching of RCS in an EMI setting, there is a need to understand the complexities in terms of the relationships between the RCS implementation and the students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and EMI and EFL social settings.

The following section presents the aims and the key research questions of the study.
1.6 Research Aims and Questions

This study focused on the investigation of the facilitating or hindering factors that contribute to learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EFL/EMI contexts, and exploration of ways in which Year 6 EFL students and ESL teachers manage the issues of EFL and EMI in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

The following research questions (RQs) directed the study:

1a. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the learning of RCS among Year 6 EFL Bruneian students in EFL/EMI settings?

b. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the teaching of RCS among Year 6 EESL Bruneian teachers in EFL/ EMI settings?

2a. How do Year 6 EFL Bruneian students manage the EFL and EMI issues in the learning of RCS in L2 RC?

b. How do Year 6 ESL Bruneian teachers manage the EFL and EMI issues in teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI?

1.7 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 has presented the background for the study, research problem, theoretical framework, research aims and questions for the study and the significance of the study.

The second chapter reviews the contexts of the study. This chapter briefly discusses the contextual justification for the investigation of the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI by Year 6 students and teachers in EFL environment in Brunei. It outlines the roles of Malay and English in Brunei and then discusses the bilingual education policy of Brunei that provides the context of the study and the situation of the two languages of education in Brunei, Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and English language. It also looks at the implementation of EMI policy in Brunei Darussalam. This provides evidence for the importance of the English language as a medium of instructions (EMI) in Brunei education. It also explores English reading practices in Brunei’s classrooms, and briefly describes the reading activities in the subject of English language, in order to show the importance of English reading in Brunei primary education.
Chapter 3 reviews the literature that underpins the study. It reviews empirical literature on the impact of EMI in classroom settings, in order to understand the issue from a global perspective, followed by the theoretical basis of the study, drawing from the socio-cultural perspective, in particular activity theory that have influenced the SLA approaches. Then language learning strategies (LLS) are discussed, of which RCS form an important part. The RCS, and empirical studies of the use of RCS among adult and young learners, are discussed. Empirical studies of RCS with adults are discussed in this chapter, as few studies have been conducted with young learners. This provides contextual information and understanding of the use of RCS by young learners. A discussion of concepts of L2 (language 2, or second language) reading comprehension, teaching of reading comprehension (RC), and studies of the teaching and learning of RC in Brunei contexts, are presented. The conceptual framework for the research is also established on the basis of the review of the literature.

Chapter 4 discusses the research design and methodology used in the study, and justifies the application of a mixed methods research approach. Details about participants, instruments, data collection, and data analyses are presented.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the analysis of the student survey that focuses on RQ1. Descriptive statistics and bivariate analyses are used to report the numerical data.

Chapter 6 discusses the analysis of the data obtained from the students’ stimulation task of reading comprehension and group interviews. These data used to report findings related to the RQ1 and 2.

Chapter 7 focuses on RQ 1 and 2 and presents an in-depth analysis of the teachers’ interviews about the teachers’ perceptions about their teaching of RCS; data are comprised the classroom observations and teachers’ interviews in the qualitative phase.

Chapter 8 is devoted to the analysis of the teachers’ interviews and classroom observations that focus on RQ1 and 2. The data are drawn from teachers’ interviews in the qualitative phase.

Chapter 9 discusses key findings in relation to the research questions. It identifies limitations and provides some implications for future research and education practice in teaching and using reading comprehension strategies in L2 classroom.
Chapter 2
Context of the Study: Brunei Darussalam

2.1 Introduction

An interesting situation exists in Brunei, where English is not widely used in the community even though Brunei adopted English as a second language (ESL) in 1984. The adoption of ESL, requires society to keep up with the demands of English, which is positioned as the world’s language for accessing education, international business, science and technology (Hamid, 2009). One of the outcomes of this focus on English is the prevalence of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in all levels of the Brunei education system.

However, for many of the students in Brunei, English is not viewed as relevant within their immediate social context as almost all the students in Brunei only learn English within their classrooms. Norsidah (2011) argued that Bruneian students seldom have the opportunity to converse in English outside the classroom. Teachers, too, have limited opportunities to converse in English outside the classroom and the teaching of English is difficult, because English is often their second or third language (Rahmawati, 2012). This means that English in school is therefore a foreign language to both students and teachers. Although the societal environment of English in Brunei is a foreign language, instruction in almost all subjects in Brunei’s schools is in English. This means that students and teachers in Brunei face unique challenges in the learning and teaching of English, as well as in the other school subjects that are taught in English. This chapter provides a context for these challenges by describing the interplay between first language (Malay) and English that impacts the students’ and teachers’ classroom practices.

The first section outlines the roles of Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and English in the education system. Then, the second sections discusses the bilingual education policy of Brunei. However, this study focused on English language, as it investigated the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI by teachers and students in the EFL educational environment in Brunei.

The third section discusses the implementation of EMI policy in Brunei Darussalam. This explains the importance of English language as a medium of instruction (EMI) in the Brunei education system.
As the focus of this study was on reading comprehension, the fourth section of this chapter addresses English reading practices in Brunei’s classrooms. This section briefly describes the current reading activities in English language, to illustrate the importance of English reading in Brunei primary education. The next section provides the issues of English textbooks in the teaching of L2 reading comprehension. The final section presents the reading assessment in Brunei and the summary of the chapter.

The following section explains the roles of Malay and English in the Brunei education system.

2.2 Malay and English Roles

Brunei is a Muslim kingdom. The Sultan and government of Brunei have their own ideology called Melayu Islam Beraja, known locally as MIB (Malay Islamic Monarchy). Martin (2008) notes that MIB supports the Malay Sultanate, the absolute monarchy, as well as Brunei’s historical and Islamic values. This shows the importance of the Brunei Malay ethnic identity, Malay culture, Malay language (the official / national language), Islam and the nation (Martin, 2008).

While standard Malay (Bahasa Melayu), is the official language, Brunei Malay is the language of communication among Bruneians in Brunei. According to Martin (2008), Brunei Malay symbolises Brunei’s national identity and is also increasingly used in informal or formal contexts and interethnic communication. However, while Brunei Malay captures national identity, it has not been used as the language of education in Brunei. Standard Malay, alongside English, is the language of literacy and education. These two languages play an important role in Brunei’s education although, in practice, English is perceived as the more important of the two. This view is reflected in the SPN21 education policy, where the greater proportion of subjects in schools are taught through English medium (MOE, 2013).

In Brunei, standard Malay and English are highly valued as written and oral languages for education, rather than the other indigenous languages; for example Tutong, Belait, Dusun, Bisayas and Muruts (Jones et al., 2010). The Language and Literature Bureau was established by the government of Brunei in 1961 to support standard Malay literacy by publishing varieties of literature such as books, anthologies, journals and periodicals in standard Malay for education purposes.
English and Malay are not only used in schools for education purposes; they also play an important role in the media, including newspapers, radio and television, and electronic sources of information. The Brunei community accesses daily newspapers in Brunei in both standard Malay and English. The Borneo Bulletin and Brunei Times are in English and Media Permata is in standard Malay.

The daily television news is also presented in both standard Malay and English; for example Warta Berita is in standard Malay and airs every day at 8pm, whereas News at 10, in English, airs daily at 10 pm. Both the Malay and English versions cover both local and international news and views. Bruneians may also purchase a satellite dish in order for them to access BBC, CNN, English and Malay movies, all broadcasting for 24 hours a day, mostly in English.

The use of radio in Brunei started in 1965, when ‘Radio Brunei’ began broadcasting on two stations, one in Malay and one in English. They broadcast for 10 hours daily. Since the 1990s, many changes have taken place in recent years in terms of media ability and choices for the young listeners (Jones, 1996). There are two English language radio stations, the London’s Capital FM and Capital Gold broadcasting 24 hours a day. All the developments of newspapers, radio, and television have greatly increased the exposure of both languages to Bruneians.

2.3 The concepts of ESL and EFL.

An interesting situation exists in Brunei: Is Brunei an ESL or EFL environment? In Brunei, there is no active role for English outside the classroom in the government primary schools (Norlipah, 2011). English is supposed to be the second language for the people in Brunei, however it has not come into common usage and the language is only used for the purpose of teaching and learning in the classroom. Limawati (2007) confirmed in her study that limited use of English was evident in both students’ and teachers’ language use in the classroom. This scenario suggests that English is considered as a foreign language to students in Brunei government primary schools.

Therefore, the concepts of ESL/EFL are explained in order to understand the situation of English in Brunei. Both ESL and EFL involve the learning of English by speakers of other languages. However, these two concepts differ in terms of learning and teaching environments. Language learning in an EFL environment takes place largely inside the classroom, but learning a language in the ESL context may or may not take place in a classroom setting (Ellis, 2005). That is, learners may learn English formally but also informally outside the classroom such as when they
communicate in English among themselves in real contexts, listening or watching English TV news programs or reading English newspapers.

English is not normally used as the medium of instruction, or in the community in an EFL context where learners do not hear and speak English outside their classrooms (Eskey, 2005). EFL teachers are usually not native speakers but may have learnt English through formal education or work experience, and they may not be able to speak English like native speakers (Ellis, 2005). In many EFL contexts, the community does not provide support for the learning of English (Eskey, 2005). That is, learners rely heavily upon teachers for language learning because the classroom is the only place to learn English. When English is taught as an L2 in a country where the dominant language is not English, the educational programme is referred to as an EFL programme (ibid). Moreover, according to Ellis (2005), the role of the teacher in an EFL setting is more as a “sole provider of knowledge and experience”.

The researcher’s anecdotal experience, as a teacher who has taught in several primary schools in Brunei between 1994 and 2009, is that English is rarely used in the school community, where the majority of teachers and students come from an L1 Malay ethnic background. This results in low competencies among teachers and students using English as their second language (L2). Limawati (2007) found this in her study in Temburong upper primary schools in Brunei, conducted through informal observations and interviews with students. Limawati concluded that English was seldom used in informal communication between teachers and students outside the classroom. Based on the definitions of ESL and EFL, and the use of English in Brunei, it can be argued that Brunei teachers and students work in an EFL environment. In addition, even though English in Brunei is a foreign language, English is also used as a medium of instruction (EMI).

As a result of the environments found in the community and in classrooms in EMI and EFL contexts, students may have difficulties learning English because of the limited contexts in which to practice; consequently, their comprehension of English may be affected. This, in turn, may affect students’ ability to develop proficiency in English, and also hinder their comprehension development when they read EFL texts. This study investigated students’ and teachers’ experiences in this context, in order to generate a deeper understanding of how reading comprehension develops in this EFL/EMI environment.

The next section discusses Brunei’s education system.
2.4 Brunei’s Education System

This section offers a historical perspective of the emergence of English in the nation and then provides an overview of the history of English education in Brunei, discussing also the education system in Brunei.

2.4.1 A brief history: emergence of English.

Brunei was first in contact with English (and the English) in 1839. English came to Brunei when James Brook, an English adventurer, helped the King to put down a rebellion. As a reward, the King appointed him as a governor. Meanwhile, the British North Borneo Company was expanding in Brunei. In 1888 Brunei became a British protectorate, a status that lasted until 1983 (Jones et al., 2010). During the protectorate, the English language entered Brunei Darussalam. Brunei’s royal court used Malay for its functions whereas English was the language of the British administration. In 1906, the English connection to Brunei became official with the start of the British Residential in which English gradually acquired an important status in the country (Poedjosoedarmo, 2004).

2.4.2 Early history: English education in Brunei.

Formal education in Brunei began in the British residential period of 1906-1959. The first Malay vernacular school was opened in the capital of Brunei in 1912. The number of schools around the country increased once oil was discovered in 1920. There were several private English and Chinese schools, and over 24 Malay schools. The private English and Chinese schools mainly served the children of staff in the British Malayan Petroleum Company. The first government English school was opened in 1951 and students received all of their instruction in English. The first English secondary schools were opened two years later. At the time, even greater prestige was given to English-medium education (Abdullah & Osman, 2010). However, there were problems with English medium education during the British residential period. First, there was a shortage of trained English teachers. Second, the British authorities’ policy was to widen the spread of English medium education, which promoted ‘separatism’ and there was no attempt to introduce a national education policy (Poedjosoedarmo, 2004). At the end of the residential period the introduction of Malay as the medium of instruction to all schools was proposed but never implemented. As a consequence the two separate streams of education, Malay and English, continued. The first Malay
medium secondary schools were established in 1966. However, in general, these Malay medium schools catered for students who were less academically gifted.

### 2.4.3 The bilingual education system.

In 1984, the sistem pendidikan Dwibahasa or bilingual education policy was introduced and fully implemented a year later. This policy mandated both Malay (Bahasa Melayu) and English as the languages of education in Brunei.

Under the bilingual policy, the allocation of time for the two languages in primary education clearly showed the importance of both languages, where Malay was introduced as a medium of instruction from lower primary pre-school to year 3, for all subjects except English language, which was taught in English. However, in upper primary years 4 to 6, all subjects were taught in English except Malay language, Islamic religious knowledge, physical education, arts and handicrafts and civics. In lower secondary, Malay, Islamic religious knowledge and history were taught in Malay, while other subjects were taught in English. In the upper secondary, only Malay language was taught in Malay. However, to some extent, medium of instruction depended on the students’ choice of stream. Those students who chose to focus on Malay language and/or Islamic religious studies would have more subjects taught through the medium of Malay.

### 2.4.4 21st century national education system (SPN21).

In 2009, in support of the country’s aspiration to ensure that school education remained relevant in an era of globalisation, a new 21st Century National Education System or Sistem Pendidikan Abad ke 21 (Malay acronym is SPN21) was implemented in Brunei. It emphasised and raised the importance of English as a second language, aiming to comprehensively develop and enhance the Brunei education system for the future. The aim of this reform was to produce students who are independent, life-long learners and who can meet the demands of the English language dominated life of this new information age (MOE, 2013).

Since 2009, English has played a crucial role in the SPN21 system as from year 1 onwards all subjects are taught in English except for Malay-based subjects; therefore Bahasa Melayu, Malay Islamic Monarchy or Melayu Islam Beraja (Malay acronym is MIB) and Islamic religious knowledge (IRK) continue to be taught in Malay. However, Arts and Crafts, Civics and Physical
Education can be taught either in English or Malay. As a result, English is now embedded in all years of schooling, and across the majority of subjects in both primary and secondary schools.

In secondary schools from Years 7 to 9 all core subjects such as English language, mathematics and science are taught and learnt in English, whereas Malay language, MIB and IRK are taught in Malay. Meanwhile, in upper secondary, from Year 10 to 11, almost all the optional subjects such as Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, History and Economics are taught in English. The exception is IRK and other Malay based subjects, such as Malay literature (‘Kesusteran Melayu’) or Arts. At the tertiary level, English is a core course in the first year for all students. The language of instruction at university level is English for all subjects except Malay language, Malay literature, MIB, all of which are taught in Malay, and Islamic studies which are taught in a combination of Malay and Arabic (MOE, 2013).

Hence, it can be seen that education is the central contributor to language development in Brunei, where both English and Malay are the media of instruction in Brunei’s education system. According to Norsidah (2011), most Bruneian children view Brunei Malay as the language they use socially and English is not viewed in the same way. Norazmah (2010) found that Year 6 students mostly perceive the learning of English as a task that must be mastered in order to pass the Primary Examination Certificate (Malay acronym is PSR) at the end of Year 6. However, within the new SPN21 education system, English is deemed important in realising the mission of SPN21 to raise these students’ achievements in the core subjects: English, Mathematics and Science. These subjects are fully taught in English in schools.

The next section discusses issues surrounding the implementation of EMI in Brunei primary education, as the discussion of these issues provides a deeper understanding of why learning and teaching of reading in English, particularly in upper primary education, may be a challenge for many students and teachers.

2.5 Issues around EMI

Despite the importance attributed to English in the current context, specifically as part of EMI education policy, in general, students’ English proficiency has yet to match the developmental demands required. Bruneian students’ ability to use English has been criticised, as the results in English ‘O’ level tests are very poor (Coluzzi, 2011).
From previous research (e.g. Akbari, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2013; Belhiah & Elhami, 2015; Garton, 2014; Nguyen, 2011; Pearson, 2014; Sert, 2008; Zacharias, 2013) on the impact of the implementation of EMI studies, conducted in many parts of the world where English is taught as a second or foreign language, it is evident that teachers experienced challenges in implementing EMI, such as a lack of, or inadequate, English language curriculum and materials, and the lack of training and school supervision in relation to the teaching and learning of English as a second language and teachers’ education backgrounds. These studies also found that factors such as students’ low English proficiency, teacher supply, methodologies, materials, training and professional development hindered the implementation of EMI. These findings are also evident in the Bruneian context where teachers experience difficulties in schools, caused by such factors as teachers’ inadequate educational background, a lack of in-service training, curriculum issues (Norsidah, 2013), and a lack of English materials and support (Norlipah, 2011). Given these challenges, it can be argued that teachers have faced both positive and negative impacts of the implementation of EMI in schools. These impacts are not only experienced by Bruneian teachers, but their students too.

Previous local studies found that the low levels of students’ English ability were due to a lack of oral language skills; poor vocabulary knowledge (Limawati, 2007; Nadia, 2007; Norazmah, 2010); inadequate reading habits (Hamidah, 2007; Rahmawati, 2012), and unsatisfactory reading achievements (Rahmawati, 2012). These studies reported that one of the reasons for students’ low English ability is their low levels of reading achievement. In support of this finding, the National Study of Student Competencies in Mathematics and English (Anderson, 2008) provided evidence of the factors that contributed to students’ low English competencies in Brunei. They found low reading level results in benchmark testing. Thus, this also provides evidence for difficulties of students reading in English. Previous research has shown that reading strategies can improve reading comprehension (e.g. Baier, 2005; Clifford, 2008; Denton, et al., 2015; Hashemi, et al., 2014; Küçükoğlu, 2013; Manoli & Papadopoulou, 2014; Sporer, et al., 2009; Yukselir, 2014; Zhang, 2008). Reviewing these learners’ factors, it is clear that reading strategies have been adequately investigated in western countries, however, limited research has been done in EMI/EFL settings among primary students.

English comprises several basic skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. Of these skills, reading is especially important for foreign language learners who use English as a source of information e.g. in textbooks written in English. The ability to read written English material is essential in this globalised world (Fazeli, 2010). It has been argued that reading proficiency is the access door to knowledge and is essential for success in all academic subjects.
(Fazeli, 2010). In Brunei, reading is taught as part of the English language subject but it is prioritised because of its key role in basic education, as per the SPN21 syllabus. Reading is the basis for learning and is the important skill which all pupils need to acquire (MOE, 2013). Due to its importance and relevance to this thesis, the next section describes the teaching of reading skills in English language, in order to understand the complexities of the teaching of reading comprehension strategies in EFL/EMI contexts.

2.6 The Teaching of Reading Skills in English

Brunei has a centralised system of education. The Curriculum Development Centre (CDD) in the Ministry of Education provides the country with the national curriculum. The CDD plays a major role in designing the syllabi, teachers’ guides, teaching aids, textbooks and workbooks for all subjects that are taught, both in government and non-government primary and secondary schools.

Before the SPN21 syllabus was introduced, an approach to teaching English language for students in primary levels, called reading language acquisition (RELA), had been used (Ng, 2001). This program included many mainstream or ‘best practices’, as determined by previous research into primary English teaching in countries such as Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand. Examples of best practice were ‘big books’, ‘the shared book approach’ and ‘the whole language approach’. RELA was eventually modified by the introduction of a topic based syllabus accompanied by primary English materials called Primary English for Brunei Darussalam (acronym, PEBD), to provide a more relevant local context. The teachers were provided with the syllabus and the primary English materials (teacher’s guidebook, pupil’s book and workbook) that contained the underlying principles and classroom methods appropriate to the RELA program. Moreover, the teaching of reading strategies for upper primary levels incorporated the teaching of English language according to themes; for example: home, health, travel, light and colour, festivals and celebration. However, a lack of detail about the teaching of reading strategies was evident in the Teachers’ Guide Book (CDD, 2008). This book did not support specific strategies, rather it only recommended the use of teaching practices such as sustained silent reading (SSR), guided reading, KWL (‘what I know’, ‘what I want to learn’ and ‘what I have learned’) as comprehension strategies. This was problematic for teachers as they were not given details of the specific comprehension strategies they were expected to teach by using teaching practices such as SSR, guided reading, or KWL.
When the new curriculum in the SPN21 system was introduced in 2009, the teaching of reading skills in English in pre-school to year 3, focused on words and phrases before progressing to sentence recognition and reading paragraphs. This means that from pre-school to year 3 level, students are taught how to read using a phonics approach. Meanwhile, the teaching of reading skills in English language for upper primary levels (Year 4 to Year 6) in the new curriculum focuses on various aspects: guiding the learners to extract specific information from a text, with teachers guiding and showing learners how to use dictionaries, exposing learners to a variety of texts in order to help develop their reading skills for different purposes and motivating learners to read extensively. Thus the new syllabus emphasises the teaching and learning of reading strategies in English reading comprehension lessons. By drawing on these strategies as they read, learners gain comprehension in reading (MOE, 2013).

However, the developers of the new SPN21 curriculum did not provide textbooks to accompany the teaching manuals or specify how to teach reading in the ESL classroom. The curriculum documents only prescribed themes (such as costumes, arts and handicrafts, places around the world and prehistoric animals) for teaching. Thus, teachers are left to design their own approaches and strategies to teach reading in English lessons. This suggests there are fundamental changes to teachers’ roles, and more information is needed about the impact on teachers of designing their own approaches and strategies in teaching of RCS in English reading comprehension lessons.

Furthermore, the new SPN21 curriculum still places important value on the teaching of reading in the English language at the upper primary level. The teaching of reading focuses on ‘the teaching and learning of reading comprehension strategies in second language reading lessons, as learners gain comprehension in reading’ (MOE, 2013, p.2). Based on the SPN21 curriculum, the teaching of reading in English language should include the teaching of reading comprehension strategies as a tool to enhance readers’ comprehension and to produce effective readers. However, due to limited information on learning, therefore, there is a need to understand students’ perspectives on how they experience using or learning RCS in EFL/EMI classrooms.

The next section discusses the issues surrounding the teaching materials used for the teaching of L2 reading comprehension in the classroom. This provides insights into the contribution of textbooks in guiding teachers in their preparation of reading lessons.
2.7 Issues of English Textbooks

Prior to the SPN21 syllabus, the teaching and learning of English reading comprehension was associated with the Primary English for Brunei Darussalam (PEBD) textbooks that have been used since 1996. These include a student’s book and workbook as well as teachers’ manuals that specify how to teach reading in a second language in the classroom. However, the use of PEBD textbooks, while well intended, may have led to issues that are outlined in the following paragraphs.

First, the PEBD textbooks used by the teachers were poorly designed for the teaching and learning of ESL reading comprehension. The National Study of Student Competencies in Mathematics and English (NCSSME) (Anderson, 2008) examined the textbooks and found that the texts were designed for teaching oral English skills and vocabulary. They predominantly contained lists and/or highly repetitive and predictable texts. Reading for meaning was devalued because there was little meaning to be explored beyond what was given. Students were discouraged from developing a range of text processing skills because all they needed to do was to match words the teacher provided to find and copy their answers. As a result, according to Norlipah (2011), Brunei students have difficulties in linking ideas across texts and making simple inferences because they have not had enough exposure to a range of texts.

Second, according to Smith (2008) there is a large amount of content in the English curriculum which needs to be covered by teachers in Brunei. Hence the pressure to meet the requirements of the curriculum through teaching to the textbook has meant there is little time for teachers to accommodate other learning needs.

Third, the use of textbooks was criticised in a study of textbooks in Brunei conducted by Asmah (2001). She argued that these books were very prescriptive and so comprehensively written that teachers in the government schools became dependent on them to teach their lessons. She further claimed that while the detailed guidance helped teachers to implement the curriculum, the teachers’ dependence led them to teach as prescribed by the textbooks. The reading comprehension material in the textbook was in the traditional format of a reading passage followed by questions about the content and vocabulary. As a result of this structure, the teaching of reading comprehension consisted mainly of reading the texts accompanied by exercises in the worksheet for students to complete in a given time (Chamberlain, 2008). Furthermore, Anderson (2008) found that the reading passages in the textbooks were designed more for teaching oral English skills and
vocabulary. Thus, this may lead teachers to simply testing reading comprehension rather than teaching reading comprehension strategies (Chamberlain, 2008).

Due to the drawbacks identified in these PEBD textbooks, in the new revised curriculum, textbooks were no longer provided to the teachers. Currently, therefore, teachers are no longer given guidelines in terms of textbooks to help them to prepare for their lessons in the classrooms. However, PEBD textbooks still can be used by teachers as their reference to teaching of English in the classroom. Questions may arise as to how the new revised curriculum influences their teaching of RCS in reading comprehension lessons.

Another important aspect of the teaching of reading comprehension in English, that needs to be considered in this current study, is how reading is assessed in schools. This is pertinent as it highlights the complexities of the teaching of reading in EFL/EMI contexts. The next section discusses this in more detail.

2.8 Reading Assessment in Brunei

School assessment practices in Brunei primary education overemphasise the written examination. Tests and examinations dominate in schools resulting in a strong emphasis in the core subjects and their assessments (Mundia, 2010). Primary education in Brunei is examination oriented rather than skills oriented, for example, standardised examinations are conducted on the completion of Year 6 for those continuing to secondary level and are in English. At the end of primary school, Year 6 children sit for a national examination, the Primary School Assessment (acronym PSR) which is written in English. This examination assesses students’ reading skills in an English language paper. Students’ Year 6 reading comprehension performance is assessed in the written English language paper in the PSR. The English language paper consists of two papers: Paper I assesses students’ writing skills, and Paper II assesses students’ reading comprehension, grammar and vocabulary skills. The reading comprehension section in Paper II comprises 15 marks. Five marks are allocated for the ‘reference’ questions, five marks for vocabulary questions in a multiple choice form and five marks for the reading comprehension questions in a subjective form. Altogether the reading comprehension consists of 15 marks out of 50 marks for the English language paper. This means that 35 marks are allocated for various grammar sections. This may lead teachers to focus more on grammar than on comprehension. Research by Mundia (2010) suggests that teachers in Brunei focus on what is examined in their teaching.
Bourke (2006) has argued that teachers in Brunei diligently follow the old textbooks provided for them because they are aligned with the examination-oriented education system. Thus, teachers are directed to focus on and emphasise only what is examined (Mundia, 2010). This current study has investigated if this remains the case in teaching English reading comprehension in the context of the SPN21.

2.9 Summary

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the learning and teaching of reading comprehension strategies (RCS) in EMI by students and teachers in EFL in Brunei. Having discussed the local context of the study, there are several calls for further research to be conducted that support the need for this study.

First, education is the central contributor to language development in Brunei, where both English and Malay are media of instruction in the education system. However, the Ministry of Education, has put greater emphasis on the development of English language in order to produce students who are independent, life-long learners and who can meet the demands for English in the information age (MOE, 2013). In relation to the importance of English, the SPN21 specifies two major roles of English in primary and secondary education. First, English is mandated as the medium of instruction (EMI) for the learning and teaching of English and other content subjects such as Mathematics, Science, Social studies, and Computing. This has highlighted multifaceted issues for both students and teachers in the EFL environment of Brunei. These issues include the poorly designed textbooks, limited English resources, lack of training and workshops, teachers’ teaching backgrounds, limited use of English in classrooms as well as minimal use of English outside of classrooms, students’ low English proficiency and curriculum issues. The impact of these issues undermines the implementation of EMI in schools.

Second, English is a compulsory subject in schools. One of the basic goals of the SPN21 education system is for students to be proficient in, and to process, the content in the English syllabus, in each of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among these skills, reading is seen as the fundamental tool to facilitate students to succeed in education from primary levels onwards. In light of the importance of reading, comprehension is the major goal of reading. Previous research has shown that factors that may contribute to reading comprehension difficulties include: lacking vocabulary knowledge, lacking oral communication skills, poorly developed comprehension and reading strategies. Among these, reading strategies have been given much
attention, especially in ESL/EFL contexts. It is evident from previous research that reading strategies can enhance reading comprehension. The low reading level results in benchmark testing also provide evidence for the lack of effective reading comprehension strategies in Brunei primary schools. However, few studies have focused on the use of RCS among EMI/EFL primary students. In the Bruneian context, there is a gap in the literature in research investigating and identifying the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI by students and teachers in EFL settings; in particular, factors that facilitate or hinder the learning and teaching of RCS and how they manage the interplay between EMI and EFL in the classroom. The present study addresses these gaps and represents the first study of this nature to be conducted in the Bruneian context.

The theoretical and empirical justifications for the study are discussed in the next chapter: the review of the literature.
Chapter 3
Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

The development of L2 reading comprehension is vital in contexts where English is the medium of instruction (EMI) and also a foreign language (EFL). In Brunei, English is a foreign language to a majority of students at all levels, and at the same time English is the medium of instruction to subjects like Mathematics, Science, Social Studies and Integrated Communication Technology (ICT), commencing in primary schools. Thus, the development of L2 reading comprehension has been a challenge to Year 6 classes in Brunei that take place in an English as a foreign language (EFL) environment where both students and teachers have to achieve and work through EMI. In this complex environment, English reading comprehension amongst students in Brunei has been identified as an area that needs to be improved. This study aims to investigate the facilitating or hindering factors of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EMI/EFL contexts, and explore ways in which Year 6 EFL students and ESL teachers manage EMI and EFL issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

This chapter develops a conceptual framework for the study by reviewing the literature in areas identified as relevant for the context of developing RCS in EMI and EFL environments typical for primary school classes in Brunei. The first section (3.2) reviews empirical literature dealing with the impact of EMI in classroom setting, in order to understand the issue from a global perspective. This is followed by the theoretical basis of the study, drawing from second language acquisition (SLA) theory (see section 3.3); in particular, from socio-cultural perspectives. The next section discusses the concepts of L2 reading comprehension in order to explain why reading skills were the focus of this study. This is followed by a review of language learning strategies (LLS), of which RCS form an important part. This section also discusses the role of RCS in second language reading comprehension, and reviews empirical studies of the use of RCS among adult and young EFL learners. A discussion of research into the teaching of reading comprehension (RC), studies on the teaching and learning of RC in Brunei contexts and implications from this literature are presented. The final section explains the conceptual framework for the investigation of the complexities of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EMI by year 6 students and teachers in the EFL environment of Brunei.
3.2 English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI)

The English-medium instruction (EMI) in schools and tertiary institutions in non-dominant English-speaking countries (NESC) has been increasingly adopted in contemporary education systems (Baldauf, et al., 2011). English as a medium of instruction (MOI) has been introduced in primary, secondary schools and tertiary institutions in NESC such as Bangladesh, Brunei, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam and Timor Leste. For example, in Nepal, a large number of public schools are using EMI from primary to secondary levels (Phyak, 2013). In the Maldives, English is used as MOI in primary and secondary schools (Mohamed, 2013). English is used as MOI in all subjects in Singapore government schools except for mother tongue and third language classes from Grade 1 to tertiary levels (Chua, 2010).

There is much discussion about the widespread adoption of English as a medium of instruction in many countries particularly in NESC. English has been adopted as a medium of instruction due to several drivers. First, English has been assumed as the language of communication in the world (Marsh, 2006). Second, English has been adopted in many NESC to enhance their English speaking capabilities (Hamid, et al., 2013). Third, EMI has been adopted to gain benefits of globalisation, human capital development and the internationalisation of education (Doiz, et al., 2012). Fourth, the choice of English as a medium of instruction is part of developing the socioeconomic capital of the countries that implement it to meet the demands of globalised economies (Marsh, 2006).

However, there are factors that may facilitate and hinder the adoption of EMI in all schools (Baldauf, et al., 2011). Some of the issues raised about EMI implementation were students’ levels of English proficiency, use of resources, the curriculum, teachers’ backgrounds and training, and the use of English language (e.g. Hayes, 2008; Moon, 2005; Nguyen, 2011). These issues are discussed in Chapter 2: section 2.4.

As such, there is a need to understand the complexities of EMI and EFL contexts and how students and teachers manage learning and teaching in the context of the interplay of these factors. The next section provides a context for the study, as it discusses literature related to the implementation of EMI in primary, secondary and tertiary education levels in a global context.
3.2.1 Empirical studies related to the implementation of EMI.

Many studies have been conducted to examine the implementation of EMI in schools and tertiary institutions. Several studies found a range of factors that hinder or facilitate the implementation of EMI in primary, secondary schools and universities (e.g. Akbari, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2013; Belhiah & Elhami, 2015; Garton, 2014; Nguyen, 2011; Pearson, 2014; Sert, 2008; Zacharias, 2013).

Garton (2014), for example, examined teaching EFL to young learners in South Korea by using survey data from 125 Korean primary school teachers and together with the data from a small scale data from one teacher. The study found that primary school teachers faced challenges to teach English, due to students’ different levels of English proficiency and limited English resources. Similar findings were reported in a study by Pearson (2014) among eight teachers in two public primary and secondary schools respectively in Rwanda using ethnographic interview data. The findings revealed that the effectiveness of EMI was negatively impacted by the lack of an English language curriculum and materials, training and school supervision, and teachers’ educational backgrounds.

Similarly, Nguyen (2011) investigated the implementation of EMI in two primary schools, one private and the other public in Hanoi, Vietnam. The study was an exploratory case study with data collected from multiple sources including classroom observations and four 45 minutes focus group interviews conducted with two groups of three to five English teachers, the principal of the public school, and the EFL advisor of the private school. Eight 40 minute lessons were observed each at each school. The study found that factors hindering the effectiveness of teaching English included, such as teacher supply, training and professional development, resourcing, inappropriate teaching methods and materials. These findings are relevant to the current study that also investigated aspects of teachers’ challenges in the teaching of RCS, in the interplay of EMI in an EFL environment. The studies raise the matter of whether these aspects may also play a crucial role in this research setting.

Bhattacharya (2013) conducted a case study of five children from an orphanage who studied through English, the orphanage administrator, two assistants and five teachers at the school in Noida, New Delhi. The data for this study included 250+hours at the sites, 100 hours of classroom observations for 4-6 hours per week and more than 150 hours at the orphanage for nine months. The data collection process entailed participant observations, structured and semi-structured interviews
and informal conversations. The findings revealed that the implementation of EMI led to restricted acquisition of English, and constraints around students’ ability to access educational content across subject areas. The teachers in the study taught texts in English primarily by translating words, phrases or sentences into Hindi. Comprehension checks of the English texts were conducted in Hindi with students responding in Hindi. Teacher-centric pedagogy was evident as these were minimal opportunities for students to use English communicatively. Another finding of this investigation was the disconnection between various textbooks and students’ everyday lives. Students memorized composition as the textbooks and grammar books contained model compositions such as short essays. Students were also provided answers to the questions posed in textbooks which they then memorized for tests. The focus of teaching using memorizing and questions-answers was more on preparing for tests than on acquiring knowledge. English learning was primarily through memorization of answers provided by teachers for tests.

Other factors have also been identified in secondary and tertiary levels of education. Many studies found that the successful implementation of EMI was impacted by low English proficiency among students, which led to difficulties in the learning of English language (e.g. Akbari, 2015; Belhiah & Elhami, 2015; Sert, 2008; Zacharias, 2013).

Sert (2008) investigated the effectiveness of the use of English in language acquisition and academic content in three universities in Turkey. 577 fourth-year students and 87 lecturers were participated by means of questionnaires and interviews. The study explored three different approaches to language instruction. These were (a) EMI in which academic content is provided through English after a preparatory year, (b) English aided instruction in which Turkish is used for lectures and English for exams and resources with the support of preparatory and post preparatory English courses, and (c) Turkish medium instruction in which Turkish is used in all academic areas supported with preparatory and post preparatory English courses. The results showed that EMI was not effective as students had difficulties in comprehending the meaning of the materials in English; transferring it to the classroom activities through Turkish, and expressing their ideas in the exams in English.

Zacharias (2013) investigated EMI implementation in an International Standard School (ISS) in Indonesia. Twelve teachers at two ISS were interviewed to examine their responses to EMI policy. The findings showed that all teachers attempted to use English in their classrooms though they did not agree with the policy. However, EMI implementation was also shaped by the individuals involved in teaching and learning i.e. the teachers and students. Individual factors that
challenged the implementation of EMI in the classrooms were teachers’ and students’ inadequate English competency. Moreover, it was also found that the lack of socialisation around the implementation of EMI policy in schools and subsequently into everyday teaching and learning was another factor that challenged the implementation of EMI.

Belhiah and Elhami (2015) explored the effectiveness of EMI in their study at six universities in the United Arab Emirates. Five hundred students and 100 teachers responded to a survey and participated in structured interviews about the effectiveness of EMI. The findings showed that students struggled to learn subject matter due to their low-proficiency in English. Similarly, Byun et al. (2011) investigated the effectiveness of EMI in a Korean University. A student survey, focus group interviews, and instructors’ interviews were used. The analysis revealed that some students and instructors did not possess the necessary language skills and the effectiveness of EMI was shaped by the students and instructor’s English language proficiency. Lin and Morrison (2010) examined the impact of EMI in Hong Kong. A test was administered by comparing its results among computer programming students who enrolled in Chinese-medium and English medium courses in Hong Kong. The results showed that the students who chose Chinese-medium schools to learn computer programming achieved more highly than the EMI schools. Thus, this suggests that the effectiveness of using English for instruction is shaped by the students’ language competency in this context.

Similarly, Brock-Utne (2007) conducted a study involving 20 hours of classroom observation in Form 1 secondary schools that identified issues related to instruction in English in Tanzania. The study used two classes each for an experimental group which was taught in Kiswahili and the control group that was taught the same topics in English. The experimental group was carried out for 6 weeks in a larger secondary school which was located away from Dar es Salaam. Another experimental group was formed in a smaller secondary school located near Dar es Salaam. The same teacher taught the same topic in Biology or Geography lessons to two different Form 1 classes, once in Kiswahili and once in English. There was no learning material in English for the control group in the Biology lesson except that the teacher had a textbook. The students in the control group had textbooks in English in Geography lessons. The findings revealed that in the classes where English was used the learning process slowed down due to students’ lack of oral language ability to communicate in English.
Akbari (2015) examined the challenges of EMI in the teaching and learning of English for EFL learners in junior high and high school in Iran. This extended her previous research that had investigated the problems of EMI in the teaching and learning of English in Iran. Several findings were obtained. First, students’ oral difficulties was one of the major problems in language learning in Iran as most of the students did not have the capacity to express themselves in English fluently though they had been studying English for seven years. Second the teachers’ target of teaching English was for the preparation of examination rather than teaching essential skills of language learning, that is, it was shaped by the demands of nationwide exams. Third, the inadequacy of textbooks was another pitfall of teaching and learning of English. Fourth, the study also found that the challenges of teaching and learning of English also lay on the teaching methodologies. The extensive use of translation activities in this Iranian English language teaching and learning context was evident. Fifth the focus on summative assessment and lacking of testing methods were also challenges, as well as, the insufficient curriculum to cater the students’ needs in terms of four language skills such as speaking listening reading and writing. The study also identified conflicts around language policy in English as the first foreign language that students must study in schools and universities, despite the low English proficiency of students in Iran.

Unlike many of the previous studies that show negative outcomes of EMI, Dang et al. (2013) found some facilitating factors in the successful implementation of EMI in a study among 20 Vietnamese pre-service teachers in EFL teacher education programmes. The study found that these teachers used English more in class among themselves, they used English materials from the internet, audio and video materials to teach speaking and pronunciation and relied on materials from the international testing system.

Similarly, Lin and Morrison (2010) conducted a study to investigate the impact of EMI in Hong Kong secondary schools and tertiary student’s vocabulary. This study administered two vocabulary tests to 762 first year students from eight faculties of one Hong Kong University. Then 471 students were asked to write an essay to identify their lexical richness and assessed by an experience language instructor to examine lexical appropriacy. The results suggest a positive impact of EMI in secondary school education on the teaching and learning in the tertiary sector. That is, students who were in the English medium schools in secondary level and exposed to more to English academic vocabulary enabled the EMI students to produce more academic words and use them appropriately in their written work in their tertiary education. The findings from these studies raise questions about whether they also have an effect in primary school EFL/EMI contexts.
In summary, the findings of previous research have emphasised the factors such as students’ and teachers’ inadequate English language competencies, English curriculum and resources, training and professional development, school supervision, teachers’ educational background, and teaching methods, that may facilitate or hinder the implementation of EMI in EFL contexts. A study investigating the experiences of students and teachers in learning and teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL context has the potential to add to our knowledge about the interplay of these factors, to support students and teachers, to inform practices and to improve pedagogy in English reading comprehension classrooms in Brunei.

The following section discusses concepts of second language acquisition theory that underpin the theoretical framework of the study.

3.3 Theoretical Framework: Second Language Acquisition

Second language acquisition (SLA) is a field of study investigating how a second language is learned. SLA is the product of factors around individual learners and learning conditions (Saville-Troike, 2006). From this perspective second languages are acquired by different learners in different situations in different ways, depending on contextual variables, and the personal and socio-cultural circumstances of the learner. SLA research focuses on the issues around what is learned, how it is learned, and why some learners are more successful than others. That is, it aims for an understanding of learner variables of different situations, such as individual, psychological, cultural, social as well as economic variables (Block, 2003; Saville-Troike, 2006).

However, while SLA deals with issues around how a second language is learned in general, one current emerging issue in SLA studies in the non-dominant English speaking countries (NESC) is of particular relevance for this study. Many countries in Asia are now moving to educational models that are delivering subject content through the medium of English (EMI); Baldauf and Kaplan (2011) state that there is consequently a need to examine how English or other second languages (SLs) or foreign languages (FLs) are used for learning and teaching in Asia. In EMI contexts the aim is that learners simultaneously learn subject content and English as a language. The use of a foreign language as an educational medium is therefore linked to concepts of acquiring, or learning, a second language. As a consequence, it is important to take EMI into consideration, since EMI is an aspect of second language acquisition theory that can illuminate students’ and teachers’ experiences with English RCS, as investigated in this study.
In order to understand the nature of SLA, the section that follows discusses the theoretical basis that is drawn from the socio-cultural perspectives that have influenced the SLA approaches, specifically, activity theory.

3.3.1 Activity theory in social cultural theory.

Activity theory (AT) was built on from Vygotsky’s social cultural theory (SCT). It has evolved through three stages which constitutes Vygotsky’s (1978), Leont’ev’s (1981) and Engeström’s (1987) work.

First, AT was considered as a derivative of Vygotskyan SCT and attributed to the work of Vygotsky (1978) who introduced the role of tools in mediated human action that lead to actions. Generally, Vygotsky’s model included a subject, the subject’s object (objective) and the tools or artifacts a subject use to attain the objectives. In other words, human learning and behavior resulted from both internal and external factors. An individual learner may use a tool to support his or her own internal cognitive development (Lantolf, 2000). The concept of tool or mediation is the foundational principle for SCT and AT (Lantolf, &Thorne, 2006).

Second, Leont’ev, one of Vygotsky’s students expanded the original model of SCT after Vygotsky died in 1934. Leont’ev (1981) expanded the concept of mediation to develop activity theory by adopting activity as the unit of analysis. He introduced the concept of actions in performing an activity. He argued actions are performed in relation to satisfaction of a particular need. These actions can only be understood by looking at their social contexts. As such, Leont’e further clarified a distinction between activities that satisfy a need and actions that create the activities (ibid). Figure 3.1 shows the Vygotsky’s SCT with the mediated action triangle. It shows the subject as the individual or individuals performing and activity and the object as the immediate goal of the activity, and the mediating artifacts or tools that may include physical objects such as books or computers, and non-physical objects such as language that provide cognitive support to the learner.
Third, Engeström (1987) created the second generation of activity theory around Vygotsky’s and Leontiev’s ideas. Engeström’s activity theory is a tool to understand a link between subjects, activities and activity systems (Engerström, 2001). Figure 3.2 shows the Engeström’s activity theory that consists of subjects, tools, objects, rules or norms, community and division of labour.

3.3.1.1 Engeström’s activity theory and its relevance to the study.

Engeström used a triangle and double headed arrows to explain how aspects of human activity are interrelated to each other. In order to use this theory to underpin this study, it is important to understand the meaning of each component, its relations in the system and relevance to the study. The aspect of elements in the activity theory frames the analysis of possible sources of challenges within the activity of learning and teaching of RCS in the classroom in which it will give wider understanding on the issues around learning and teaching of RC in EFL/EMI contexts.
In Figure 3.2, the components of the activity system help to explain their relationship. According to Engeström, activity is a motive driven process toward a particular object, and the motive is the “cultural-psychological-institutional impetus that guides human activity toward a particular object” (Lantolf, 2006, p.223). Hence, the activity explored in this study is the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 reading comprehension in Year 6 EFL/EMI classroom settings in Brunei Darussalam.

The tools are positioned on the top of the triangle in between the subject and object. This denotes that tools play an important part in mediating the subject towards goal-directed activity. Tools are the means that participants use for acting on the object (goal). In this study, the implementation of RCS in learning and teaching of L2 RC are the tools which act on the object. Students’ use of RCS when they read English texts and teachers’ use of RCS in their teaching pedagogies in L2 RC lessons are examined in this study to identify their roles in mediating students and teachers towards their objectives of the activity. In order to identify the strategies used and taught in the classroom, an Oxford’s (1990, 2013) classification of language learning strategies was used. This classification frames the analysis of the types of RCS implemented by students and teachers in the L2 RC lessons. The type of tools used to manage complexities around learning and teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL contexts were also analysed in this study. These analyses are important in understanding the implementation of RCS in Brunei as it will illuminate the sources of tensions around the activity system itself. The choices of strategies may be related to the sources of complexities within the elements in the activity system. Hence, this study will expose the issues around reading comprehension in Brunei as it will provide an understanding of managing complexities faced by students and teachers toward acting on the object of the activity within the activity system.

In an activity system, the subject is the group of people or individuals engage in an activity. The subject can be individual or a group of individuals (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy, 1999). Subjects’ actions and decision are also shaped by their personalities and identities (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004). Therefore, in this study, the subjects are students in Year 6 EFL classes and ESL teachers. This concept frames the analysis in terms of looking at the students and teachers’ backgrounds and gender, reading abilities and teachers’ professional development and perceptions. Given that there are issues around reading comprehension skills among students in Brunei, this study will highlight to the teachers the importance of focusing on gender and reading abilities in the classroom specifically in the implementation of RCS to enhance L2 reading comprehension among
students. Thus, individual differences in terms of gender and reading abilities may highlight the contribution of the social dimension in the field of second language acquisition particularly in the learning of RCS in L2 RC. In addition, teachers’ backgrounds in terms of their perceptions and profession development activities were also investigated to develop a better understanding of the role of teachers in enhancing students’ L2 reading comprehension in EFL/EMI classrooms.

The object is the artifact generated by the activity system, and it may be physical, mental or symbolic. In this study, hypothetically, to improve students’ reading comprehension skills is the object in the activity system. In an activity system, the purpose is to transform the object of the activity into an outcome. In this study, the outcome of the activity system is that students perform well in their L2 reading comprehension. This frames the analysis of other objectives attained in fulfilling the outcome of the activity.

At the base of the triangle, Engeström puts the community, rules and the division of labor within the community. Aspects of community are positioned in the middle of the bottom of the triangle to denote their purpose of providing a conceptual framework for the activity as they connect the local micro-activity of the subject to the greater macro-activity of the larger social-cultural structures (Lantof, 2006). Engeström stated that learning occurs within social and cultural contexts, and community and its components are at the base of the triangle to explain their importance in providing the social and cultural context in which the learning or activity occurs. In this theory, community refers to the ‘who’ who work together to reach the objective (goal) of the activity. The concept of community frames the analysis of the involvement of all stakeholders working together to reach the object of the activity. Hence, this will highlight the issues around reading comprehension performance in Brunei in providing better understanding of the roles of the community in developing students L2 reading comprehension performance.

The rules and customs of an activity system refer to the ‘explicit regulations, laws, policies and conventions that constrain activity as well as the implicit social norms, standards and relationship among the members of the community (Johnson, 2001). In this study, rules or norms were identified to highlight the important role of rules or norms within the activity system as it will provide better understanding of RCS implementation in Brunei.

According to this theory, division of labour refers to what people do in the communities, that is, the multiple roles that people do in the activity system itself. In this study, the division of
labour of students and teachers in the classroom were explored to understand their roles in the activity system.

The section that follows discusses previous studies that used AT as research that includes theoretical and empirical background, the data collection procedures and analysis procedures.

3.3.1.2 A review of activity theory research in the field of SLA.

A considerable volume of research has used activity theory for research in other fields such as work psychology as well as education. In SLA research, it helps to portray the interplay between the individual and the social environmental aspects of language learning. SLA research began in the 1990s with SLA researchers using AT as a theoretical concept to examine SLA processes. Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the importance of contexts in SLA research (e.g. Campbell, 2014; Gillette, 1994 cited in Terantino, 2009; Haneda, 2007; McCafferty, et.al 2001; Park, 2000; Tocaimaza, 2015)

Gillet’s (1994, cited in Terantino, 2009) study examining the learners’ personal thoughts and how they position themselves strategically to complete an activity was conducted through a longitudinal study through use of a student diary. The study found that although the outcomes of the activity were similar, the motives of the activity are different and as a result, the learning outcomes are different too. This shows the difference between the intended goals of a particular task and how the task takes place as a form of an activity. The implication of activity theory in this study is that learning outcomes are primarily related to learners’ motives and their motives are socially and historically constructed. That is, some learners acquire L2 as much as possible but other may only want to meet certain purposes, e.g. for passing examinations successfully.

Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) study examined a task-based approach from the activity theory perspective. They concluded that different people react differently to the same task. This study aligned with Gillet’s study that people react differently as their motives towards the same tasks were different. Coughlan and Duff suggest the performance of a task may be impacted by the learners’ own objectives and conditions under which they undertake a task. Hence, activity cannot be separated from its sociocultural context (Engeström, 2008).
Boag-Munroe (2004) investigated the experiences of teacher mentors in two activity systems labelled ‘schooling’ and ‘mentoring’. It investigated the tensions that may arise for the classroom teacher mentor and to the language tools which mediate work. The study was undertaken with two mentors in each of two schools who worked within Science a core subject for all secondary students’ ages 14 and 16. The other mentor worked in a non-core (optional) subject area, for example History in one school, Religion in the other. Each schools worked within a different Initial Teacher Training (ITT) partnership. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with subject mentors and senior mentors, observations and recordings of mentor’s meetings with student teachers, semi-structured interviews with subject tutors and course leaders, Government documents related to ITT and classroom teaching. The study found that none of the six mentors were willing to hand over complete control of Year 11, 12 and 13 examination classes to trainees. There are tensions between the rules in the activity of schooling and the rules in the activity of mentoring. Examination results and consequently league tables influence decision about the priorities of teacher mentor work.

Similarly, McCafferty et al., (2011) studied five L2 Spanish students who were native speakers of English, in a large university in the USA. The study investigated the retention of new second language vocabulary in Spanish classes. There were two conditions investigated in this study. In the control conditions, the learners were asked to write a brief essay about a visit to the zoo using zoo-related vocabulary items provided by the instructor. The words were in Spanish with English gloss. A few days prior to the actual writing, the learners were given a pre-test of 20 potentially unknown words. In the test, learners heard the words once and subsequently used them in their essay during a single class period. In the experimental conditions, learners were asked to do peer interviews about their second language learning experiences. They were then asked to report on the interviews to the class. It was carried out over three class periods which involved four separate activities. The learners, therefore, received multiple exposures over several days to the words both through overhearing others and by using them themselves in speaking and writing. The authors found that the experimental condition produced higher levels of retention than the control condition. That is, learning or retention was enhanced when a lexical item became the focus of goal directed action. These findings support the basic contention of an activity theory that the orientation of the individual is a key to how task is carried out in relation to the goal.

Gibbes and Carson (2014) investigated the students’ experiences on project based language learning (PBL) in a university language programme. This study employed a questionnaire and an extended semi-structured learner interview with 95 students taking language modules. Data were
grouped and analysed according to six AT triangle actors indicating objects and outcomes, subject, division of labour and rules, tools and community. The findings revealed that the students’ reasons for taking the PBL module and their experiences of project work were related to object and outcomes, subject, division of labour and rules. For some subjects, the projects were seen as an effective way to reach the object of the activity or their true motive. For others, the outcomes did not align with the object of their activity that lead to negative experiences. The evaluation of PBL revealed conflicts in the activity system that included inequitable division of labour, perceived lack of time due to community obligations or opposition to the rules, for example target language use governing the activity in the modules.

Liu (2015) investigated the impact of learning environment on Chinese international masters students’ reading approaches through the lens of activity system. This study conducted individual and focus group interviews which were carried out twice in one academic year among 15 students and 8 lecturers at a Business School in the UK. The average age of the students was twenty-three with an average IELTS score of 6.3. The data analysis used the elements of activity systems. That is the elements of agents (Chinese students), goal (personal or institutional target), tools (test-preparation and reading tasks), rules (socio-cultural values and academic requirements), community (university staff and students), and division of labour (teachers and students’ roles). This study found that students’ reading approaches were related to their learning environment to meet new academic requirements. Their reading approaches were also related to testing strategies. The findings suggest that activity is embedded in a wider social context in which goals act as a catalyst to generate motives throughout the goal-achieving process.

The studies discussed previously illustrate that AT can also be applied to the field of second language acquisition as AT not only posits the importance of individual but also social contexts in an activity system. That is, AT constructs learning as a social event taking place as a result of interaction between the learner and the environment (Engeström, 2008). Hence, the social environment in which the interaction occurs determined the activity which can be categorised as constraints, that deter learning and affordances that promote it (Allen, 2010).

This study, therefore, focused on the investigation of the facilitating (affordances) or hindering factors (constraints) of learning and teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI L2 RC classrooms, and explored the ways the students and teachers manage EFL and EMI issues in that setting. This study will provide more information about RCS implementation in Brunei. Hence, the research will
highlight issues around RC performance in Brunei, by providing a deeper understanding of the roles of EFL/EMI contexts in developing students L2 RC performance.

3.3.2 Summary.

In summary, the discussion of the concepts of activity theory relating those concepts to learning and teaching activities in L2 RC in EFL/EMI contexts, it is apparent that activity theory is useful for this study. A considerable volume of research has used activity theory for research in SLA fields (e.g. Boag-Munroe, 2004; Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Gibbes & Carson, 2014; Gillets, 1994; McCafferty, et al., 2011). These studies posit the importance of individual as well as social contexts in language learning. That is, language learning proceeds in the interplay of the learner and the environment. However, to date only one study has investigated L2 reading comprehension from the perspective of activity theory (e.g. Liu, 2015). Liu’s study reported that students’ reading approaches were related to learning environment. Thus, this theory provides an approach to explain the multiple aspects of students’ and teachers’ backgrounds (subject) and other related societal factors that constitute a useful framework for this study.

These multiple aspects contribute to the activity in the classroom specifically the activity of learning and teaching of L2 RCS in an EMI/EFL setting. By referring to activity theory, relationships between learning and teaching of RCS and classroom components such as subjects, tools, objects, rules or norms, community and division of labour were explored in this study. Thus, the research results generated valuable insights and recommendation for appropriate instruction and facilitation of the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 reading comprehension in EFL/EMI contexts. In addition, this study shows how the use of activity theory can bring new insights to language learning and teaching; specifically in the contexts where English is used as a medium of instruction in an EFL environment. Hence, by using activity theory, this study contributes to our knowledge of the development of L2 RC in Brunei primary schools and deeper understanding of the development of L2 teaching and learning for broader curriculum and language policy development.

3.4 L2 Reading Comprehension

This section begins by focusing on various models of reading in order to explain how students approach reading when they read L2 texts.
3.4.1 Second language reading models.

There are three types of reading approaches: (a) bottom up, (b) top down and, (c) interactive models. These models were used in this study, to identify reading approaches used by the students, in order to understand their relationship with L2 RC performance and the RCS used. The bottom-up model stresses the identification and decoding of letters and words in a text as language learners need to be able to process words before they can process the text in sentence and text discourse level for reading comprehension (Alvermann, et al., 2013). Readers construct meaning from the letters, words, phrases and sentences which are found within the text (Moskovsky, et al., 2015). When readers read, they analyse the text in small units. That is, the letters in the text are built up into words, words into sentences and sentences into text. The meaning of the text is constructed through this process (Fatemi, et al., 2014). However, the bottom-up model has been criticised by researchers (e.g. Gascoigne, 2005) who argued that the bottom-up model is an adequate model to explain the reading process. This model only takes into account the lower levels of reader processing such as word identification and does not describe the reader’s high level processing such as drawing on background knowledge that may have an impact on reader’s comprehension.

The second type of reading processing is top-down. The Top-down model focuses on the meaning of the word or text rather than the phonemic representation of the word (Angosto, et al., 2013). That is, readers focus on the meanings and the context clues to identify words (Fatemi, et al., 2014). The difference between top-down and the bottom-up processing is that readers who are using a top-down approach do not use all the information in the text when they read. Instead, readers select relevant information in the text according to their purpose for reading. Gascoigne (2005) states that readers make use of their guesses, relating their general knowledge to the text, to make meaning. This process is also called a ‘reader driven’ model (Nassaji, 2002) and does not take into account the processing of lexical and grammatical features of the text (Gascoigne, 2005). This suggests that this model is limited, as it does not emphasise word recognition skills. This gap led to the development of an interactive model of reading.

Anderson (1999) claims that interactive processing provides a basic explanation of the reading process that involves both top-down and bottom-up processing. This model is defined as a process in which readers are actively engaged in the reading process whereby they construct the meaning of what is being read (Babashamsi, et al., 2013). Kintsch (2005) insisted that both kinds of processing occur simultaneously and that they are related to each other. Nassaji (2002) argued that many studies have described the interactive process as the interaction between higher level and
lower level processes. Reading comprehension involves lower skills, such as recognition of lexical and grammatical units, and higher skills such as using context and background knowledge (Babashamsi, et al., 2013). As such, the interactive model is the reading process currently advocated as it postulates that reading comprehension occurs when there are interactions among the text, readers and others (ibid).

In summary, the bottom-up processing model focuses on a reader’s ability to decode a text. That is, the process of reading starts with letters and sounds. The top-down processing model involves readers’ accessing previous knowledge for understanding the text. The interactive model stresses both bottom-up and top-down processing. Comprehension of the text occurs only when both of these occur simultaneously. A question arises regarding whether students’ approaches of reading have an impact on their selection of reading strategies. Thus, the concepts of reading processing approaches are pertinent in this study to find if there is a relationship between the students’ reading approaches and their use of RCS when they read L2 texts. The next section discusses the concepts related to language learning strategies (LLS). Reading strategies comprise one forms of LLS.

3.5 Language Learning Strategies

Generally, in order to improve language learning, learning strategies are applied by learners in the language learning process (Oxford, 2013). Therefore, it is important to understand the concept of language learning strategies (LLS) which serves as a theoretical model to analyse the data generated in this study. More broadly, LLS are strategies used in order to acquire the target language, which include all aspects of language skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing.

This section provides an overview of the concept of LLS, subsequently RCS which form one part of LLS, and studies related to RCS, to explain the reasons for the focus here on reading skills in a second language. First, this section defines language learning strategies (LLS). Then, the classification of LLS and their importance in language education are discussed in the second and third sections. In order to link the data collected in this study to theoretical concepts, the classification of LLS in reading skills was used to analyse the experiences of students and teachers and to match them to types of RCS, as discussed in more detail in the second and third sections. Finally, empirical research conducted in the areas of LLS in general, is reviewed to provide a broader picture of issues related to language learning in the Brunei context.
3.5.1 Definitions of language learning strategies (LLS).

Many second or foreign language researchers have broadly defined LLS using different categories. For example, in this study the technical terms have been used to categorise what an LLS is; namely conscious behaviours or actions (Cohen, 1998; Oxford, 1990) and thoughts or beliefs (Weinstein & Dierlking, as cited in Domyei, 2005, p.164). Based on the definitions of LLS developed by these researchers, the concepts of LLS that are relevant to the study are presented in Table 3.1, which also provides an overview of how these definitions are relevant for the analysis offered in the later data chapters of this thesis.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition ‘LLS is ...’</th>
<th>Concept of LLS</th>
<th>How it is measured in the study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscious behaviours or actions (Cohen &amp; Weaver, 1998; Oxford, 1990); Thoughts or beliefs (Weinstein &amp; Dierlking, as cited in Domyei, 2005, p.164)</td>
<td>Behaviour based</td>
<td>Identified which RCS are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts or beliefs (Weinstein &amp; Dierlking, as cited in Domyei, 2005, p.164)</td>
<td>Value based</td>
<td>Identified why RCS are used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of ‘behaviour based’ and ‘value based’ will be used to analyse the data generated in this study. That is, by identifying and classifying which RCS are used (behaviour) and why RCS are used (value). This study therefore can provide explanations of the RCS that helped students and teachers to enhance reading comprehension. Thus this information will provide deeper knowledge about not only the descriptions and reasons of strategy use to facilitate RCS, but also how students and teachers manage the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL contexts.

3.5.2 Classification of language learning strategies.

Many scholars have classified LLS (Anderson, 1995; Bialystok, 1979; Cohen, 1998; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Wenden, 1986; Rubin, 1987; Wenden, 2000; Stern, 1975). The classification of LLS from other scholars are also discussed briefly in this section to provide a better understanding of the classification of strategies. The major classification of strategies are discussed below as these classifications provide insight into the rich repertoire of potential LLS (Fazeli, 2011). Furthermore, there is no classification which is universally accepted and the framework for strategies identification is enormous (Fan, 2003).
Naiman et al. (1978) suggested five categories of LLS, namely: *an active task approach, realization of language as a system, realization of language as a means of communication and interaction, management of affective demands, and monitoring of second language performance.* This classification was built from the data gathered from a group of 34 proficient adult language learners through interviews. However, according to O’Malley and Chamot (1990), Naiman’s classification lacked a theoretical foundation in second language acquisition theory. However, Naiman’s scheme of LLS characterizes many important traits and techniques used by the successful language learners in Rubin’s (1981) research. The categorisation of LLS has been changed since Naiman’s (1978), Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) taxonomies on good language learners. The categorisation of LLS has moved from a few simple categories to broad detailed ones, for example, Rubin’s (1981) classification of LLS.

Rubin (1981) categorised LLS based on direct and indirect strategies. Her categorisation was based on her observations on good language learners. According to Rubin, direct strategies are the strategies that contribute directly to the learners’ language learning that include *clarification or verification, monitoring, memorization, guessing or inductive reasoning, deductive reasoning and practices.* Indirect strategies are those that benefit the learners indirectly, for examples, *creating opportunities for practice and using production tricks such as circumlocutions, synonyms, or formulaic interaction.* She contributed to LLS research through the outlining the important strategies used by successful language learners. Later, it was found that the Rubin’s (1981) cognitive categories were also identified by O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990). O’Malley and Chamot (1990) developed their LLS classification based on: a) metacognitive strategies such as *planning, monitoring, or evaluating language learning*; (b) cognitive strategies such as *the operation of new information including rehearsal, organisation, inference, summarising, deduction, imagery, transfer, and elaboration*; and (c) social-affective strategies, for example *interaction with another person and control over emotion.* Further, O’Malley and Chamot’s three categories were included in Oxford’s (1990) SILL.

Oxford’s (1990) categorised LLS into direct and indirect groups which she later further classified into six categories. The direct group includes: *memory, cognitive and compensation strategies*, while the indirect group includes: *metacognitive, affective and social strategies.* Drawing upon her original classification categories, Oxford (1990) developed the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), with more than 50 sub-categories, which is designed to measure the use of learners’ LLS. Many language learning studies have employed the SILL to collect and analyse
quantitative data about language learning strategies (Chang, 2009; Ketabi, 2012; Khosravi, 2012; Lan & Oxford, 2005; Ismail, et al., 2013; Ozmen & Gulleroglu, 2013; Sadeghi & Khonbi, 2013). The Oxford (1990) classification of LLS is well known and regarded as the most comprehensive LLS available (Ellis, 1994). Moreover, SILL has also been adopted in L2 reading comprehension strategies studies in several countries (Asgarabadi, et al., 2015; Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Ghavamnia, 2013; Phakiti, 2003). For these reasons, this study adopted SILL to measure learners’ use of LLS in reading comprehension.

SILL has divided the strategy items into six categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social. This study uses the SILL category of strategies, as it guides the data analysis in terms of the types of RCS as reported and identified in students’ and teachers’ experiences.

Oxford (2013) further developed the details of LLS. The overview of Oxford’s two classifications (1989, 2013) of LLS, and their relevance to RCS, are explained in Table 3.2. Table 3.2 explains the categories of strategies used in language learning by Oxford’s two classifications of LLS. There are six categories of strategies for both classifications. In the early nineties, Oxford (1990) classified the LLS into six different categories, including: memory, cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies. The 2013 classification of LLS includes: cognitive, metacognitive, meta-affective, affective, meta-social cultural-interactive (meta-SI) and social-cultural-interactive (SI) categories of reading strategies.

The cognitive and memory strategies are combined as one category of cognitive strategies in the new version of Oxford’s (2013) classification. These strategies help learners to manipulate language materials in direct ways; for example by using the senses to understand, remember and activating knowledge. The compensation strategies are grouped in the metacognitive strategies category. These strategies help learners to manage the learning process well. The affective strategies are grouped into two types of strategies: meta-affective and affective, which help learners to manage their emotions and motivation levels. The social strategies are grouped into two types of strategies: meta-SI and SI. These strategies help learners to learn, via interacting with others and understanding the target culture.
Table 3.2
Oxford’s 1990 & 2013 Classifications of LLS and their Relevance to the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Memory: creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing action.</td>
<td>1. Cognitive: using the senses to understand and remember, activating knowledge, reasoning, conceptualizing with details, conceptualizing broadly, going beyond the immediate data, paying attention to affect, and planning for affect.</td>
<td>Helping learners to link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding.</td>
<td>Trying to understand every word in the text, splitting phrases or words to understand the text, taking notes of the meaning of words, use the vocabulary and structures to understand main idea etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive: practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output.</td>
<td>2. Metacognitive: Paying attention to cognition, planning for cognition, obtaining resources for cognition, organizing for cognition, implementing plans for cognition, orchestrating cognitive strategy, monitoring cognition, evaluating cognition, and evaluating cognitive strategy.</td>
<td>Helping make up for missing knowledge.</td>
<td>Guessing the meaning of some words from the contexts, skip the difficult words etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Metacognitive: centering your learning, arranging and planning your leaning and evaluating your learning.</td>
<td>4. Affective: activating supportive emotions, beliefs, and attitudes, generating and maintaining motivation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affective: lowering your anxiety, encouraging yourself, and taking your emotional temperature.</td>
<td>5. Meta-social-cultural-interactive (meta-SI): paying attention to contexts, communication and culture, planning for contexts, communication and culture, obtaining and using resources for contexts, communication and culture, organizing for contexts, communication and culture, implementing plans for contexts, communication and culture, orchestrating strategy use for contexts communication and culture, monitoring for contexts, communication and culture, evaluating for contexts, and communication and culture.</td>
<td>Helping the learner to learn via interacting with others and understanding the target culture.</td>
<td>Asking for word meaning to teacher or friends, discuss the text and read with friends or teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social: asking questions, cooperating with others and empathizing with others.</td>
<td>6. Sociocultural-interactive (SI): Interacting to learn and communicate, overcoming knowledge gaps in communicating, and dealing with sociocultural contexts and identities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, Oxford (1990) acknowledged that there are overlaps, and lack of clarity in the classification of LLS. She further commented that, “there is no complete agreement on exactly what strategies are; how many strategies exist; how they should be defined, demarcated, and categorized; and whether it is possible to create a real, scientifically validated hierarchy of strategies…classification conflicts are inevitable.” (p.17). In this study, Oxford’s SILL categorisation will shed light on the interplay between reading difficulties in EMI contexts in Brunei, and the strategy clusters that might support the development of proficient reading comprehension.

LLS are about effective ways to achieve successful outcomes in language learning (Oxford, 2013). This postulates that LLS are important to reading comprehension acquisition. The next section discusses the concepts of RCS in their role in developing comprehension.

3.6 Reading Comprehension Strategies

Lipka and Siegel (2012) described four important factors involved in the reading comprehension process: the reader, the text, the strategies and the goal. He further emphasised the importance of learners’ utilisation of RCS. Of all four factors, reading strategies are of interest as they are a key element in the development of L2 reading comprehension (Küçükoğlu, 2013). Reading strategies reveal the ways readers manage their interaction with the text that lead to effective L2 reading comprehension (Anastasiou & Griva, 2009). Therefore, the definition of reading strategies is discussed as it provides deeper understanding of its importance in L2 reading comprehension.

Applied linguists, such as Ellis (1994), have commented on the lack of consensus about the definition of the term, ‘reading strategies’. This diversity of opinion is largely due to the way the term has been used in different contexts, such as in first, second or foreign language learning (Griffiths & Oxford, 2014). However, McNamara (2007) stated that reading strategies act as a facilitating tool for comprehension. Choo, et al. (2011) defined reading strategies as conscious processes that are executed when readers purposefully approach a text to make sense of what they read.

Generally, the term ‘reading comprehension strategy’, for the purposes of this research, is defined as ‘specific actions consciously employed by the learner for the purpose of understanding
the text they read’. The following discussion explores several studies that showed the importance of reading strategies and the main reason why it was chosen as the main focus of the study.

Since reading strategies involve an active and complex process, and play a role in reading comprehension, there have been numerous studies investigating reading strategies used by L2/FL learners over the past two decades. There were several studies that investigated the kinds of strategies used among primary school children (e.g. Alsheikh & Haq, 2011; Anastasiou & Griva, 2009; Baker & Boonkit, 2002). For example, Alsheikh and Haq (2011) investigated the reading strategies used by 150 United Arab Emirates 6-10th grade students with learning disabilities while reading easy and difficult expository texts. All 150 students were asked to complete a Survey of Reading Strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002) and 10 students were selected randomly from the 49 participants in Al-Ain educational Zone to participate in the think aloud. Several findings were obtained such as that students were aware of variety of reading strategies. The five strategies that were reported as being the most used by these students included: ‘previewing text before reading’, ‘using text features (e.g. tables)’, ‘trying to stay focus on reading’, ‘underlying information in the text’, and ‘paraphrasing for better understanding’. However, it was found that they did not use several reading strategies in the actual use of reading strategies. The findings also revealed that there were no significant variations in the usage of strategies while reading easy and difficult texts. The students with learning disabilities were found to use two or more strategies when reading difficult text to compensate their comprehension problems that arose when they read difficult texts. The strategies used were ‘checking how text content fits purpose’ and ‘pausing and thinking about reading’.

Most studies have contrasted strategy use, between more or less successful readers, in order to identify effective reading strategies that can help improve RC (Zhang et al., 2008; Anastasiou & Griva, 2009; Lau, 2006; Mokhtari, 2008; Zoghi et al., 2010; Maarof & Yaacob, 2011). For example, Anstasious and Griva (2009) explored the used of reading strategies in English texts among 201 sixth grade primary school students who spoke Greek aged between 11 and 12. The study was conducted using retrospective interviews and reading test scores. The findings revealed that both groups utilised a variety of cognitive strategies though the poor readers were less aware of high levels of cognitive strategies in comparison with good readers.

Other previous studies also investigated the use of specific reading strategies such as metacognitive and cognitive strategies in enhancing reading comprehension (e.g. Anjomshoaa, et al., 2012; Hosseini, et al., 2014; Mehrdad, et al., 2012; Wang, 2015; Zare, 2007). Mehrdad, et al.,
(2012) investigated the effects of teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies on EFL students’ reading comprehension across proficiency levels in Azad University. One hundred and eighty students majoring in English were divided into three levels of proficiency groups on the basis of their quick Test of Michigan. The subjects were divided into experimental and control groups. The subjects in each of the experimental groups was taught cognitive and metacognitive strategies whereas the control group received vocabulary instruction and structure. At the end of the study, the students were asked to complete the reading comprehension test. The results revealed that teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies enhanced intermediate students, reading comprehension. This suggests that reading strategies are very important in helping students reading comprehension development. Hence, this study focuses on the students’ and teachers’ experiences in learning and teaching RCS in L2 RC lessons.

Reading strategies used in different texts, tasks and settings were also investigated in several studies in schools and tertiary levels (Cogmen & Saracaloglu, 2009; Lee, 2012; Tercanlioglu, 2004; Malcolm, 2009; Zhang et al., 2008). For example, Malcolm (2009) investigated the reading strategy awareness through a questionnaire among 160 EFL students at a medical university in Bahrain. Their reported academic reading strategy use when they read medical text was compared among the use of readers at varying initial English proficiency level and year of study. The study found that all students reported high use of metacognitive strategies in general and specific strategies related to translating from English to Arabic. Students with low initial English proficiency and those in the first year reported they used translating more when they read English medical texts. The fourth year students translated less and used more metacognitive strategies. This suggests that reading strategies are not only important in reading English texts but also for the purpose of enhancing comprehension in other academic texts. Reading strategies are therefore, one of the important factors that can enhance reading comprehension and thus needs more research to be conducted especially in EFL settings.

Numerous studies have investigated the kinds of strategies used by primary school children (e.g. Alsheikh & Haq, 2011; Anastasiou & Griva, 2009; Baker & Boonkit, 2002), identifying reading strategies that can help improve reading comprehension (e.g. Zhang et al., 2008; Anastasiou & Griva, 2009; Lau, 2006; Mokhtari, 2008; Zoghi et al., 2010; Maarof & Yaacob, 2011). Researchers have investigated the use of specific reading strategies such as metacognitive and cognitive strategies in enhancing reading comprehension (e.g. Anjomshoaa, et al., 2012; Hosseini et al., 2014; Mehrdad, et al., 2012; Wang, 2015; Zare, 2007), and reading strategies used for different texts, tasks and settings (Cogmen & Saracaloglu, 2009; Lee, 2012; Tercanlioglu, 2004;
This literature reveals that although reading strategies are important in enhancing reading comprehension, there is still a gap in exploring the roles of reading strategies in investigating the challenges of using reading strategies in L2 reading comprehension in the context of EMI and EFL. The present study addresses this gap in the literature.

As the aim of the current study was to investigate the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI, by Year 6 teachers and students in an EFL environment in Brunei, it is important to review empirical studies that focus on the use of RCS in the teaching and learning of L2 RC.

3.6.1 Studies on the learning and using of RCS.

As part of the larger field of language learning strategy research, RCS have been given attention by second-language learning strategy researchers (e.g. Akkakoson, 2013; Manoli & Papadopoulou, 2014; Yukselir, 2014). However, extensive investigations into RCS only started approximately three decades ago, with the work of Hosenfield (1977). A number of previous researchers had investigated differences in reading strategy use, in terms of second language (L2) proficiency differences, gender, and reading strategies instruction. The next section discusses these earlier empirical studies that investigated how these differences play their roles in RCS use and RC.

3.6.1.1 L2 Proficiency.

Several researchers have investigated differences in RCS use in terms of L2 proficiency. Hosenfield (1977), a pioneering researcher in L2 RCS, identified differences of RCS used among successful and unsuccessful readers. Two hundred and ten students comprising five French, four Spanish and two German level two (second year) classes in Western New York. Twenty students who scored high on the reading proficiency test (scores from 32 to 45) and 20 students who scored low were selected to participate in the study. Hosenfield used think-aloud protocols and created inventories of good versus poor reading strategies, based on a series of studies (1977, 1984). He found that successful readers employ typical RCS such as “keeping the meaning of the text in mind, skipping insignificant words, reading broad phrases, having positive self-concept, and guessing the meaning of unknown words from the context. Meanwhile unsuccessful readers translated short phrases, lost the meaning of sentences, seldom skipped words, looked up words in the glossary, and had a negative self-concept” (p.120).
Other studies (e.g. Block, 1986; Feng & Mokhtari, 1998; Lau, 2006) also reported that good readers use more strategies and use them more frequently than poor readers. Block’s (1986) study compared the RCS used by nine native English speaking and ESL students enrolled in a remedial university-level reading course. Her results resonate with Hosenfeld’s findings; she found four characteristics that differentiated good from poor readers. She found that readers who read in a reflexive mode, i.e. tended to shift their attention away from text information towards themselves in an affective and personal way while readers who read in an extensive mode, i.e. focused on the author’s ideas, as expressed in the text, instead of relating the text to themselves personally and affectively.

Block (1992) in a later study also found that good L2 readers react to a text in an extensive mode, i.e. by integrating information, monitoring their understanding consistently and effectively, by the use of meaning-based cues to evaluate what they have understood, focus on inter-sentential consistency, and maintaining an evaluative and critical attitude towards the text.

In addition, the findings of several previous studies revealed that proficient readers tend to use RCS flexibly and adjust strategy use according to text type and purpose for reading (Alsheikh & Haq, 2009; Feng & Mokhtari, 1998; Lau, 2006). Feng and Mokhtari (1998) found that the poor readers were also not conscious of how and when to use strategies. Previous studies have also illustrated the role of second language reading proficiencies in impacting strategy use among students in secondary or tertiary levels; however, empirical studies on primary school learners’ use of RCS in EMI/EFL contexts are less documented. As such, it is important to find out if there are also differences in terms of RCS use and reading abilities among Year 6 students in Brunei, when they read L2 texts. Lau’s (2006) study used a think-aloud method to compare reading comprehension of good and poor readers among native readers in secondary schools. He found that poor readers tended to have limited reading skills, were less motivated and gave up easily when they faced problems in reading difficult texts.

With regard to the relationship between the use of RCS and English proficiency levels, Ikeda and Takeuchi (2006) investigated this among EFL learners. They conducted the study with 37 female non-English majors at a Japanese university and found that there were six major differences identified between the learners with different EFL proficiency levels. The high proficiency learners used more than one strategy in detail, understood the purpose of using the strategies, understood the conditions in which each strategy is effectively used, understood the impact of using combined strategies, understood the importance of the outline of the passage and understood how to evaluate
the efficacy of strategy use. The low proficiency learners however, used one or more strategy with little detail in each entry, read passages not for the sake of using strategies, did not understand the conditions of using the strategies, and were not organised in their strategy use.

Although the study by Ikeda and Takeuchi (2006) was carried out in an EFL context at the university level, it may help to illuminate how students with different reading ability levels in primary schools use RCS. Similar findings were also reported in the limited research available that related to how second language proficiency impacts RCS use among young learners. For example, Zhang et al. (2008) conducted a study in Singapore to examine the RCS used by Singaporean primary school pupils, from a cognitive perspective. Data were collected from high and low proficiency students. There were 18 participants from three neighbourhood primary schools in grades 4, 5 and 6. The students were asked to read and report on what they were thinking about while reading. The think-aloud protocols were recorded, transcribed verbatim, coded and analysed. The study found that the bilingual children’s use of RCS, in learning to read in English, was related to their English language proficiency. The learners with high proficiency orchestrated their use of reading strategies during reading, interpreted the text in order to synthesise, read the text not only literally but also by reconstructing, interpreting, summarising and making inferences based on linguistic, and real world or schematic, knowledge to understand the text. However, the learners with low proficiency levels focused their reading on linguistic aspects, i.e. decoding, and repeatedly rephrasing words or phrases in the text. The low proficiency readers gave up or abandoned the reading task if they did not understand particular words or expressions, if they had perceptual problems such as being unable to form textual information links, and were not able to monitor their own interpretation and understanding. This study suggests that, although these bilingual pupils had many years of exposure to English in society and at home, as well as a stronger metalinguistic knowledge, they had difficulties in reading in the context of ESL. This study with its focus on how the L2 reading experiences of Brunei Year 6 students, who were learning reading comprehension in EMI within the EFL setting, would confirm or challenge these findings.

In sum, previous studies of reading strategies have focused on investigating differences in RCS use among successful and unsuccessful readers (e.g. Hosenfield, 1977), attesting that good readers use more strategies more frequently than poor readers (e.g. Block, 1986; Feng & Mokhtari, 1998; Lau, 2006). Proficient readers tend to use RCS flexibly and adjust strategy use according to text type and purpose for reading (Alsheikh & Haq, 2009; Feng & Mokhtari, 1998; Lau, 2006). Research also suggests that there are relationships between the use of RCS and English proficiency levels, (e.g. Ikeda &Takeuchi, 2006; Zhang et al., 2008). While the roles of language or in
particular reading proficiency in the use of reading strategies have been examined in these studies, there is limited discussion on how students with different reading proficiencies differ in their use of reading strategy in EMI/EFL contexts. Another question arises regarding whether gender differences may also influence reading strategies use. This study seeks to address these questions.

The next section reviews previous studies on the contribution of gender differences in the use of reading strategies.

#### 3.6.1.2 Gender differences.

Several researchers have investigated differences in RCS use, in terms of gender (e.g. Lee, 2012; Phakiti, 2003; Sheorey and Mokhtari; 2001). For example, Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) studied the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies among 152 second language readers (92 males and 60 females) who were studying at the freshman level at a large Midwestern US university. The participants completed a survey about their use of cognitive, metacognitive and support strategies while reading in English. The results found that females used more strategies than males.

This finding was consistent with a previous study conducted by Phakiti (2003) who investigated the utilization of cognitive and metacognitive strategies of 384 Thai college students with 173 male and 211 female in a final exam at large Thai University. The students completed a questionnaire about the strategies they used. The findings revealed that there were no significant differences between males and females in terms of cognitive strategies they used. However, the study found that male used more metacognitive strategies than their female counterparts as well as across different proficiency levels.

Similarly, Lee (2012) investigated the differences of frequencies of using types of foreign language RCS among EFL college freshmen, at the University of Technology in Taiwan, according to genders. She used a modified version of a 39-item questionnaire called “Strategy Inventory for EFL Students’ Reading” which was partially derived from the SILL (Oxford, 1990). Lee found that female students used more metacognitive and social-affective strategies than males. Meanwhile, males reported to use more of memory, cognitive and compensation strategies than females. These studies shed light on gender differences and strategy use in tertiary levels. A question arises if the findings can be found among students in EFL/EMI primary schools.
However, the findings of these studies contradicted those of other studies (e.g. Naseri & Zaferanieh, 2012; Poole, 2005; Shmais, 2003) which reported that women used more learning strategies than men. This is important for the current study because it used a RCS questionnaire which was derived from SILL, in order to find out students’ reported use of RCS when they read L2 texts. This can guide the analysis of the current study that investigated the use of cognitive, metacognitive, social-affective, memory and compensation strategies by and with year 6 school students and their teachers.

Shmais (2003) investigated the reading strategies used by 99 (19 males and 80 females) Palestinian college students majoring in English. The students completed a SILL questionnaire about their reported reading strategies when they read English texts. The findings revealed that there were no significant differences between male and females use of reading strategies and on any of the SILL subscales. Similarly, Poole (2005) conducted a study on the use of academic reading strategies among 248 (138 males and 110 females) advanced college ESL students from six universities and one community college in the United States. The students completed Mokhtari & Sheorey’s (2002) SOR survey about their reported used of reading strategies in academic texts. The study found that male and female college ESL learners showed no overall significant differences in their overall strategy use. Males and females only differed in two individual strategies, such as noting text characteristics and paying close attention to reading. Females revealed higher strategy use in noting text characteristics than males whereas males exhibited higher strategy use in paying attention to reading than females.

Naseri and Zaferanieh (2012) investigated the relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs, reading strategy use and reading comprehension levels of 80 Iranian EFL learners comprising 59 students females students and the rest were male from college senior and junior English major at one University. The students were asked to complete a Michigan reading comprehension test, reading self-efficacy Beliefs questionnaire and a SILL, ESL/EFL version 7.0 Reading strategy use. The findings exhibited relationship between gender and reading strategies used by these students.

In sum, based on these studies, gender differences may contribute to RCS use and there may also be gender differences in students’ use of cognitive, metacognitive, social-affective, compensation and memory strategies in using such strategies when they read L2 texts. The findings of these studies suggest that the implementation of RCS instruction should consider the role of
gender in L2 classroom. Moreover, there is still a need to explore the roles of gender as students’
gender may play a role in the orientation aspect of an activity system.

These studies show that RCS instruction should consider gender issues. This has the
potential to lead to future research in understanding the impact of gender on students’ experiences
in learning and using RCS within EMI/EFL contexts.

Although the results of the previous studies are inconsistent in terms of gender differences
in reading strategy use, gender is considered another contributing factor that may impact the use of
reading strategies. According to Poole (2005) classroom teachers should be aware of strategic
differences among males and females in how reading strategies are taught. A question raises if there
is relationship between the reading strategy use and how reading strategies are taught in the L2
reading comprehension classroom. Therefore, the next section discusses the studies that focus on
the role of reading strategies instruction in enhancing L2 reading comprehension.

3.6.1.3 Reading strategies instruction.

Many scholars argue that RCS instruction plays an important role in RCS use to enhance
students’ L2 RC. Ness (2011), for example, examined which reading comprehension instructional
strategies were employed in English language arts instruction by teachers in elementary classrooms.
Four percent of the students in the study were ESL learners and the remaining 96% were EFL
learners. Of the 20 teachers who participated in the study, 15 were women and five were men.
These teachers were observed over 3,000 minutes of classroom instruction. Observations were
equally divided among grade levels with four classrooms per grade level. Each of the teacher
participants was observed for a total of 120 minutes, broken into four 30 minute blocks. Ness
(2011) found that the most frequently occurring RCS were question asking, predicting or activating
prior knowledge and summarising. This means that teachers still need variety in the strategies they
teach. The narrow teaching of RC in this study was attributed to teachers’ unfamiliarity with other
comprehension strategies; their lack of confidence in teaching other strategies, and by relying solely
on the RCS as predetermined by their instructional materials. This finding was also found in other
studies (e.g. Aghaie & Zhang, 2012; Akkakoson, 2013; Dabarera, et al., 2014; Nasrollahi, et al.,
2015; Raisi & Roustaei, 2013). Aghaie and Zhang (2012) explored the impact of explicit teaching
of reading strategies on intermediate level EFL students’ reading performance in Iran using an
adopted version of Chamot and O’Malley's (1994) questionnaire. The study involve a control and
experimental group with whom an intervention program was implemented. The study found that the
treatment group performed better results of reading comprehension and reading strategy transfer from the contrast group after four month of strategy based instruction. The strategy instruction contributed to improved reading performance.

Similary, Akkakoson (2013) investigated the relationship between strategic reading instructions, the process of learning second language-based reading strategies and English reading achievement for Thai University students of science and technology. Eight two students were involved in the study for the experiment cohort whom were taught using a strategy based approach and another 82 students were taught using a traditional teacher centred approach in the control cohort. A pretest and posttest research design was employed and a portfolio approach was used to investigate the experimental cohort students’ process of learning reading strategies. The author reported that the experimental group performed more strongly than the other cohort in the post course standardized English test. The high level reading proficiency learners used second language based reading strategies more effectively than the low level peers.

Raisi and Roustaei (2013) investigated the impact of RCS instruction on the students’ performances in RC at Islamic Azad University in Iran. Sixty undergraduate students, who were studying a general English course, participated. These students were grouped into control and experimental groups. All the participants received extensive reading instruction but the experimental group received different RCS instruction. A RC test and self-efficacy questionnaires were administered to both groups at the beginning and end of the study. They found that the students in the experimental groups performed better in their RC than their counterparts. This suggests that RCS instruction plays an explicitly important role in the students’ RC performance.

Manoli, et al. (2016) investigated the immediate and delayed effects of multiple- reading strategy instruction on EFL learners reading performance. Ninety-nine Greek speaking EFL learners aged ranged from 11-12 year old. The study involved an experimental group that received a three month strategy instruction set within direct Explanation framework and a control group that receive no such training and participated in the pretest, immediate and delayed posttests measurements. The study indicated that the students in the experimental group improved their reading performance both in the immediate and delayed posttest measurements as compared to the students in control group. The findings from these studies raise questions about whether these may also have an impact in primary schools.
Many studies have reported that RCS instruction has an impact on the use of reading strategies in L2 reading (e.g. Aghaie & Zhang, 2012; Akkakoson, 2013; Dabarera, et al., 2014; Nasrollahi, et al., 2015; Raisi & Roustaei, 2013). Previous research reveals that although RCS instruction may enhance the use of reading strategies use, questions such as the following arise: Do teachers experience challenges or support in their mission to enhance reading comprehension in primary EMI/EFL contexts? If they experience challenges, how do they address them? The current study is designed to illuminate local challenges in implementing RCS and to point out future research pathways on RCS and RCS instruction in EMI/EFL contexts.

The next section reviews the issues around the teaching of L2 reading comprehension.

3.7 The Teaching of L2 Reading Comprehension

The aim of reading instruction is to help students become independent and strategic readers. However, some researchers suggest that there is evidence to show that there is little teaching of RCS taking place in the RC instruction in ESL/EFL classrooms. In order to understand better the trend of reading instruction, this section discusses the previous studies from as early as in 1978 and to date.

Earlier L1 studies such as Durkin (1978) concluded that while many teachers believed that they were teaching comprehension, they were only assessing instead of explaining how to comprehend the reading text. Durkin observed 24 fourth grade classrooms totalling 7200 minutes of observation. She reported that the teachers were not teaching but simply testing comprehension with the questions that came with the comprehension text. Durkin’s conclusions have since been supported by other observational L1 studies. Duffy and McIntyre (1982) claimed that teachers seldom showed their students how to do the comprehension task. Instead they used activities provided through basal programmes. When they were interviewed about their teaching strategies, the teachers responded that they believed that was what they were supposed to do.

Ten years later, Manzo (1991) investigated why teachers were under utilising available methods and what might be done about it. Manzo argued that teachers were not using the methods primarily because they had not been taught how to employ them. In light of this situation, Taylor et al. (2002) argued that in general, although teachers had made some changes in their classrooms over the last 100 years, basic forms of instruction had not changed. Norsidah (2011) confirmed Taylor’s argument in her study investigating the teaching techniques and common practices in the L2
classroom in Brunei’s primary schools. She found that the majority of the teachers were only assessing, rather than explaining how to comprehend the reading text. Similarly, Muhammad (2013) explored the reading beliefs and classroom instructional practices of English teachers in public sector universities in Pakistan. A mixed method research was conducted among 71 English teachers in the departments of English in six selected public sector universities of Pakistan. The results of the study indicated that majority of English teachers who taught English L2 reading, text materials or language skills courses preferred to *read the text aloud and explain in English, read the text aloud and translate often in English, sometimes in a native language, and ask students to read orally and check their comprehension by asking oral questions* while teaching English.

Sidek, et al. (2014) examined the ESL reading instruction in the Malaysian ESL reading curriculum at Form four level and its execution at the textbook development level as well as at the instructional implementation level. The study found that the execution of reading instruction in ESL reading lessons was not aligned in the form Four English Language Curriculum Specifications to what was proposed in the textbook. This misalignment is crucial as many Malaysian students face comprehension problems when reading in English (Krishnan, et al., 2009).

The next section discusses further the studies around the teaching and learning of reading comprehension in the context of Brunei.

### 3.7.1 Studies of teaching and learning of L2 reading in Brunei.

There are several issues around the teaching and learning of L2 RC in Brunei. The teaching and learning of reading related factors, is often mentioned as something that contributes to the problems students face in their primary and secondary education (Lipka & Siegel, 2012). There are issues such as English language proficiency, vocabulary knowledge, teaching instruction and reading strategies that need addressing.

Limawati (2007) conducted a study of processing meaning in RC among year four primary students in Temburong district of Brunei. The study found that the students employed more than one strategy to make meaning. They used experiential knowledge, making inferences and predictions, guessing, visualising, translating the meaning from L1 and L2 and retranslating the meaning from L1 to L2. Moreover, this study identified five difficulties faced by the year 4 students when they read English texts. They were a) unfamiliar and difficult words, b) unfamiliar and
difficult contexts, c) words in the text never before seen or learnt, d) long and difficult sentences and contexts and e) long and difficult sentences and questions.

There was a distinction in the meaning making process across the different ability levels. The high ability students were capable of utilising their experiential background knowledge. They constructed explanations and built meaning of the English reading texts used in the study, by linking the material with their experiential knowledge. The researcher further noted that the students with high English language proficiency levels performed better in their reading comprehension test, as they employed not only more, but also a greater range of strategies. Those students with low English language proficiency could only build their mental images based on the surface meaning of the texts. Their visualisations were very text bound and lacked details and elaboration. They could not use available information and their background knowledge to construct meaning.

Norlipah (2011) conducted research into the influence of text genre in the L2 reading comprehension of 100 Year four students in 12 government schools. The students read and responded to 16 comprehension texts, comprising eight recount texts and eight information report texts. The texts were schema based and non-schema based and were also categorised as easy or difficult. Four students with high English language proficiency (HLP) and four with low English language proficiency (LLP) were then interviewed about the texts. The findings indicated that the students with HLP performed better in both genres, than the students with LLP; an outcome which highlighted that high English language proficiency was crucial for better L2 RC performances. The students with HLP and LLP were better at answering literal questions than inferential comprehension questions. They depended solely on surface meaning to answer the comprehension questions and were unable to notice embedded meaning in the texts, and therefore did not employ many of the RCS required to facilitate comprehension.

This raises questions about whether these difficulties abate or are still evident in Year 6. These studies (Norlipah, 2011; Limawati, 2007) focused on students in primary schools. The current study is different from these studies as it focuses on how these students tried to negotiate the challenges of using English language in the learning of RCS.

One of the issues raised, regarding the teaching and learning of L2 RC in Brunei, is students’ vocabulary knowledge. Nadia (2007) and Zunaidah (2010) reported that primary students’ vocabulary knowledge plays important roles in their reading comprehension. Hamidah (2007) also
reported similarities in her study, where issues of reading without understanding among year 9 students were attributed to the lack of vocabulary knowledge. These studies suggest that the students’ lack of vocabulary knowledge impacts reading comprehension in both primary and secondary schools. Similarly, Nicol (2004) and Shamsulbahri (2005) found that students were having vocabulary problems in reading comprehension with content subjects such as Science and English. However, these studies only investigated factors hindering reading comprehension. The researchers did not look into students’ use of strategies to comprehend when they lacked relevant vocabulary knowledge. The current study focused on teachers’ ways of tackling students’ vocabulary problems in English reading texts and extends the research cited immediately above.

The problems of RC among students in Brunei have also been attributed to the ways teachers teach RC in the classrooms. Mahanom (2007), in her investigation of the teaching techniques and common practices in the L2 classroom in Brunei’s primary schools, found that the majority of the teachers focused more on assessing students’ understanding, instead of explaining how to comprehend the reading text; how to gain that understanding. Zunaidah (2010) and Norsidah (2012) found that the majority of the teachers who taught RC in Year five government primary schools were not teaching how to comprehend a text, but were simply testing comprehension with the questions that came with the comprehension text. Mahanom (2007), Zunaidah (2010) and Norsidah (2011) confirmed that teachers were assessing, instead of explaining how to comprehend the reading text. However, most of these studies looked at teachers’ practices in the classroom and came up with barriers that impacted on their teaching practices. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine how these barriers influence their teaching of reading practices by examining teachers’ strengths and challenges associated with teaching RCS in the L2 RC lessons. Thus, the current study hopes to shed light on the understanding of the complexities of the teaching and learning of RCS in EMI/EFL classrooms.

Previous research also identified the influence of RCS on students’ RC. For example, Rahmawati (2001) investigated the impact of metacognitive strategies in the students’ L2 RC among secondary students. She found that metacognitive strategy training increased the effectiveness of reading instruction. Similarly, Yahya and Noradinah (2012) investigated the employment of metacognitive strategies to comprehend Malay texts by pre-university students. They found that the pre-university students focused more on strategies such as underlining when reading, and reading the text more than once. However, their study did not explore the relationship of those strategies with the students’ reading comprehension. Moreover, these studies involved secondary and university students, rather than those in primary school.
In sum, although the studies (e.g. Limawati, 2007; Norlipah, 2011; Rahmawati, 2001) reviewed suggest that students were taught RCS in the primary and secondary classes, a number of concerns remain unresolved about the factors that may influence the teaching and learning of RCS in the EMI/EFL classroom.

3.9 Implications for the Study

Given that EMI is central for English development in Brunei, as well as an issue from a global perspective, there is a need to understand the interplay of multiple factors within the activity of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC in both EMI and EFL contexts.

In light of this, RCS is the focus of the current study, as it is one of the key LLS involved in the reading process. This literature review has provided pertinent information that the researcher has drawn on, to develop a deeper understanding of the complex relationship between EMI and EFL and the learning and teaching of RCS among primary students and teachers in Brunei and elsewhere. Thus, this study contributes to the development of existing theories about SLA in the field of LLS, particularly in reading skills. It hoped to provide more evidence about the importance of RCS in enhancing students’ reading comprehension, especially in the context of EMI in EFL settings, leading to a deeper understanding of effective language learning and teaching, in particular in EMI/EFL contexts.

Yet, the literature review also uncovered another relevant area in relation to second language acquisition. That is, the literature pertaining to EMI policy at schools includes primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Previous research found diversity in the challenges and the problems uncovered in EMI settings. The review suggested certain factors that may hinder teaching and learning, which are aligned with the implementation of EMI in schools. These factors include students’ English proficiency, teachers’ ability to teach in English; language use in classrooms and a lack of support to students and teachers. Numerous studies, especially in non-dominant English speaking countries (NESC) countries (e.g. Dang et al., 2013; Garton, 2014; Nguyen, 2011; Pearson, 2014) have examined the factors that may facilitate and hinder the EMI implementation; however, there is only limited research that has examined the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lesson in EMI mandatory contexts at the primary level in Brunei.
Moreover, searching for research in this area revealed that the current use of RCS among students in primary schools is rarely reported. In Brunei, in particular, although there were a significant number of studies investigating reading comprehension, reading comprehension difficulties and reading comprehension approaches, there was limited focus on the use of RCS among students and teachers in upper primary levels. Hence, the present study of the learning and teaching of RCS in EMI among year 6 primary schools in EFL contexts is timely.

The conceptual framework developed in this study is based on the socio-cultural perspective of second language acquisition. This framework comprises of the interaction of multiple factors of students, and teachers’ backgrounds, and between EMI and EFL in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. The focus on the interaction of these two areas of knowledge is new, and has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of EMI and EFL. The section of this chapter that follows, presents the research questions and a more detailed discussion of the conceptual framework.

3.9 Research Questions and Conceptual Framework for the Study

In order to better understand the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EMI/EFL settings, this study investigated the facilitating or hindering factors of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EMI/EFL contexts, and explored ways students and teachers in managing the EMI and EFL issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

The following research questions (RQs) directed the study:
1a. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the learning of RCS among Year 6 EFL Bruneian students in EFL/EMI settings?
   b. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the teaching of RCS among Year 6 ESL Bruneian teachers in EFL/EMI settings?
2a. How do Year 6 EFL Bruneian students manage EFL and EMI issues in the learning of RCS in L2 RC?
   b. How do Year 6 ESL Bruneian teachers manage EFL and EMI issues in teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI?

The literature has shown the complexities of the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms, from the point of view of its connections with students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and its implementation in the context where English is used as a medium of instruction, but is a foreign
language. Thus, this study provides a closer examination of the relationship of multiple factors of students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and EMI and EFL societal factors in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

The conceptual framework was developed based on the theoretical basis from the social-cultural perspectives of SLA, and relevant research in the implementation of EMI and learning and teaching of RCS, as previously reviewed. This conceptual framework was developed for this study to frame the investigation of the two research questions. As shown in Figure 3.1, in order to find answer for the RQs, the study focused on relationships between RCS and students’ and teachers’ background factors and EMI/EFL settings, facilitators or hindrances faced by students and teachers learning and teaching of RCS, and ways students and teachers manage EMI and EFL issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

The aspects of learning and teaching of RCS investigated include: The relationships of RCS and other background factors; such relationships include that between RCS and gender and between RCS and reading abilities, and between reading approaches, and the relationship between teachers reported teaching of RCS and teachers’ qualifications, experiences, training and support. The facilitators or hindrances of learning and teaching RCS in L2 RC in EMI and EFL contexts were also investigated as well as ways students and teachers manage the EFL and EMI in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

The review of the literature revealed the interplay of EFL/EMI settings in the learning and teaching of RCS; in this regard the mandatory use of EMI in the EFL classroom may have impacted the learning and teaching of RCS. Therefore, complexities faced by the students and teachers in learning and teaching of RCS in the context of EMI in EFL settings were also investigated in this study. How students and teachers managed challenges in the learning and teaching of RCS was also examined.

Hence, the findings from this analyses undertaken in this study enabled the RQs to be answered and provided evidence for addressing the complexities of second language acquisition theories. As a result, the findings developed our knowledge of understanding of the complex interplay of multiple aspects of students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and EMI and EFL, in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.
Figure 3.1. The Complexities of Learning and Teaching of RCS in L2 RC among Year 6 EFL/EMI Students and Teachers
3.10 Summary

This chapter presented the theoretical and empirical basis for this study of learning and teaching of RCS in Bruneian Year 6 EFL/EMI classes through a critical review of the relevant literature. The review revealed that limited research has examined the interplay of multiple factors of students and teachers and social setting such as EFL and EMI in the learning and teaching of RCS in primary schools. From the identification of the issues that need to be further explored and examined, based on the review of the literature, the RQs were established, followed by the conceptual framework for the study. The next chapter presents the design and methodology employed in the research.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design and methodology employed in the study. The chapter is organised into three sections. The first section provides the research design and the underlying rationale for the design choices. This is followed by a discussion of the selection of data sources, data collection instruments, and data collection procedures. The final part of this chapter presents the data analysis procedures.

4.2 Research Design

This section presents the research design and methodology adopted for this study. It provides an overview of the study and is followed by a discussion of the rationale for using case study methodology. This is followed by a discussion of the justification for using mixed methods in the case study and a summary.

4.2.1 Overview and rationale for case study.

This study focused on the investigation of the learning and teaching of RCS among Year 6 students and teachers in Bruneian EFL/EMI contexts. A case study design was chosen to address the research questions. A case study allows the researcher to explore in depth the phenomenon under study in order to obtain deeper understanding of students’ and teachers’ experiences in learning and teaching RCS in EFL/EMI contexts (Bryman, 2008; Creswell, 2013; McDuffie & Scruggs, 2008; Silverman, 2011).

According to Creswell (2008) there are three types of qualitative case studies: (a) the intrinsic case study is a case selected for study because it is unusual and of itself has interest (Stake, 2000); (b) the instrumental case study when the study serves the purpose of illuminating a particular issue, where it focuses only on a specific issue with a case or cases used to illustrate this issue, and (c) case studies may also include multiple cases called a collective case study (Stake, 1995) where multiple cases are described and compared to provide insight into an issue.
Using these classifications the present study took an instrumental approach that allowed the researcher to investigate the issue of learning and teaching RCS in EFL/EMI contexts, in order to provide a richer pool of data for the study. In this study, experiences using RCS in the L2 reading classroom were explored from two different perspectives; those of EFL students and teachers of year 6 in primary schools in Brunei.

There are three broad methodological approaches to case study research, these are quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. The nature of the research questions in this study, and the need to collect data about both breadth and depth of the issues involved, suggested that both quantitative and qualitative methods were necessary to answer the research questions, as a consequence a mixed methods approach was used. The next section describes the justification for this mixed methods design.

4.2.2 Mixed methods.

To answer research questions, both quantitative and qualitative data are often necessary to provide a better understanding of the research problem under consideration (Creswell, 2009; Dömyei, 2007; Hesse-Biber, 2010). Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) have identified the four most commonly used mixed methods designs in educational research, in order to simplify the choice of designs. They have labelled these: triangulation, embedded, explanatory and exploratory designs.

First, in the triangulation mixed method design, quantitative and qualitative data are collected at the same time, and the data are merged. The results are used to understand a research problem from different perspectives. Thus, different data collection forms compensate for each other’s weaknesses. That is, the two different data are collected to establish if there is convergence, difference, or some combination of the two (Creswell, 2009).

Second, the embedded mixed method refers to the process of data being collected quantitatively and qualitatively in a concurrent manner; however, in this approach, one form of data is used to support the other form. Creswell (2009) wrote that “unlike the traditional triangulation model, a concurrent embedded approach has a primary method that guides the project and a secondary method that provides a supporting role in the procedures” (p.228).

Third, instead of collecting data at the same time, the explanatory design uses quantitative and qualitative information in sequence. It consists of collecting quantitative data and then
collecting qualitative data to help explain or elaborate the quantitative results. The rationale for this approach is that the quantitative data and results provide a general picture of the research problem; more analysis, specifically through qualitative data collection, is needed to refine, extend or explain the general picture. This approach may also be used to obtain quantitative results from a population, in the first phase, and then refine and elaborate these findings through an in-depth qualitative exploration in the second phase. This design is also called a two-phase model (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Fourth, the exploratory design begins data collection through qualitative methods and then collects quantitative information. Its purpose is to gather qualitative data to explore a phenomenon and then to collect quantitative data to explain relationships found in the qualitative data. Typically, this design uses two phases, with the first phase involving qualitative data collection, often via interviews and observations with a small number of individuals, followed by quantitative data collection, often via a survey, with a large randomly selected number of participants.

These four designs utilise two distinctions: the time orientation and the purpose of mixing the quantitative and qualitative approaches in a study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). First, the time orientation distinguishes between designs where the mixed methods are implemented concurrently (Creswell, 2009), or in parallel (Mertens, 2010), or sequentially (Creswell, 2009). A concurrent or parallel design is when qualitative and quantitative information is collected at the same time, whereas the sequential design is implemented when quantitative and qualitative information are gathered one after the other (Onwuehbwu & Collins, 2007).

Second, the purpose for using mixed methods is another distinction that shapes the mixed method design of a study. Greene et al. (2005) identified four distinct purposes for mixing methods. The four distinct purposes were triangulation, complementarity, development and expansion. Triangulation occurs when the quantitative and qualitative approaches are used to increase the validity in assessing the same phenomenon or phenomena. Mixing methods for the purpose of complementarity occurs when the results from both approaches are used to serve to elaborate, enhance, deepen and broaden the overall interpretations and inferences of the study. The third purpose for mixing methods is development. In a mixed methods development study, the results of one method are used to help select the sample, inform the development of other methods or to help in the development of actual instrument construction. Such an approach is implemented sequentially. Fourth, in an expansion mixed methods study, the different methods are used to assess
different phenomena. The quantitative and qualitative data are combined by using more than one method to extend the scope and range of inquiry.

In accordance with the categories of mixed methods design discussed by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), the purpose in this study for mixing quantitative and qualitative methods was to extend the scope of inquiry; both complementarity and development functions are relevant to this study. According to Hamid (2009), the explanatory method is based on the purpose of complementarity and initiation, the exploratory design functions as complementarity and expansion whereas the embedded design is based on the development purpose.

Thus, this study adopted the explanatory design with the specific purpose of using the qualitative data to help explain and support the quantitative data. On the other hand, this study was also exploratory in nature, as the study’s purpose was to explore the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EMI/EFL contexts in depth. In relation to this research design, this present study employed an explanatory sequential data collection. That is, the study was accomplished in two phases, a quantitative followed by a qualitative phase. Each phase provided information about the learning and teaching of RCS among EMI/EFL students and teachers in Brunei’s primary schools, to give a more complete picture that addresses the research questions.

The quantitative phase specifically aimed to examine how reported RCS in reading comprehension lessons are related to students’ backgrounds and teachers’ reported teaching of RCS. Thus, this provided a general overview of the current use of RCS in the Brunei Year 6 classrooms as a baseline for a further investigation of the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. In addition, the results from the quantitative phase helped to select the samples for the qualitative phase. The qualitative phase focused on investigating how learning and teaching of RCS were related to students’ and teachers’ backgrounds. Also undertaken in this phase was the identification of challenges faced by students and teachers in learning and teaching of RCS in an EMI/EFL environment, and the exploration of how challenges are managed by the students and teachers in terms of RCS practices in the L2 RC lessons. Results from the qualitative phase were used to enhance and elaborate the results found in the quantitative phase; specifically the relatedness of learning and teaching of actual RCS used and students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and other societal factors. Thus, this mode of data integration is complementary, where the results from one method are used to elaborate, enhance or illustrate the results from the other (Greene et al., 2005).
In addition, data triangulation and method triangulation were also employed in the qualitative phase to crosscheck results for consistency, to balance any bias and to reduce false conclusions (Hammersley, 2008). That is, data in the qualitative phase were collected from three sources using the same subjects that was, students’ focus group interviews, teachers’ in-depth interviews, and classroom observations.

4.2.3 Summary of the research design.

In sum, having discussed the theoretical issues of the research design and the aims of this study in the previous section, implementing a mixed method research approach was the most appropriate for the study. This research employed an instrumental case study using a sequential explanatory design. Quantitative data collection, based on a self-report survey, was used in the first phase of the study, followed by qualitative methods based on students’ focus group interviews, teachers’ interviews, and classroom observations in the second phase.

In the quantitative phase, investigation focused on the examination of the reported use of RCS and its relation to students’ background and teachers’ reported teaching of RCS. The second phase focused on an in-depth examination of the use of RCS in the learning and teaching of L2 RC, and its relations to students’ and teachers’ backgrounds and other societal factors that may contribute to the complexities of the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC in EMI/EFL contexts.

4.3 Research Methods

This section presents details of the research site, participants and sampling, and the research instruments used in the study.

4.3.1 Research site.

The research was conducted in Brunei Darussalam, which is a small Malay Islamic monarchy, with an estimated population of about 460,000 people, situated on the Central West coast of Borneo. There are four districts in Brunei Darussalam: Brunei-Muara, Tutong, Belait and Temburong.

Students and teachers from 44 schools across Brunei-Muara District, the largest district in Brunei Darussalam, participated in the study. The study focused on government-funded schools
because most children entering primary education in this district enrol in government-funded schools. The majority of the teachers in government-funded schools have graduated from the Brunei Teacher Training College or the Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Education at the University Brunei Darussalam (Norlipah, 2011). Moreover, the government primary schools across Brunei-Muara district reflect the general population across Brunei Darussalam, in terms of ethnicity. That is, the majority of the students and teachers came from the Malay ethnic group with their linguistic background being Brunei Malay (Norsidah, 2011).

### 4.3.2 Participants and sampling.

As a starting point, a research project needs to define its sample size. Onwuegbuzie and Collins (2007) stated that “sample size determines the extent to which the researcher can make statistical and/or analytic generalizations” (p.287). Creswell (2008) suggested selecting a sample that was as large as possible from the population because “the larger the sample the less the potential error that the sample will be different from the population” (p.156).

The students selected for this study were chosen based on the fact that they were taught by the teachers in the sample. The students were identified using a stratified sample according to their ability in reading. Every teacher selected a sample from his or her class, which included three high ability readers, three students who were intermediate readers and three low ability readers. Each teacher selected them based on their evaluation of the students’ achievement in English reading and their English language mid-year test. Altogether, 477 students were involved in the study, comprising 159 students from each of the three levels of reading achievement (high, medium and low).

The student participants were drawn from all five school zones in Brunei-Muara. Table 4.1 shows the distributions of the students’ participants according to schools’ zones in this study.
Table 4.1

Number of Students’ Participants According to Schools’ Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Brunei 1</th>
<th>Brunei 2A</th>
<th>Brunei 2B</th>
<th>Brunei 3</th>
<th>Brunei 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locations of</td>
<td>Water village,</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Away from the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>and, on land in</td>
<td>housing area.</td>
<td>housing area</td>
<td>housing area</td>
<td>in more rural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the heart of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos. of</td>
<td>90 (30 students</td>
<td>90 (30 students</td>
<td>72 (24 students</td>
<td>99 (33 students</td>
<td>126 (42 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>of each RA levels)</td>
<td>of each RA levels)</td>
<td>of each RA levels)</td>
<td>of each RA levels)</td>
<td>of each RA levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Primary Section, Department of Schools, Ministry of Education (2011), there were 60 primary schools in Brunei-Muara district comprising 70 year 6 teachers. In this study, there were initially 66 EFL teachers from government funded schools across the Brunei-Muara district, the largest district in Brunei Darussalam, who participated in this study. However, only 53 teachers submitted and completed the questionnaire. The 53 participant teachers with valid data consisted of seven males and 46 females, who were in their 20s, 30s and 40s.

In the qualitative phase of the study, a total of nine teachers were selected using purposeful sampling. These participants were chosen from the sample used in the quantitative phase of the study. Purposeful sampling is employed in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the study (Patton, 2002) and to provide rich and varied insights into the phenomena being studied (Merriam, 2009). The teachers were selected so that three teachers were high users of RCS, three teachers were intermediate users of RCS and three were low users of RCS. The high, medium and low users of RCS were identified using the self-report survey in the quantitative phase of the study. The 81 students of these nine teachers were also included in this phase of the study. However, one of the teachers could not participate in the second phase of the study as a result of being transferred to teach other subjects; therefore, the final sample in the qualitative phase consisted of only eight teachers and 72 students.

4.3.3 Research instruments.

Data collection for this study involved the use of several research instruments. In the quantitative phase of the study self-report surveys were used with both students and teachers, while in the qualitative phase of the study an English reading comprehension simulation task, students’ group interviews, teacher interviews, and classroom observation were used to provide data. The
details of the instruments and reasons for choosing them are discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.3.3.1 Self-report surveys.

Students’ and teachers’ self-report surveys were used in the quantitative phase of the study. The surveys used in the study were adapted from previous research (Baker and Boonkit, 2004; Cabaroglu & Yurdaisik, 2008) related to the use of RCS in the learning and teaching of L2 reading comprehension. Details about the surveys are provided later in section 4.3.3.1.1.

The surveys were used to elicit information about participants’ backgrounds and their use of RCS in the learning (student participants) and teaching (teacher participants) of L2 reading comprehension. In order to ensure students and teachers understood the survey items, all the items were presented both in English and Bahasa Melayu. The surveys, originally in English, were translated into Bahasa Melayu through the following stages. The researcher made the first draft of the translation. To avoid the possibility of the translated version not fully representing the meaning implied in the English version and to enhance the reliability of the surveys, the translated versions were checked by three English teachers who were native speakers of Bahasa Melayu but who were not participants in the study. Suggestions for improvement given by the teachers were taken into consideration and suitable adjustments of the Bahasa Melayu version were made. Next, the surveys in Bahasa Melayu were then checked via back translation to ensure their conformity with the originals. They were given to two different English teachers for back-translation. The English versions were compared to the originals and discussions were conducted to address any problems and to agree on a bilingual version.

4.3.3.1.1 Student self-report survey: The use of English reading strategies survey.

This survey was used to measure the reported use of RCS by the students when they read L2 texts. The English reading strategies survey, developed by Baker and Boonkit (2004), addressed this issue and this survey was then used in the present study. Permission was obtained from the authors for its use.
The original version of the English reading strategies survey (Baker & Boonkit, 2004) was used in this study to measure students’ types and frequency of using RCS to understand the L2 texts they read. Oxford’s (1989) questionnaire contained six scales and Baker and Boonkit’s modification retained these scales and numbers of items. Each scale is as follows: memory strategies (3 items), cognitive strategies (13 items), compensation strategies (2 items), metacognitive strategies (12 items), affective strategies (1 item) and social strategies (1 item) (See Table 4.2).

Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) survey had also distributed the items in the survey related to the stages of reading; that is, pre-reading (7 items), during reading (15 items) and post-reading (10 items). The items for the pre-reading stage included six metacognitive strategies (items 1-6) and one cognitive strategy (item 7). Fifteen during-reading items comprised eight cognitive strategies (items 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19, 20 and 22), three metacognitive strategies (items 10, 15 and 21), two memory strategies (items 12 and 13) and two compensation strategies (items 17 and 18). The items for the post-reading stage consisted of one memory strategy (item 29), four cognitive strategies (items 24, 26, 27 and 28), three metacognitive (items 23, 30 and 31), one affective (item 32) and one social (item 25) strategies (see Table 4.2). These descriptions were also used in this study. The adapted survey is presented in Appendix 1.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Pre-reading</th>
<th>During reading</th>
<th>Post-reading</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Items 12 and 13</td>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Items 8,9,11,14,16,19,20, and 22</td>
<td>Items 24,26,27 and 28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Metacognitive</td>
<td>- Items 1,2,3,4,5 and 6</td>
<td>Items 17 and 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Social</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Items 10,15 and 21</td>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) survey was developed from Oxford’s (1989) questionnaire. She developed a self-report questionnaire called *The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)* that gathers information on the use of learning strategies by language learners. These strategies relate to one of four aspects of language: listening, speaking, reading or writing. SILL has been field tested in many studies since its creation in 1989. It has been used in English-as- first-language...
situations, as well as in English as a second or foreign language context, both for adults (Griffiths, 2007; Kok, 2010; Nam & Leavell, 2007; Rao, 2006; Yang, 2006; Zhenhui, et al., 2007) and young learners (Belet & Gursoy, 2008; Boyan; 2002; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Sugeng, 1997; Yu, 2006). The survey’s validity was derived from previous work by Oxford (1989) and Baker and Boonkit (2004).

The reading comprehension strategy items, in the English reading strategies survey, were originally drawn from Oxford’s (1989) general reading strategies and Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) research experiences. Baker and Boonkit (2004) modified Oxford’s items to reflect reading process theories of EFL/ESL. Baker and Boonkit’s study not only looked at different RCS, but also which strategies were used in the reading process. Thus, the current study sought to examine not just RCS in isolation, but also which strategies might be used in different stages of reading (pre, during and post reading stages).

The 32-items in the English reading strategies survey were then used in the current study after it was pilot tested on year 6 students, reviewed by year 6 primary teachers who taught English, and checked by university experts. There were a few changes made to the language used so that the wording in the survey would be clearly understood by young learners. The survey was presented to the year 6 students bilingually in both the English and Malay languages.

The responses of the participants in the survey were collected using a 5-stage Likert scale (1-5). The response possibilities on the scales are 1- never or almost never true of me; 2-usually not true of me; 3-somewhat true of me; 4-usually true of me and 5-always or almost true of me. There is one reversed item (item 17) in the survey. The item was reversed and recorded so that higher scores represented higher use of RCS students’ reported use of RCS.

In order to analyse the using of reading strategies reported by the participants, the three level frequency criteria used by Oxford (1989) were employed (see Table 4.3). The high mean scores indicated the students always or usually reported adopting the strategies. Medium mean scores indicated students sometimes used the strategies. Low mean scores indicated students generally did not use the reported strategies.
Table 4.3

Oxford’s (1989) Criteria of Mean Scores to Understand Language Learning Strategy Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always or almost always used</th>
<th>Usually used</th>
<th>Sometimes used</th>
<th>Generally not used</th>
<th>Never or almost never used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.5 to 5.0</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.4</td>
<td>2.5 to 3.4</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.4</td>
<td>1.0 to 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A number of questions were cross-referenced and negative questions were also used in the original version of the English reading strategies survey, in order to establish the internal validity of the survey. Some negative questions were also used to make up for excessive use of positive responses, as well as to prevent the response-bias tendency to simply agree with everything in the survey. An additional section asking for comments was also added to the survey. The external validity of the survey was reviewed by other English teachers and university experts with knowledge of language learning strategies and questionnaire design.

4.3.3.1.2 Teacher self-report survey.

The purpose of this survey was to investigate the reported teaching of RCS by EFL year 6 teachers in the teaching of L2 reading comprehension. The survey used for this study was adapted from a study conducted in Turkey to investigate the university preparatory school teachers’ views about, and approaches to, reading instruction and reading strategies (Cabaroglu & Yurdaisik, 2008). Permission to use the survey in this research was obtained from the authors.

There were three parts to the survey: background information, teachers’ familiarity with the concept of reading comprehension strategies, and the teaching of reading comprehension strategies. The adapted survey is presented in Appendix 2.
Part 1: Background Information.

The background section covered general information about the teachers. The demographic questions were designed by the researcher. There were both dichotomous and open ended questions. Dichotomous questions required a ‘yes/no’ response.

Part 2: Teachers’ Familiarity with RCS.

The second part of the survey investigated teachers’ familiarity with the concept of reading comprehension strategies (RCS). These questions were developed by Salli (2002, cited in Cabaroglu and Yurdaisik, 2008). Teachers were asked to self-assess their familiarity with the concept of reading strategies based on four pre-determined levels, these being very familiar, somewhat familiar, slightly familiar and not at all familiar.

Part 3: Teaching of RCS.

The original version of Salli’s survey (Salli, 2002, cited in Cabaroglu and Yurdaisik, 2008) was used in this study to investigate the types of RCS used by the teachers and to identify their preferred reading comprehension strategies. The reading comprehension strategy items in the survey were originally drawn from Oxford’s (1989) general reading strategies. Salli modified Oxford’s items to reflect reading process theories of EFL/ESL. Salli’s study looked at the use of different RCS in the reading process.

The survey comprised 37 Likert-type questions of reading strategies. Teachers were asked to indicate how frequently they taught the various reading strategies. The response options were always or almost always true of me; usually true of me; somewhat true of me; usually not true of me and never or almost never true of me.

They were asked to respond regarding frequency of strategy use with respect to several different parts of lesson: pre-reading (10 items), during reading (18 items) and post-reading (9 items) reflecting the division of the reading process proposed by Salli (2002, cited in Cabaroglu and Yurdaisik, 2008). There was one reversed item (item 18) which was re-coded.
The survey comprised 36 positively worded items and one negatively worded item (item 18). The responses to the negatively worded item were reversed and recoded so that higher scores represented higher use of RCS. Teachers’ reported teachings of RCS were calculated by adding up and averaging their scores for all items.

In order to analyse the teaching of reading strategies reported by the participants, the three level frequency criteria used by Oxford (1989) were employed (see table 4.3). High mean scores indicated the teachers responded that ‘they always or usually taught the strategies’. The medium mean scores indicated the teachers ‘sometimes taught’ the reported strategies. The low mean scores indicated the teachers ‘generally did not use, never or almost never taught’ the reported strategies.

The data provided a platform to present an analysis of the overall picture of the current degree of teaching RCS in class, in the sample population. The data were then used to identify and select teachers for the qualitative phase of the study. The selection was based on the teachers who were considered to be high, medium and low users of RCS as determined from the survey.

4.3.3.2 Reading comprehension stimulation task.

An English reading comprehension passage was used as a stimulation task (see Appendix 3). The English passage consisted of approximately 270 words. The passage was taken from The English Revision Book (Cfbt, 2003). It comprised of 5 references, 5 vocabulary and 5 comprehension questions.

4.3.3.3 Interviews.

Interviews are one of the most useful qualitative research instruments for collecting data needed to understand personal experiences and perspectives (Johnson& Christensen, 2014). According to Cresswell (2008), interviews “provide useful information when you cannot directly observe participants, and they permit participants to describe detailed personal information” (p.226). Creswell clarified that “the interviewer has a better control over the types of information received, because the interviewer can ask specific questions to elicit this information” (p.226).

Gall et al. (2007) stated that interviews can be used to collect data that are not observable, such as data on participants’ opinions, experiences or interests. Therefore, in this study, teachers’
experiences of using RCS in the L2 reading lessons, and their perceptions of underlying factors that facilitate and hinder their use of RCS, were gathered through interviews.

Creswell (2008) stated that interviews can be identified as structured, unstructured and semi-structured, according to the degree of formality. In structured interviews, pre-determined questions are posed by the interviewer and answered using fixed responses provided by the interviewer. In unstructured interviews, the researcher does not control the responses, and the participants are given full freedom to provide any appropriate explanations they wish.

According to Merriam (2009), semi-structured interviews are guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, although the order of the questions or the predetermined wording may be varied. This flexibility allows the researcher to respond instantly to the participants’ points of views or ideas. This type of interview allows the researcher to gain more information than from the more structured interview format, as it is possible to probe with more open questions during the interview sessions, depending on the responses of the interviewees. According to Gall et al. (2007), the advantage of the semi-structured interview is that it provides more standardised data across interviewees than from unstructured interviews, and with greater depth than in structured interviews.

In this study, non-standardised and more in-depth data were collected for the purpose of answering the research questions in the qualitative phase of the study. Therefore, the semi-structured interview format was used, as it generated more information about the participants’ experiences and, at the same time, provided a non-standardised data set which was easier for the researcher to analyse. Semi-structured interviews were used for students’ group interviews and teacher interviews in the qualitative phase of the study.

An interview log and tape recorder were used during the interview sessions in order to record details of the interviews; for example date, time, venue and comments. The group interview guides for students and teachers are described below.

4.3.3.3.1 Student group interviews.

Group interviews were administered to the students in this study. This enabled data collection about shared understanding from several individuals and it was also useful for the limited time to collect information (Creswell, 2013). In this study, semi-structured interviews were used to
guide the group interviews in order to elicit more in-depth information about the students’ use of actual RCS; as well as their experiences about using RCS, including how they manage such challenges in learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. Thus, this approach provided data to answer research questions 1 and 2 on the perspectives of the students. A student group interview guide (see Appendix 4) was used by the researcher in carrying out the interviews.

4.3.3.3.2 Teacher individual interview.

The purpose of the semi-structured interviews, for the teachers in this study, was to gain more information on the teaching of actual RCS in relation to those teachers’ backgrounds and other societal factors, and their experiences of challenges in teaching RCS in L2 reading lessons within the EFL and EMI environments. The management challenges experienced by teachers in terms of RCS practices in the teaching of L2 RC, within the EFL/EMI contexts, were explored through the interviews; thus providing data to answer research question 2 on the perspectives of the teachers.

English or Bahasa Melayu was used in the interview sessions with the teacher participants. Knowing the difficulty that some teachers might have in finding a time to meet for a group interview, due to workloads or other reasons, an individual interview with the teachers was used to collect data. A teacher interview guide (see Appendix 5) was used for the researcher in carrying out the interviews.

4.3.3.4 Classroom observations.

Observation is a well-accepted form of qualitative data collection (Creswell, 2008). Creswell clarifies that “observation is the process of gathering open-ended, firsthand information by observing people and places at a research site” (p.221). One of the advantages of conducting observations is to record information about behaviour or events that occur in the actual setting, to study actual behaviour and watch individuals who may have difficulties verbalising their ideas (Creswell, 2013).

The purpose of using observations in this study was generally to collect data about the teaching of RCS in the L2 reading lessons. Specifically, observations for each of the eight teachers in the qualitative phase of the study were conducted, in order to provide more in-depth information about the teaching of RCS in L2 reading comprehension lessons.
Non-participant observation was used in this study, due to the fact that a participant observer might interrupt classroom activities. According to Creswell (2008), a non-participant observer visits the site and records notes without involving herself or himself in the participants’ activities. The researcher in this study therefore sat at the back of the classroom to record the observable facts under study. A broad-to-narrow perspective of observation strategy was applied by the researcher in the observation sessions (Creswell, 2013). The researcher engaged in broad observation, first by noting the general landscape of the classroom, activities or events. As the researcher became familiar with the setting, then she began to narrow the observation to specific aspects by looking at the teachers’ classroom practices in teaching of RCS in L2 reading comprehension lessons. Classroom observation field notes (see Appendix 6) were used to record the proceeding of the lesson. All lessons were audio-video taped.

4.4 Data Collection

Ethical approval was sought and gained from the School of Education Research Ethics Committee of the University of Queensland (see Appendix 7). Data collection for the study began with pilot tests of the instruments, followed by formal collection of data through two phases.

4.4.1 Pilot test of instruments.

Students’ and teachers’ report surveys, students’ group interviews and teachers’ interviews were piloted before the collection of the actual data. In regards to the instruments used to collect student data, nine students were involved in testing the student self-report survey; three out of nine were then involved in the group interview.

Three teachers were involved in piloting the teacher self-report survey, and two of them were involved in the teacher interview. The purpose of the pilot study was explained to the students and teachers. The teacher self-report survey was tested with two year 6 EFL teachers, who were not part of the research population. The teacher interview protocol was tested with two teachers who, also, were not part of the research population. No changes were made to the two instruments.

In the end, no suggestions were provided to alter the research instrument before they were used to collect study data.
4.4.2 Data collection phases.

Data collection was conducted into two phases which are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4
Phases of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major phases</th>
<th>Name of the phases</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Quantitative phase</td>
<td>Student questionnaire (n=477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher questionnaire (n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Qualitative phase</td>
<td>Stage 1: Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group interviews (n= 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2: Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations (n=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (n=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.1 Phase 1: Quantitative phase.

The administration of the student self-report survey occurred with the help of the teachers in charge. The students were provided with the information package, student letter and student consent form. Prior to the administration of the students’ self-report survey, the teachers involved in this study were briefed on how to answer any questions appropriately; explanations were provided to clarify the concepts included in the self-report survey. The teachers were given one week to administer the students’ self-report survey and a date was set for them to return the completed forms. A total number of 477 surveys were collected and all were eligible for analysis. Teachers were also asked to collect identification of students’ gender, as this information was necessary to provide a description of the sample for data analysis.

In the administration of the teachers’ survey, the teachers who had agreed to participate in the study were provided with a set of papers including the information package, the teacher letter, the teacher consent form, and the self-report survey. The teachers were given one week to complete the survey. To collect the survey data, the researcher arranged a meeting with each teacher. A total number of 53 surveys were collected for analysis, out of a possible total of 60.
4.4.2.2 Phase 2: Qualitative phase.

There were two stages in the qualitative data collection phase. Stage 1 involved students’ group interviews and teachers’ interviews. Following a purposive sampling scheme, nine teachers were selected to participate in this phase. However, one teacher withdrew from this study as a result of being transferred to teach other subjects. Stage 2 of this phase involved classroom observation.

The following is the explanation of data collection according to the stages involved in this phase.

Stage 1: Students’ Data Collection.

The group interviews for the students were conducted on different days, using semi-structured interviews. Seventy-two students were supposed to be interviewed; however, only 67 students were involved in the sessions as five of the students were absent when their interview sessions were conducted. Each interview took approximately 45 minutes. The interview was conducted in the school libraries of the respective schools.

The session was introduced with the explanation of the purpose and significance of the session. An interview session was conducted with the students to elicit information about their reading process in understanding the text. The questions asked in the session were based on the questions found in the student’s group interview guide in Appendix 4. The sessions were audio recorded and supplemented by written notes.

Stage 2: Teachers’ Data Collection

(a) Interviews.

Eight teachers were interviewed in this study; the interviews ran between 30 and 60 minutes. The interviews were conducted in the libraries of the respective schools.

The semi-structured interviews began with an introduction by the researcher, followed by an explanation of the purpose of the interview session. The interviews were based on the questions in the teachers’ interview guide, as set out in Appendix 3. The data collected in the interview were audio recorded and supplemented by written notes.
b) Classroom observation

The eight EFL teachers, who were involved in the interview session, were also involved in the classroom observations. Two reading comprehension lessons were observed for every teacher, for a total of 16 lessons. Prior to the classroom observation, the details of the observations were explained to the teachers; in particular, where the observer should be located. The observer sat at the back of the class. The tape and video recorder were placed where it captured the best audio and videos during the lessons. Observation field notes were also used to record the proceedings of the lesson (see Appendix 5).

4.5 Data Analysis

The quantitative and qualitative data were analysed separately. The data were then matched and linked for the interpretation of findings.

4.5.1 Quantitative data analysis.

The quantitative data were collected from the students’ and teachers self-report surveys about their reported use of RCS in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms. The following sub-section describes the analysis of the data from the students’ and teachers’ self-report surveys respectively.

4.5.1.1 Student’s self-report survey.

Data collected from the self-report survey was analysed using the statistical package for social science (SPSS). Cronbach’s alpha was also calculated in order to estimate the internal consistency reliability of the scales. A normality test was also performed prior to the analysis of the data from the students’ survey, in order to check whether the raw reading strategies’ scores were normally distributed for analysis using parametric tests. Data analysis for the students’ survey also included calculating descriptive statistics including means, frequencies and standard deviations for the whole sample, and subgroups related to gender and students’ reading achievement levels.

In this study, the reading strategies and six strategy categories were dependent variables, whereas gender and students’ reading achievement levels were independent variables. In order to determine if there were significant differences in the use of reading strategies among students with
high, intermediate and low reading achievement, ANOVA procedures were conducted (Pallant, 2011). Given the results of the one way analysis of variance were significant, post hoc procedures were conducted in order to identify the differences between groups. A univariate test was conducted to examine differences in the use of reading strategies between boys and girls. In addition, MANOVA procedures were conducted to determine the effect of the independent variables of students’ reading achievement levels and gender on the dependent variable of reading strategies group (ibid). Follow-up univariate F tests, and post hoc comparisons, were also performed to investigate the main effects of reading achievement levels and gender on strategy use.

4.5.1.2 Teachers’ self-report survey.

The data from the responses to teachers’ survey were entered into to create a statistical package for social sciences (SPSS version 16) database. Descriptive statistics (means, frequencies and standard deviations) were used to summarise the demographic data: gender, age, years of teaching English, highest qualification and professional development activities. Descriptive statistics were performed to examine the overall reported strategies employed by teachers. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated in order to estimate the internal consistency reliability of the scales.

4.5.2 Qualitative data analysis.

The qualitative data for analysis came from multiple sources, including students’ group interviews, teachers’ interviews and classroom observations. The following section describes the analysis of the data from the multiple sources.

4.5.2.1 Students’ group and teachers’ interview data.

A total of 67 students and eight teachers were interviewed to gather data for qualitative analysis in this study. Students’ and teachers’ responses in the interviews were later transcribed verbatim, segmented and coded for analysis. The six phases of a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) were used to guide the analysis of the data gathered through interviews of the students and teachers. The six phases were (a) familiarisation with research data, (b) generating, (c) initial codes, searching for themes, (d) reviewing themes, (e) defining and naming themes and (f) producing the report. The following sub-sections explain the phases involved in analysing raw data from teachers’ and students’ interviews.
a. *Familiarisation with research data*

In order to be familiar with the research data obtained from students’ group interviews and teachers’ interviews, the researcher read the data repeatedly to search for meanings and patterns in the data, as well as taking notes for future coding. The data set was read several times before the actual coding was created.

b. *Generating initial codes*

An analysis of the initial list of ideas about the data content, and its significance, was created manually. Then, the initial codes of the data content were organised into meaningful groups throughout the whole data set. The data set was coded and written manually for the data texts analysed. The data were also gathered within each code; that is, by copying extracts of data from different transcripts of different interviews and gathering them. This phase was similar to open coding, which is often used to identify categories. Creswell (2013). The interview transcripts were read continuously in order to uncover the categories.

c. *Searching for themes*

The codes were organised into themes. The relevant coded transcripts were gathered within the identified themes. The codes were analysed and combined to produce a broad theme. This was similar to axial coding, which is often used to make connections between categories (Creswell, 2008). Axial coding was used to investigate the relationship between data or categories in order to identify similarities and differences of the data (Merriam, 2009). That is, the previously separated categories were thematically brought together into broad themes, with the inclusion of relevant direct quotes from the discussion that underlined those themes (Silverman, 2011).

d. *Reviewing themes*

The themes identified were verified in this phase. That was, undertaken through renaming themes, creating separated minor themes into one major theme, or breaking themes into separate themes. This phase was essential to gather all the different themes, which were then reorganised through the patterns and meanings of the data.

e. *Defining and naming themes*
The significance of the themes identified were then defined and refined for the research purposes analysis. That is by reviewing the data gathered and organising them consistently.

\[ \text{f. Producing the report} \]

The completed sets of themes were identified for the write up of the qualitative analysis. This process was essential to provide sufficient data extracts to support the relevance of the themes. The final thematic analysis is further discussed and elaborated in chapters 6 and 7, which present the research findings derived from the students’ focus group interviews and teachers’ interviews respectively.

\[ 4.5.2.2 \text{ Analysis of classroom observations.} \]

First, teachers’ talk from the tape recordings was transcribed and translated. The transcriptions were read to gain better understanding of the data. Next, coding was done to identify the relevant data. Data were selected and reduced to the data focusing on the phases of teaching reading lessons and the teaching of RCS within the teaching. Similar information was coded from the observations to provide similar patterns and themes. An open and axial coding technique was used to identify categories and themes respectively (Creswell, 2008). Initial analysis and conclusions were drawn. To verify the data, cross-checking with other different sources of findings were made; for example, sources from observation sheet notes and video recording.

Following that, the interviews and classroom observations data set, as a whole, was reframed using (a) Oxford’s LLS classification (1989, 2013), and (b) activity theory analysis. This allowed a deeper look into questions about the facilitating or hindering factors of learning and teaching RCS in L2 RC lesson, and ways students and teachers manage EMI and EFL issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC c RC in EMI/EFL classroom setting.

\[ 4.6 \text{ Validity and Reliability} \]

According to Creswell (2008), reliability refers to the situation where “the scores from an instrument are stable and consistent” (p.169) while validity means “the individual’s scores from an
instrument make sense, are meaningful, and enable you, as the researcher, to draw good conclusions from the sample you are studying to the population” (p.169).

In this research, a pilot study was conducted before the formal study began. The pilot study aimed to examine the reliabilities of the quantitative surveys; that is the students’ and teachers’ self-report surveys. The internal consistency reliabilities of the surveys were measured using Cronbach’s alpha (Creswell, 2013). Secondly, the pilot study helped to check the construct validity of the qualitative data. According to Patton (2002), construct validity can be strengthened in research design through using triangulation. To enhance the construct validity of the qualitative data collected in this study, several sources of evidence were applied in the pilot study. The data that were used in this pilot study were from the students’ group interviews, teachers’ interviews and classroom observations. This pilot study also helped to test for difficulties in administering the qualitative instruments, and to check the face validity of the wording of all Malay-version instruments. At the end of the pilot study, the participants were asked to give comments about the instruments.

Both intra-coder and inter-coder reliability were ensured to enhance the reliability and validity of the coding process in the interviews and classroom observation. Intra-coder reliability was enhanced by administering multiple coding and double coding a portion of the data (Révész, 2012). The data for each of the themes of types of reading strategies, facilitating or hindering factors of EMI in reading strategies use, managing EMI/EFL challenges were double-coded after finishing coding the whole data set.

For inter-coder reliability, only the researcher did the coding because of the time and cost constraints. However, the coding sets obtained by the researcher were given to the researcher’s peers (two PhD students) for feedback. They were provided with a coding set which included a list of factors and their references (excerpts), and a hierarchical list of theme - categories - subcategories - factors (i.e., coding frame). They were requested to check whether the excerpts under each factor elaborated it; and whether the categorisation of factors was arranged logically. Major agreement was obtained for the lists of factors and their references. With regard to the hierarchical list, i.e. categorisation of factors, the researcher received feedback from one of her peers (a PhD student). She suggested that factors such as professional development, socio-historical and school leadership should be put under the theme of ‘community’ rather than ‘tool’ as categorised previously. The researcher then discussed the disagreements with these peer to obtain consensus. During the analysis process, the researcher revised these hierarchical lists several times.
All changes were discussed with the respective peers to gain their agreement before the results were finalised for interpreting and reporting.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

Prior to conducting the study, permission to carry out the study in the respective schools was obtained. This procedure includes attaching copies of written permission from several parties such as approval letters for conducting the study from the School of Education, University of Queensland, and my personal letter to inform my intention of study. The letters were then posted to the Brunei Ministry of Education, through the Brunei High Commission in Canberra, Australia.

Upon receiving the approvals, all Year 6 ESL primary school teachers were informed by contacting their principals through emails or phone calls to provide them with information about the research and invite them to participate in the study. The consent forms were also circulated to inform teachers that they were not obliged to participate and they had choice not to participate from the study anytime without penalty. Given the collegial relationship between the researcher and teachers, it is an advantage that teacher interviewees might feel great rapport and willing to disclose information (Creswell, 2013). Nevertheless, the researcher still undertook all necessary procedures including explaining the purpose of the self-report survey, how classroom observations and interviews data would be used, and ensuring the teachers’ anonymity. In addition, the researcher also promised to send a summary of the results of the study to teachers’ participants if they were interested by providing the researcher with their email addresses.

A self-report survey for students was administered in this study; the first page of the survey stated explicitly that information obtained from the survey was kept confidential. In the interview and observation sessions, the participants’ confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research.

Consent forms were given to the participants of the study. On the part of the students, the consent forms were signed by their parents/guardians. Only students with permission from their parents and guardians participated in the study.
4.8 Summary

This chapter has discussed the conceptual framing and the research design used in this study. The selection of samples, the design of the research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods for each set of data were explained. The ethical considerations underpinning the research were also considered and the approaches used to ensure that the research was conducted following ethical principles were presented.
Chapter 5
Analysis of Students’ Reading Comprehension Strategy Survey

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of the reading comprehension strategies (RCS) survey and the use of RCS with respect to the stages of reading, as reported by Year 6 EFL students in Brunei primary schools. The survey of students’ reading strategies and the use of reading strategies with respect to the stages of reading data were collected concurrently in order to allow both processes to be examined.

This study was undertaken in 44 government primary schools in the Brunei – Muara District. It involved 477 students who were identified by their English teachers as being students with high, medium or low reading achievement. The students’ self-report survey (see Appendix 1) was conducted in order to investigate which factors might be related to students’ reported reading strategies, and with respect to the stages of reading.

This chapter consists of five sections. The first section presents the participants’ background. The next section discusses the RCS scales and the summary of the analysis procedures. The reported uses of RCS, and with respect to the stages of reading by the Year 6 EFL/EMI students, are discussed in the third and fourth sections respectively. The fifth section concludes the chapter.

5.2 The Background of the Participants

5.2.1 Student participants.

This section describes the background of the student sample. Four hundred and seventy-seven students participated in this study: 245 boys and 232 girls. These 477 respondents were selected by teachers, nine by each of the 53 teachers from 44 schools. The research design also meant there were 159 respondents from each of the three levels of reading achievement: high, medium and low. The reading achievement level of each student was previously determined by their classroom English teachers based on (1) the teacher’s evaluation of the student’s achievement in English oral reading and (2) their English language mid-year test results.
All the participants were in year 6. Just over 80% of the participants had studied English for more than 7 years. When asked about their perceptions of studying English reading, the majority of the students regarded the study of English reading as very important (82%) with an additional 14% indicating they considered it to be important.

5.3 Reading Comprehension Strategies Scales

Cronbach’s alpha, which is the most widely reported internal consistency measure, was obtained for the reading comprehension strategy scales in this study. The coefficient alpha for total scale (i.e. all the items) was .88, whereas the reliability coefficients for the component scales were as follows: memory =.87, cognitive =.84, compensation =.88, and metacognitive =.84. The Cronbach alphas for component scales for affective and social strategies were not calculated as there was only one item in each scale (Sijtsma, 2009).

5.4 Summary of the Procedure of Analysis

Teachers’ data were used to analyse their reported teaching of RCS in order to analyse the effect it might have on students reported strategy use, as well as students’ data on their reported use of RCS when they read English texts. Therefore, data analysis procedures for this phase of the study included testing the normality of the teachers’ and students instruction RCS scores, classification of teachers of their reported teaching of RCS, and the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests on students’ reported RCS by location. The following section explains the details of the procedures.

5.4.1 Assessing normality.

A normality test was conducted on the distribution of teachers’ instruction RCS total scores. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance value of .200 was found. The actual shape of the distribution of group scores indicates a reasonably normal distribution. The normal probability plot (normal Q-Q plot) produced a reasonably straight line. Based on these findings, this variable was appropriate for analysis using parametric tests.

Similar tests were also performed for the distribution of raw RCS total scores using students’ data. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance value of .063 was found. This is a non-significant result indicating normality (Pallant, 2011). The actual shape of the distribution of group
scores indicates a reasonably normal distribution. The normality of the distribution is also supported by an inspection of the normal probability plot (normal Q-Q plot). It produced a reasonably straight line. Based on these findings, this variable was appropriate for analysis using parametric tests.

Similar tests were also performed on the distribution of raw scores for each of the sub-scales as well as the scores related to the reported RCS with respect to the three stages of reading subscales. The distribution for all sub-scales indicated reasonably normal distributions. Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance values of .054, .051, .200, .160, .107 and .215 were found for the cognitive, metacognitive, social, compensation, memory and affective subscales respectively.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance values of .069, .058 and .058 were found for pre, during and post scales respectively. The inspection of the normality probability plots showed a reasonably straight line that indicates the variables were appropriate for analysis using parametric tests.

5.4.2 Teachers’ classifications of their reported teaching of RCS.

This study also examined the relationships between students’ reported RCS and teachers’ reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension. Therefore, the teachers’ reported instruction about RCS was taken from the teachers’ self-report survey about their RCS instruction in English reading comprehension lessons.

The teachers’ self-reported RCS instruction mean scores were calculated. The cut-off scores related to each classification were based on the three level frequency criteria used by Oxford (1989). The high mean scores indicated the teachers always or usually reported adopting the teaching of RCS. Medium mean scores indicated teachers sometimes teach the strategies. Low mean scores indicated teachers generally did not teach the reported strategies. When the teachers’ self-reported instruction mean scores were calculated, it was found that there were three categories of teachers: those who reported high levels of instruction of RCS (n=40); those who were classified in the medium group (n=10), and those whose self-reported low instruction of RCS placing them in the low group (n=3). However, no teachers were found who reported they provided no instruction of RCS. Since there were only three teachers in the low group, the low group was combined with the medium group. As a result, a two-group analysis was formed: the high and low/medium group.
5.4.3 Students’ reported RCS by location.

To determine whether location had a significant effect on the use of reading strategies, the students’ self-report data were analysed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with location as the independent variable, and student responses to the RCS survey as the dependent variable. A Wilk’s Lambda multivariate F was used in order to interpret the MANOVA results. The Wilk’s = .92 was significant, $F(4, 472) = 1.630$, $p=.028$, partial eta squared = .20, indicating that there was a significant multivariate effect in the reported use of reading strategies for location. However, follow up univariate tests found no significant effects for location in the reported use of reading strategies (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1.

<p>| Relationship of Students’ Use of Reading Strategies and Locations (School Zones) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy group</th>
<th>Brunei 1 (n = 90)</th>
<th>Brunei 2A (n = 90)</th>
<th>Brunei 2B (n = 72)</th>
<th>Brunei 3 (n = 99)</th>
<th>Brunei 4 (n = 126)</th>
<th>df (4,472)</th>
<th>Sig. 2.tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>M 3.22 SD 0.89</td>
<td>M 3.00 SD 0.86</td>
<td>M 3.13 SD 0.91</td>
<td>M 3.09 SD 0.92</td>
<td>M 3.17 SD 0.79</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>M 3.60 SD 0.66</td>
<td>M 3.41 SD 0.63</td>
<td>M 3.68 SD 0.53</td>
<td>M 3.55 SD 0.62</td>
<td>M 3.54 SD 0.58</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>M 2.95 SD 1.42</td>
<td>M 2.88 SD 1.06</td>
<td>M 3.03 SD 1.65</td>
<td>M 2.73 SD 1.32</td>
<td>M 2.76 SD 0.96</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>M 3.42 SD 0.72</td>
<td>M 3.40 SD 0.62</td>
<td>M 3.47 SD 0.71</td>
<td>M 3.45 SD 0.67</td>
<td>M 3.42 SD 0.61</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>M 2.54 SD 1.40</td>
<td>M 2.32 SD 1.40</td>
<td>M 2.81 SD 1.27</td>
<td>M 2.76 SD 3.41</td>
<td>M 2.39 SD 1.29</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>M 3.53 SD 1.09</td>
<td>M 3.66 SD 1.13</td>
<td>M 3.25 SD 1.10</td>
<td>M 3.65 SD 1.10</td>
<td>M 3.50 SD 1.08</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>M 3.21 SD 1.03</td>
<td>M 3.11 SD 0.95</td>
<td>M 3.23 SD 1.03</td>
<td>M 3.21 SD 1.34</td>
<td>M 3.13 SD 0.88</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M=\text{Mean}, SD=\text{Standard Deviation}, \text{Sig} = \text{Significance}$

Next, MANOVA was run with students’ reported use of RCS in relation to reading process and location. The Wilk’s = .96 was not significant, $F(4, 472) = 1.378$, $p=.170$, partial eta squared = .012, indicating that there was no significant multivariate effect in the reported use of reading strategies in relation to reading stages for location (See Table 5.2). Thus, these analyses suggested that location was not a factor in strategy use or reading stages, and that this variable could be disregarded in further analysis.
Table 5.2.

Relationship of Students’ Use of Reading Strategies in relation to Reading Process and Locations
(School Zones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Process</th>
<th>Brunei 1 (n = 90)</th>
<th>Brunei 2A (n = 90)</th>
<th>Brunei 2B (n = 72)</th>
<th>Brunei 3 (n = 99)</th>
<th>Brunei 4 (n = 126)</th>
<th>df (4,472)</th>
<th>Sig 2.tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, Sig = Significance

5.5 Relationship of Reported use of RCS by Reading Achievement (RA), Gender and Teachers’ Reported Teaching of RCS

5.5.1 Effects of gender and RA levels on reported used of RCS.

A factorial 2 (gender) x 3 (RA group) MANOVA test was conducted with reported use of RCS as the dependent variables. There was a main effect for group F (2, 477) = 16.24, p = .000, partial eta squared = .07; however, there was a significant effect for gender F (2, 477) = 2.57, p = .01, partial eta squared = .02, and there was no significant interaction F (2, 477) = 1.35, p = .27, partial eta squared = .06.

5.5.2 Use and relationships of strategy group by students with different RA levels.

The analyses reported above related to reading strategy use. The following analyses examined whether RA groups differed across the subscales of the RCS. A multivariate test was conducted. The Wilk’s $\Lambda$ = .083, was significant, F (14,936) = 6.38, p < .001, partial eta squared = .087, indicating that there were significant differences between reading achievement levels on the dependent variables.

Follow up univariate analyses revealed that there were significant group effects on four of the six subscales (see Table 5.3). There were significant differences in the reported use of memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies among the students with different RA.
Table 5.3
Reported Use of Reading Strategies by Students with High, Medium and Low Reading Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy group</th>
<th>High RA (n=159)</th>
<th>Medium RA (n=159)</th>
<th>Low RA (n=159)</th>
<th>df (2,474)</th>
<th>Sig.2tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory (k=3)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive (k=13)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (k=2)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive (k=12)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective (k=1)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (k=1)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

Bonferroni tests were conducted in order to determine the specific significant differences in the reported strategy group among the students’ with different RA levels (see Table 5.4).

There were no significant differences in using memory (MD=0.49), cognitive (MD=0.96), metacognitive (MD=1.98) and social strategies (MD=-0.03) among the students with high and medium RA.

The comparison of students with high and low RA showed significant differences especially in memory (MD=0.89), cognitive (MD=0.54), metacognitive strategies (MD=0.55) and social strategies (MD=0.30) at p=.049. However, the significant difference for social strategy was very low, when compared to the other subscales.

The students with medium and low RA showed significant differences in cognitive (MD=-0.44) and metacognitive (MD=3.54) performance. A significant difference in social strategy (MD=0.33) was evident, whereas no significant differences was found in the use of memory strategies (MD= 0.40).

Table 5.4
Comparisons of Mean Differences between RA levels in Reading Comprehension Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Metacognitive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.610</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=Mean Difference (I-J), Sig= Significance; H=High, M=Medium, L=Low.
5.5.3 Use and relationship of the strategy group by gender.

This research also examined differences in the reported RCS between male and female students. The MANOVA result with Wilk’s Lambda shows that there were significant differences between the two gender groups on RCS use, Wilk’s Lambda = 0.92, $F(6,470) = 7.049^a$, $p=.000$, partial eta squared = .083.

In order to look at the differences in the use of reading strategies between male and female students a univariate test was conducted. Table 5.5 shows significant differences were found between males and females in the use of memory, cognitive, metacognitive, and affective strategies. Females were found to more frequently use memory, cognitive and metacognitive strategies than males. Males used affective strategies more frequently than females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy group</th>
<th>Boys(n=245)</th>
<th>Girls(n=232)</th>
<th>df (1,475)</th>
<th>Sig. 2 tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M$=Means, $SD$=Standard Deviations, Sig=Significant

5.5.4 Relationship between students’ reported RCS and teacher’s reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension.

The dependent variable was the students’ overall reported RCS and the independent variable was the teachers’ reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension. The MANOVA result with Wilk’s Lambda shows that there were significant differences between two groups of teachers, on students reported RCS use. Wilk’s Lambda =0.93, $F(12,938) = 1.969^a$, $p=.021$, partial eta squared = .031. The students reported use of RCS was associated with the teacher’s reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension.
In order to look at the differences in the students’ reported use of reading strategies between two groups of teachers, a univariate test was conducted. Table 5.6 shows there were significant differences between the two group of teachers’ and students’ uses of memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies at \( p < .05 \).

Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy group</th>
<th>Reported teaching of RCS by teachers</th>
<th>df (1,51)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High group (n=40)</td>
<td>Medium/Low group (n=13)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( M = \text{Mean}, \ SD = \text{Standard Deviation}, \ Sig = \text{Significant} \)

5.6 Relationship of Reported use of RCS with Respect to Stages of Reading by RA, Gender and Teachers’ Reported Teaching of RCS

5.6.1 Effects of gender and reading achievement levels on reported use of RCS with respect to the stages of reading.

A 2 (gender) x 3 (reading achievement group) MANOVA was also conducted to examine the interaction between gender and RA group, on the reported use of RCS with respect to the stages of reading. There was a main effect for RA group \( F (2,477) = 16.08, p < .05 \), partial eta squared = .064; there was significant effect for gender \( F (2,477) = 5.74, p = .02 \), partial eta squared = .012, and there was no significant interaction \( f (2,477) = 1.53, p = .218 \), partial eta squared = .006.

5.6.2 Use and relationship of reported RCS with respect to the stages of reading by students with different reading achievement levels.

In order to investigate differences in reported RCS use, with respect to reading stages among students with RA levels, multivariate tests were conducted. The Wilk’s Lambda = .926, which was significant, \( F (6,944) = 6.21, p = .000 \), partial eta squared = .038. This indicates that there were significant differences between RA levels on the dependent variables (reported RCS with respect to reading stages).
Univariate tests were conducted to look at the differences of reported RCS with respect to the reading stages (see Table 5.7).

Table 5.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading process</th>
<th>High RA (n=159)</th>
<th>Medium RA (n=159)</th>
<th>Low RA (n=159)</th>
<th>df (2,474)</th>
<th>Sig.2tailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M   SD</td>
<td>M   SD</td>
<td>M   SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre (k=7)</td>
<td>3.70 0.61</td>
<td>3.55 0.62</td>
<td>3.32 0.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During (k=15)</td>
<td>3.51 0.54</td>
<td>3.44 0.57</td>
<td>3.18 0.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post (k=10)</td>
<td>3.46 0.62</td>
<td>3.37 0.62</td>
<td>3.11 0.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bonferroni tests were conducted to compare the differences of the stages of reading with respect to the reported RCS and students RA (see Table 5.8).

Large significant differences were found between the high and low RA groups, and the reported RCS, across all the stages of reading. There was also a significant difference found between the students from the low and medium RA groups in the reported use of RCS with respect to the stages of reading. There were no significant differences found between the students with high and medium across all the stages of reading.

Table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA</th>
<th>Pre-reading</th>
<th>During Reading</th>
<th>Post-reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD  Sig.2tailed</td>
<td>MD  Sig.2tailed</td>
<td>MD  Sig.2tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H M</td>
<td>1.04 .120</td>
<td>1.05 .850</td>
<td>0.86 .685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H L</td>
<td>2.65 .000</td>
<td>4.96 .000</td>
<td>3.48 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M L</td>
<td>1.61 .005</td>
<td>3.91 .000</td>
<td>2.61 .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD=Mean Difference, S-Sig.2 tailed, RA-Reading Achievements Levels H=High, M=Medium, L=Low, RA-

5.6.3 Use and relationships between gender and the reported RCS used with respect to the stages of reading.

This research also examined differences among gender when reported RCS were used in different stages of reading. The MANOVA result with Wilk’s Lambda shows that there was significant difference between the two groups, males and females, in reported RCS in different stages of reading, Wilk’s Lambda = 0.98, F(3,473) = 3.893ª, $p=.009$, partial eta squared=.024.
A univariate test was conducted to look at the differences in the reported RCS in different stages of reading between males and females. There were significant differences between males and females in their reported RCS in different stages of reading (see Table 5.9). Females were found to more frequently report using strategies, than males, at each phase of the reading stages.

Table 5.9

Comparison of Mean Differences between Genders in Reported RCS by Reading Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Stages</th>
<th>Boys (n=245)</th>
<th>Girls (n=232)</th>
<th>df (1,475)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre reading</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During reading</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post reading</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation.

5.6.4 Relationship between students’ reported RCS with respect to the stages of reading and teacher’s reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension.

A further examination was also conducted to find out if there was any relationship between students’ reported RCS with respect to reading stages and their teachers’ reported RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension. The MANOVA result shows that there were significant differences between the two groups of teachers on the students’ reported RCS with respect to the stages of reading: Wilk’s Lambda = .95, F(6,944) = 3.89, p=.001, partial eta squared=.024.

Table 5.10 indicates that there were significant differences (at p<.05) between the students’ reported RCS in pre, during, and post reading stages, according to their teachers’ reported teaching of RCS in their lessons.

Table 5.10

Relationship of Stages of Reading with Respect to Students’ Reported RCS and Teachers’ Reported RCS in their Teaching of English Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported teaching of RCS by teachers</th>
<th>Reading process</th>
<th>High group (n=40)</th>
<th>Medium/Low group ( n=13)</th>
<th>df(1,51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre reading</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During reading</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post reading</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, Sig=Significant
5.7 Summary

This chapter has presented the analysis of the students’ self-report survey about the use of RCS when they read L2 texts. The analyses were conducted using descriptive statistic, t-tests and ANOVA and MANOVA tests.

The analysis found that students with high RA preferred to use more strategies and a greater variety of strategies than students with medium and low RA. The significant difference in the use of reading strategies by reading achievements (RA) in terms of high, medium and low levels were also investigated. A one-way ANOVA statistic indicated that reading achievements levels had a significant effects on overall strategy use, F (2,474) =22.57, p<.05. This means that there was a significant relationship between strategy use and reading abilities. That is, a significant relationship of strategy use between students with high and low RA and between students with medium and low RA. Such findings between RA and strategy use support those of previous research (e.g. Akkakoson, 2013; Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Ghosh & Madhumathi, 2012; Hong-Nam, et.al, 2014; Lee & Liao, 2007; Karbalae Kamran, 2013; Shah , et al., 2010; Singhal, 2001; Sheorey & Boboczky, 2008; Zhang & Wu, 2009). These findings provide strong evidence for the influence of reading abilities in strategies use in Brunei as an additional context for RCS research, and confirm that RCS use is related to reading abilities. This means there is a need to help EFL students to become competent readers.

The students with high RA reported using cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently than the medium and low RA groups. This finding supported earlier studies that found the students with high RA preferred to use cognitive strategies most (Afghari & Ghaforinia, 2013; Ozek & Civelek , 2006; Phakiti, 2003). However, this finding was incongruent with previous studies that did not find students with low and medium RA to prefer the cognitive strategy the most (e.g. Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Yang, 2006; Zhang, 2001; Zhang & Wu, 2009). The students with medium RA favoured social strategies more frequently than the high and low RA groups. In addition, the students with high RA used RCS more frequently at the pre-reading phase than at any other phases of reading. This findings support previous research (e.g. Lau, 2006) that argued good readers use strategies more frequently than the poor readers. Hence, this finding also extends the study in that students with high RA used cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently. This explains that there were differences in the means in the use of cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies between reading achievement levels. These results suggest that students’ reading achievements are related to the use of cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies. The
implication of this finding is that there is a need to develop EFL students’ cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies in their reading as students with High RA used these strategies more frequently than students with low RA.

Gender was associated with the reported use of RCS and with respect to the stages of reading. Females reported using the overall RCS more frequently than males. In terms of strategy groupings, females used memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies more frequently than males. Moreover, females were found to more frequently report using strategies than males, at each phase of the reading stages. These findings align with results of other research within the EFL/EMI contexts where female learners reported more strategy use than males (e.g. Boonkongsan, 2014; Denton, et al., 2015; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Green & Oxford, 1995; Lee, 2012; Madhumathi & Arijit, 2012; Oxford & Nykos, 1989; Poole, 2005; Sheorey & Baboczky, 2008; Veloo, et al., 2014). This study found that female students used RCS more frequently than male students. This finding suggests that the implementation of RCS instruction should consider the role of gender in L2 classrooms. While RCS instruction should aim at enhancing the reading comprehension of all students, activities that target the improvement of boys’ use of RCS should be a priority. This finding also supports the contention of activity theory that students’ identities, such as gender differences may play a role in the orientation of activity system (use of reading strategies).

The students’ uses of overall RCS, and with respect to the stages of reading, were associated with the teachers’ reported teaching of RCS in their English reading comprehension lessons. The mean scores for the highest reported use of RCS were the students from the teachers who reported high teaching of RCS. The teachers who reported high and medium/low teaching of RCS in their teaching were related to the students’ use of memory, cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The teachers who reported high and low teaching of RCS in their teaching were related to their students’ reported use of social strategies. This study also found that students’ reported RCS in pre, during and post reading stages, were related to their teachers’ reported teaching of RCS in their lessons. These findings was accordance with previous research (e.g. Akkakoson, 2013; Aghaie & Zhang, 2012; Dabarera, et al, 2014; Nasrollahi, et al., 2015; Raissi & Roustaei, 2013) that highlighted the importance of teaching RCS in enhancing students’ reading comprehension performance. Thus, this finding is important because it contributed to our understanding of knowledge the role of teachers in teaching RCS to provide students’ opportunity to use RCS to enhance their students’ reading comprehension.

Questions may arise as to whether the aforementioned associations are related to the students’ reading comprehension performance. Therefore, a more valid and reliable measure of
these groups of students’ preferences for using RCS was conducted through the reading comprehension stimulation task and students’ group interviews, among the sub-sample of the year 6 EFL students. The analysis of the students’ stimulated reading comprehension task scores and students’ focus group interviews are discussed in the next chapter. Chapter 6 discusses the analysis of different RA levels recorded from the year 6 students’ focus group interviews about their use of RCS in a real situation. The relationship between the use of RCS and reading comprehension task scores will also be discussed.
Chapter 6

Students’ Experiences of Using Reading Comprehension Strategies

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter reported how students’ reading achievement level and gender were related to the students’ reported use of RCS and with respect to the stages of reading. The analysis also generated findings about the association of teachers’ reported teaching of RCS in their English reading comprehension lessons and students’ reported uses of RCS, and with respect to the stages of reading. The findings showed that students’ background and teachers’ reported teaching of RCS in English reading comprehension lesson may have influenced the students’ reported use of RCS, and with respect to the stages of reading. Thus, students’ background and teachers’ reported use of teaching RCS may facilitate or hinder the learning and teaching of RCS in their L2 RC. The chapter concluded by considering the roles of EFL students in the learning of RCS in this context.

Chapter 6 reports results gathered from both the reading comprehension stimulation task and students’ group interviews conducted with 67 Year 6 EFL students who had previously taken the reading comprehension strategies survey (Appendix 1) in phase 1 of this study. Phase 2 of this study moved from a general view of the students and teachers under study to focus on specific and actual reading strategies used by the students in relations to their reading approaches, factors contributing to students’ difficulties in English reading, and students’ negotiations of their difficulties of English reading comprehension.

The findings presented in this chapter were integrated with the relevant findings from the quantitative data analysis, as presented in Chapter 5, to address the related research questions.

Sixty-seven students, who were divided into high (HRA), medium (MRA) and low reading (LRA) achievement levels, participated in the reading comprehension task and interviews. The reading achievement level of each student was previously determined by their classroom English teachers, based on their evaluation of that student’s achievement in English oral reading and their English language mid-year tests.

For the reading comprehension stimulation task, all the students with high, medium and low reading achievement levels were given a passage to read (Appendix 3). The students were asked to read the English passage and then answer 15 questions comprising five reference, five vocabulary
and five comprehension questions. After answering the questions, the students were then interviewed in groups of three about which RCS they used when they read the given text, why they used specific strategies to comprehend the given text, what difficulties they faced in English reading comprehension, and how they addressed their difficulties in reading English texts.

The chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section complied a summary of the analysis procedures. The second section discusses the reading strategies profiles of two groups of students. The third section synthesised the results of the three types of readers, followed by their perceptions of complexities of learning RCS, students’ reading approaches and aims of using RCS. Finally, the chapter closes with an analysis of the ways they managed EFL difficulties, and a summary.

6.2 Summary of the Analysis Procedures

A reading comprehension strategies profile was created for each of the 67 student based on the interviews. Two examples of the students’ reading comprehension strategies profiles are presented in this chapter.

The students’ reading comprehension scores were then obtained and, together with the numbers and types of RCS used in the reading phases, were tabulated (Table 6.1 see Appendix 8). An examination of Table 6.1 (see Appendix 8), was undertaken to discover if any relationship existed between the reading comprehension scores and reading strategies used by students with high, medium and low reading achievement levels.

The analysis of Table 6.1 (see Appendix 8) showed that there were no obvious patterns to be found in relation to the use of RCS and the students with different levels of reading achievement. The number and types of strategies used by students when they read the text, and their reading comprehension scores, were found to be inconsistent with the distribution of their reading achievements levels. There were students with different reading achievement levels who used more strategies, but who did not score well in their reading comprehension task. There were also some students with different reading achievement levels who scored well but used fewer reading strategies than other readers. For example, students 15, 16 and 17 were the students with LRA. These students obtained 60%, 80% and 54% in their reading test respectively. Student 16, with LRA, scored higher than students 15 and 17. These students used a similar frequency and types of strategies but obtained different scores in their reading tasks. Therefore, a closer investigation was required to understand how these students used these reading strategies; particularly, which reading
approaches were used. For this purpose it was necessary to analyse the reading strategy profiles of the individual readers.

In the light of these initial findings, a decision was made to look at the anomalous student participants who revealed uncharacteristic findings. There were 24 anomalous students in the group of 67 students, who were then divided into two groups. The reading strategy profiles of the 24 anomalous students were analysed according to their reported reading approaches as their use of reading strategies was distributed inconsistently with their reading achievement levels. The first group, 15 students, consisted of readers with medium and high reading achievement levels who scored below the expectations of their reading achievement levels in the reading comprehension task. The second group consisted of nine readers with medium and low reading achievement levels, who scored above the expectations of their reading achievement levels. The next section presents two typical examples of the reading strategy profiles developed from these results using one reader from each group.

6.3 Examples of the Reading Strategies Profiles of the Readers

6.3.1 Group 1: Readers with medium and high reading achievement levels who scored below their expected reading levels.

6.3.1.1 Reader 2.

Reader 2 (R2) was considered a high reading achiever by her English teacher, based on her performance in her oral reading and English language test in the school mid-year examination in which she scored an ‘A’ for both.

She scored a ‘B’ (60%) for the reading comprehension task in this study. She scored 5 out of 5 for the reference questions, 2 out of 3 for the vocabulary questions and 3 out of 5 for the comprehension questions.

During the data collection process, R2 read the text soundly. She pointed with her finger at the words while she read the text. This was to avoid reading from the wrong line and to stay focused. She read the passage from the beginning to the end in order to get the general idea of the text. When she read the text she tried to remember her past experiences of when she was in the dental clinic. However, she did not try to relate her past experience to the text she read. After reading the text, she immediately tackled all the questions.
She answered the reference questions first by rereading the specific sentence for the answer. She said that she only read the sentence that was related to the question. She did this with the rest of the reference questions. When she finished answering the reference questions, she moved on to the next type of question, the vocabulary questions. To answer these questions, she reread the specific sentences to get the idea of the meaning of the word. Then, she tried to guess the meaning of the word by choosing the answer from the given options.

Then, she moved on to answer the comprehension questions by rereading the specific sentence for answer. She said that she used her own wording and sentence from the passage in order to answer the questions.

According to her profiles, R2 employed only a low-level of cognitive strategies when she read the text such as ‘reading the text soundly’, ‘pointing at the words while reading’, ‘rereading specific sentences for answers’ and ‘guessing answers from given options’. She read the passage once and then answered the questions immediately after she read the text. She guessed the meaning of the word only for the sake of answering the questions, without any particular consideration of the meaning of the text. She chose answers from the given options to answer the vocabulary questions. She selected answers for the questions, because the answer was stated in the text.

In general, R2 who was considered as a high reading achiever by her English teacher read the text as an exercise in answering the questions that followed. R2 only directed her attention to what was being conveyed by the reading passage’s author in the text in relation to the questions being asked.

6.3.2 Group 2: Readers with medium and low reading achievement levels who scored above their expected of reading levels.

6.3.2.1 Reader 25.

Reader 25 (R25) was a student with a low reading achievement level, as rated by his English teacher. He scored ‘E’ for his oral reading and ‘D’ for English language tests in the mid-year examination in the school. He scored 80% for the reading comprehension task in this study. He scored 4 out of 5 in the reference questions, 5 out of 5 in the vocabulary questions and 3 out of 5 in the comprehension questions.
R25 looked at the pictures before reading the text. He tried to predict what the story was all about by looking at the pictures in the text. He read the text silently. He pointed at the words while reading the text. He read the text twice.

When he read the text, he encountered difficulties in understanding the meaning of some of the words in the text. He reread the specific sentence to understand the meaning better and get the general idea of the whole sentence. While reading the text he tried to remember his own experiences related to the text. According to him, this helped him to understand the text better. He tried to self-retell the story silently in his mind and also tried to come up with his own conclusion about the text where he had a thought about the moral of the story.

After reading the text, he read the questions and tried to answer the reference questions first. He reread the specific sentence for an answer. To answer the vocabulary questions he reread the specific sentence, tried to guess the meaning of the words from the sentence, and translated the meaning into L1. Then, he looked at the options for answers in the vocabulary section. He chose the answers from the given option. When he tried to answer the comprehension questions, he searched for keywords in the text and reread the specific sentence to answer. He said that the text was a medium easy text. Overall, R25 interacted with the text by drawing on his experiences and made some general conclusions about the text. He used an interactive approach to reading.

R25 was considered by his teachers as a low reading achiever. Generally, he used low level cognitive strategies and high level metacognitive strategies more often than high level cognitive strategies and low level metacognitive strategies. The low level cognitive strategies that he used were looking at pictures, reading silently, pointing while reading, reading the text, reading the whole text repeatedly, rereading sentences, deducing word meaning from options of answers, translating meaning to L1, and searching keywords. Predicting the story before reading, guessing the meaning of words, relating past experience with text and self-retelling were the high level cognitive strategies used by R25. The high level metacognitive strategies used were self-evaluating on strategy use, readability of the text and self-inferencing.

In the following section, an analysis of the students’ interviews revealed several findings about the way reading was approached by the two anomalous groups of students when they read the text.
6.4 Types of Readers

The profiles developed of the types of readers were constructed from the reading comprehension simulation task and interviews. In this section, the reading approaches used by the two groups of students are identified and discussed. When the data from the two groups were analysed, three types of readers emerged in relation to how they approached the reading task when they read the text. In order to have a clear picture of the students’ overall use of reading approaches, as they relate to their reading scores (see Table 6.2). The students’ reading scores were then calculated and converted to percentages. The range of students’ reading scores was then classified according to their expected scores for their abilities as suggested by the Department of Primary Schools (JSS, 2010). The students with high, medium and low reading ability were expected to score 75% and above, 74% to 60%, and 59% and below respectively (JSS, 2010).

Table 6.2
Students’ Scores in Reading Comprehension Task and Types of Reading Approaches Used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 HRA/MRA scored below expectations</th>
<th>Group 2 MRA/LRA scored above expectations</th>
<th>Group 3 HRA scored as expected</th>
<th>Group 4 MRA scored as expected</th>
<th>Group 5 LRA scored as expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Sc (%)</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Sc (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sc-scores; RA-reading approach: B: Bottom-up; T-top-down; I-interactive.

When the profiles from the two groups of readers were examined, it was found that in making sense of the text, the readers’ responses varied. These variations led to the grouping of three types of readers: type 1 (bottom-up); type 2 (top-down) and type 3 (interactive), according to how they predominantly approached the reading task and responded in interviews.
6.4.1 Type 1: bottom-up readers.

In Type 1, five readers (2, 27, 28, 43, and 44) were students with a high reading achievement level (HRA) and 4 readers (3, 4, 46 and 56) were students with medium reading achievement levels (MRA). These readers were expected to score high marks, as they were among the students with high and medium reading achievement levels. However, in this study, these readers scored below expectation in the reading comprehension task. Their scores ranged from 40-67% (from grades ‘E’ to ‘D’) according to the Brunei national end-of-year examination standards.

When examining the profiles of these students, these types of readers first read the whole text, giving particular attention to its linguistic forms at the word and sentence levels. As such, comprehension was achieved by a process of decoding the letters, encoding the sound and then constructing meaning from the text (Gascoigne, 2005). This type of reader approaches their reading in a bottom-up manner. In general, the students in this group who used this approach tended to focus on the process of comprehending the text. Bottom-up readers predominantly first read the whole text, giving particular attention to its linguistic forms at the word and sentence levels. As such, comprehension was achieved by a process of decoding the letters, encoding the sound, and then constructing meaning from the text (Gascoigne, 2005). In general, the students in this group who used this approach tended to focus on the process of comprehending the text. That is, they began with the identification of letters. They worked up through words and sentences until the meaning of text was understood. This approach to reading aligns with the ‘bottom-up’ approach as defined by Gascoigne (2005) and these students therefore, were grouped as bottom-up readers (Type 1) in this study.

However, it was also found in this study that those students who used a bottom-up approach, when they read the text, also tried to remember their previous experience(s), but they were unable to relate these to the text they read. However, they scored better than those students who used this approach, but who did not report that they remembered their past experience(s) when they read. This suggests that these students gained their comprehension mainly from the text; further suggesting the importance of using background knowledge effectively during reading.

These readers were selected by their teachers as the students with high and medium reading achievement levels; however, they did not obtain the expected good scores in their reading comprehension task during this current project. This may be due to fact that these students were evaluated by their teachers based on their achievement in English oral reading and their English
mid-year test which comprised not only testing reading comprehension skills but also other broader language skills. This evaluation of a broader set of language skills may explain the differences in teachers’ understanding of their students’ achievements with those revealed by their test scores in the study. Therefore, it can be argued that these readers were to be poor readers using ‘context to aid word recognition’ (Zhogi et al. 2010, p.59).

6.4.2 Type 2: top down readers.

There were six students with HRA (readers 26, 29, 36, 38, 54, 61, and 62) and two students with LRA (readers 8 and 26) who used bottom-up and top-down approaches simultaneously when they read the text. The students with HRA were expected to score above 75% in their reading comprehension test in this study. However, they could only score between 60%-73%. Meanwhile, the students with LRA, who were predicted to score low marks in the test, obtained more points than expected.

These readers were characterised by being able to read the text and used their background knowledge to produce understanding. The top-down model views readers reading the text with meaning, using the information sources in the text and making connections with their own experience to construct the meaning of what they have read. These readers were characterised by their ability to read the text and use their background knowledge to construct understanding. The top-down model views readers as reading the text with meaning, using the information sources in the text, and making connections with their own experience to construct the meaning of what they have read. This group of students predominantly demonstrated these behaviours by using their previous background knowledge and predictions to connect to meaning in the text. Gascoigne (2005) states that top-down readers make use of their guesses, relating their general knowledge to the text, to make meaning. The approaches to reading most frequently used by these readers align with this top-down approach and these readers were grouped as top-down readers (Type 2) in this study.

These students performed better on the reading test than those students who processed information entirely from the text itself. Although type 2 students were more advanced in their reading strategy use by accessing their background knowledge, this study suggests that becoming a top-down reader is not enough, on its own, to enhance reading comprehension.
6.4.3 Type 3: interactive readers.

There were six students with MRA (readers 21, 22, 23, 30, 32, and 40) and one LRA (reader 25) who were categorised the interactive readers. These type 3 readers scored above their reading ability expectations in the reading comprehension task in this study with scores in the range of 73% to 87%.

These students made meaning from the text using not only the information in the text, but also their previous experience, and they also tried to self-evaluate their understanding about the text. For example, after reading the text, these readers discussed the moral of the story, as well as what they had learned from reading the text. This means that they were trying to infer what they learnt from the text. These students predominantly made meaning from the text using not only the information in the text, but also from their previous experience. They also tried to self-evaluate their comprehension of the text. For example, after reading the text, these readers discussed the moral of the story, as well as what they had learned from reading the text. These behaviours align with Nassaji’s (2002) comments about interactive readers, as those who read for meaning, use word and sentence identification, and relate background knowledge, to produce and evaluate their comprehension. Thus, these students could be said to predominantly use interactive approaches and were identified as interactive readers (Type 3) in this study.

The interactive readers did very well in their reading comprehension task, regardless of the reading achievement level that was assigned to them by their English teacher. For these students, a successful reading process combined bottom-up and top-down processing during reading. This is relevant, as the EFL reading processing among students in this study was found to occur at several levels.

There was a close relationship between students’ performance in their reading comprehension task and reading approaches. Readers who used interactive approaches (type 3 readers) in their reading performed better in the reading comprehension task than the other students who practiced the bottom-up (type 1 readers) and top-down (type 2 readers). This suggests that an interactive approach is a factor in enhancing students’ reading performance. This is relevant as the L2 reading processing among students in this study was found to occur at several levels. Hence, the findings of this study corroborate those of the researchers in L2 reading who have acknowledged the importance of interactive processing in reading (e.g. Salataci & Akyel, 2002; Saricoban, 2002; Seng, 2007; Sidek, 2010; Yitiger, et al., 2005; Zhang, 2008). This is particularly important in order
to understand the problems in Brunei where students need to move their reading approaches to an English-based curriculum. An interactive reading type is essential to process content area materials.

6.5 Complexities of Learning RCS

This section presents the results of the reading comprehension stimulation task and students’ group interviews, identifying issues around complexities of learning of RCS in EFL/EMI contexts. Engeström’s triangle (1987) was used to guide the exploration of patterns within the data. The unit of analysis is the activity system. The different elements in the activity system were examined: subject, tools, rules and norms, community and division of labour (Engeström, 1987). According to Engeström (2001), there are links between the elements of activity system. However, the findings of this study highlighted that subject, and tool-object elements were interrelated to achieve learning of RCS in this contexts. The next section discusses the issues around the elements of activity system: EFL students (subject) and students’ reading approaches and aims (subject and object)

6.5.1 Subject: EFL students.

In theory, the subject(s) of the activity system is the individual or group who are participating in the activity being studied (Yamagata-Lynch, 2010). The specific situation of all students investigated here was that reading in English as a second or foreign language necessitates the specific conditions that impact on reading as a foreign language learner, for example, vocabulary knowledge, grammar and the nexus between spelling and pronunciation. The next section discusses how the EFL issues facilitate or hinder the learning RCS in L2 RC classrooms.

6.5.1.1 Vocabulary knowledge.

The analysis of the interview data revealed that all the students perceived that they had problems in understanding English texts, because of vocabulary issues. For example, reader 2 (type 1, HRA) commented, ‘I don’t understand the text I read because I don’t know the meaning of the words and I am not familiar with the words’. Similarly, reader 25 (type3, LRA), confessed that ‘I can easily understand the text when I know the words and their meanings too, otherwise it’s difficult’. Reader 8 (type 2, MRA) also observed that ‘It is easy for me to understand a text if I am familiar with the words in the text, but I have problems when I don’t know the meaning of the word’.
In these accounts, vocabulary reported as being their main difficulty in English reading. Thus this raised a question about what types of vocabulary the students had difficulties with when they read the given English text. A further analysis was conducted to investigate this.

There are two dimensions of vocabulary knowledge as proposed by researchers in the field of vocabulary learning and teaching (e.g. Bogaards & Laufer, 2004; Milton, 2009; Nation, 2001; Read, 2000; Qian, 2002). These are size or breadth of vocabulary knowledge, and depth of vocabulary knowledge. Size or breadth of vocabulary knowledge refers to the numbers of words the learners know at a surface level (Nation, 2001). Depth of vocabulary knowledge refers to learners’ knowledge of various aspects of given words and how well learners know the words (Nation, 2001). Qian (2002) stated that depth of vocabulary knowledge consists of pronunciation, spelling, semantics, register, frequency, morphological, syntactic, associative, grammatical, idiomatic collocational properties.

In this study, the findings revealed that majority of Year 6 EFL students had difficulties with words in semantic levels such as idioms or phrases, grammatical, features and meaning.

First, the analysis found that all students had difficulties in words with idiomatic expression for example phrases or idiom. For example, Reader 8 (type 2, LRA/I) commented that ‘most of the words that I found difficult are the words that I never encounter before’. One of them is the word ‘wink of sleep’. I know the word sleep but I do not know the word wink. I just ignore it’

In this account, reader 8 illustrated the role of depth of vocabulary knowledge. Despite his understanding of the word ‘sleep’, he did not have an idea about the exact meaning of the word ‘wink’, and could not associate the word ‘sleep’ with the word ‘wink’. This led him to ignore the word when read the text for meaning.

Similarly, reader 54 (type 2, HRA/GI) claimed,

*I am not sure about the phrase ‘put on a brave front’, I have heard about the word ‘brave’ and ‘front’, I know what ‘brave’ means, it means ‘berani’ (the Malay word for brave), so I beranilah ke dental cabut gigi (I guess that he is brave to go to dental clinic)’ and ‘front’ means ‘dapan (L1)’.

In this account, reader 54 had a breadth and depth knowledge about the word ‘brave’ as he knew the word ‘brave’ and ‘front’. He could translate the meaning of the word in Malay (L1). By
translating the meaning of the word he could easily guess the meaning of the phrase ‘put on a brave front’. This finding highlighted that breadth of knowledge may facilitate the using of effective strategies such as guessing the meaning of the idiomatic expression.

Second, most of the students claimed that they had difficulties in words that involve grammatical features as past tense verb form. For instance, reader 3 (type 1, MRA/I) said,

*R: do you have any word that you don’t know in this passage?*
*R3: Yes, (pointing at the word ‘thought’)*
*R: Can you say the word?*
*R3: thought*
*R: can you guess the meaning of the word?*
*R3: No*
*R: have you heard the word ‘think’ before (R wrote the word think on the paper)*
*R3: Yes (point at his head to show the meaning of think)*

In this episode, reader 8 did not know the word ‘thought’ but he knew the word ‘think’. He was not aware that the word ‘thought’ was the past tense verb form for the word ‘think’.

Third, a majority of the Year 6 EFL student claimed to have problems with meaning. For example, reader 25 (type3, LRA/I) commented that he did not understand the meaning of the words ‘swollen’, ‘dreaded’, ‘shuddered’, ‘lingered’, and ‘extracted’. Similarly, reader 62 (type 2, HRA/I) reported, ‘I do not know the word such as ‘swollen’, ‘rid’, ‘dreaded’, ‘shuddered’, ‘lingered’, and ‘extracted’. Reader 3 (type 1, MRA/I) explained that ‘I found most of the words in this text are difficult especially the word that I have never encountered before such as ‘swollen’, ‘rid’, ‘dreaded’, ‘greeted’, ‘dash’, ‘drew’, ‘shuddered’, ‘lingered’, and ‘extracted’. When asked about the reasons for not knowing the meaning of the word, all of them replied that they have never seen the word before. For example, some students commented:

*I never heard about the words before (reader 25, type3, LRA/I)*
*I never seen them before (reader 26 type 2, HRA/I)*
*I don’t know because I never seen them before (reader 3, type1, MRA/I)*

Here, readers 3, 25 and 26 lacked breadth of the vocabulary knowledge. The words were not within their vocabulary bank at all. Thus, this finding represented that these students have inadequate breadth of vocabulary knowledge. This provides us insights that these students’ reading comprehension performance could have hindered as their amount of word knowledge was limited
that lead them to skip the words as their reading strategy to compensate for their limited vocabulary knowledge.

The analysis of students’ interview data also revealed students perceived that their limited vocabulary knowledge was because of they were not fond of English reading story books.

For example, reader 28 (type 1, HRA) confessed that ‘I don’t read story books a lot, I only read story books during library period, but I normally read Malay story books’. Another reader commented, ‘No, I don’t read story books, I don’t read story books at home I sometime read story books in the library because we don’t go to the library. We learn Mathematics during our library period’. Reader 40 (type 1, MRA) commented that ‘I only seldom read story books’.

In these accounts, majority of the students were only learn reading during English lessons. They did not read story books during their leisure time. This finding represented the role of depth of knowledge in reading comprehension. Hence, their vocabulary was limited as they read less. It is also evident in the instances that these reader tended to use limited reading strategies to compensate their limitation as they could only advocated reading strategies such as ignoring the word (see 6.6.1.2.2)

This section has highlighted the role of breadth and depth vocabulary knowledge in facilitating or hindering reading comprehension. There perceived that their reading comprehension performance may have been impacted by their lacked of vocabulary knowledge. They had difficulties with idiomatic expression, grammatical and meaning features. These findings corroborate those of researchers in L2 reading who acknowledge the importance of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension (Moghadam, et al., 2012; Sen & Kuleli, 2015; Shen, 2008). This is imperative in understanding the problems of reading comprehension in Brunei where students need to understand English text as a subject and as a tool to understand other content subjects such as Mathematics, and Science that demands sufficient English vocabulary knowledge.
6.5.1.2 Nexus between pronunciation and spelling.

Aaron, et al. (2008) stated that phonological awareness is one of the components of the reading, and being able to decode or sounding out words are linked to comprehension processes (Ecalle, et al., 2013).

In this study, student participants reported that they had difficulties in understanding the text they read, because they could not pronounce the words correctly. They believed that this hindered their comprehension. As exemplified by reader 8 (type 2 LRA) who said ‘when I read the text, and I could not pronounce the word, that made it difficult for me to understand it’; reader 12 (type 1 MRA) also identified the challenges of pronunciation: ‘I have problems with pronunciation in terms of understanding the text I read’.

Similarly, reader 29 (type 2 HRA), reader 26 (type 2 LRA), reader 25 (type 3, LRA) and reader 32 (type 3 HRA) found that pronunciation sometimes made them unclear about the English text they read. As one of them commented, ‘difficult words are sometimes difficult to pronounce; it is not easy to understand the sentence when we can’t read the sentence with correct pronunciation’. These readers believed that pronunciation also plays an important role in the efficiency of text reading and understanding.

In the excerpt above, the student’s pronunciation skill may have impacted their reading comprehension skills. A question raised as why they have pronunciation problem. A further analysis was conducted focusing on the reasons for these problems. This analysis found that the students were having pronunciation problem as they could not spell the words.

For instance, reader 8 (type 2, LRA/GI) commented, ‘I don’t know how to pronounce this word (pointing at the word ‘anaesthetic’). I don’t know how to spell it and the meaning of the word’. When asked if she have encountered the word before, she said no. Likewise, reader 44 (type 1, HRA/I) recounted, ‘I don’t know how to say this word and the meaning of this word (pointing at the word ‘anaesthetic’) so I cannot figure out the meaning of the word and I also never heard about it in written or spoken’.

Droop and Verhoeven (2003) claimed that decoding skills contributed to comprehension outcomes. Hence, the students’ reading comprehension in this study may have been negatively impacted when they had word decoding difficulties. It was also found that students were having
problems in sounding out the words as they could not spell the word. Spelling has also been identified as a skill that is related to success in reading comprehension (Little & Hart, 2016; Nunes, et al., 2012). Hence, the findings highlighted that difficulties in sounding out words and spelling may have impacted Year 6 EFL students’ reading comprehension. The finding of this study support other studies that had recognised the role of pronunciation (e.g. Petscher & Kim, 2011) and spelling (e.g. Ehri, 2000; Nunes, et al., 2012; Pikulski & Churd, 2005) in L2 reading comprehension.

6.5.1.3 Grammar.

Grammar refers to the knowledge we have of the order of elements in, and the structure of, a sentence (Kobayashi, 2002). Knowledge of grammar enables language learners to better understand the English text they read. Some of the students mentioned that grammar was another problem they faced when they read English texts.

For example, reader 40 (type 3, HRA/GI) reported, ‘I got stuck in comprehending the English text when I encountered a grammar problem’. Similarly, reader 25 (type3, LRA/GI) claimed that ‘sometimes I had difficulties in comprehending a text because of the sentence structure’.

In these instances, readers 40 and 25 identified grammar as influencing their reading comprehension, raising potential challenges for students in EFL/EMI settings to meet the needs to enhance L2 reading comprehension. A further analysis on grammar issues that may have impacted the students was undertaken. There were two grammatical issues students claimed to contribute to their difficulties in understanding a text read. There were word and sentence structure.

Some students reported that they had difficulties to understand the L2 text they read that involve words in past tense verb form. For examples, reader 40 (type 3, MRA/GI) explained that:

I got stuck in comprehending the English text when I encountered a grammar problem, like there are words which I don’t understand because the words are in past tense verb and it changes the spelling and sometimes I did not realise it was in past tense form.

Similarly, reader 62 (type 2, MRA/GI) claimed. ‘I have problem to understand the text with this word (pointing at the word ‘hesitantly’) and I don’t know if it is an action verb or not, no idea’.
The above excerpts revealed the absence of morphological awareness among readers 40 and 62. Morphological awareness refers to ability to reflect and manipulate morphemes and the morphological structure of words (Kuo & Anderson, 2006). There are three processes of morphological awareness that consists of inflection, derivation and compounding. Inflectional affixes are small in number and are largely regular structurally. Derivational affixes are words that are formed by adding derivational affix such as –ly (adverb). Compound words are formed through different forms e.g. read, reader. Reader 40 denoted that he was not aware of the English inflectional affixes such as past tense verb form ending with –ed. Reader 62 signposted an absence of derivational affixes such as word ending with –ly such as hesitantly that served not only grammatical function but it changed the meaning too.

Second, sentences can be categorised into simple, compound, complex or compound-complex sentences (Verspoor & Sauter, 2000). According to Verspoor and Sauter (2000), ‘simple sentences consists of one main clause only. A complex sentence is a sentence that contains at least one full dependent clause with its own subject and predicate. A compound sentence consists of two or more main clauses. Compound-complex sentences consists of compound sentence with complex pairs, or a complex sentence with compound parts’ (p.32-42). Several Year 6 EFL students had difficulties in understanding a text that involved complex and compound sentence structure.

Reader 61 (type 2, HRA) claimed that, ‘the sentence structure in the text was very difficult to understand, for example when they use long sentences’. Reader 25 (type 3, LRA), noted, ‘it is difficult for me to understand a text with long sentences’.

When asked about these long sentences, reader 61 pointed at the sentence that read as ‘He had to get rid of it in the morning even though he dreaded the thought of visiting a dental clinic’. Reader 25, however claimed, the sentence stated below as difficult for him to understand and claimed it as a long sentence. Reader 25 said, ‘it was a very frightening sound but the intense pain of the rotten tooth made him take a card and wait for his turn’.

In these accounts, the students believed that their text understanding were also affected when they encountered long sentences in English texts. The sentence claimed by reader 61 was a compound sentence with two main clauses and a conjunction ‘even though’. Reader 25 illustrated a complex sentence as a difficult sentence to understand. This raises questions about if they were taught different types of sentences in their English language lesson.
The teachers reported that, grammar lesson was not taught explicitly in English language lesson as reported by Liza (TESL<17HRS/I), ‘we do not teach grammar lesson separately’. Similarly, Ali (PS<5LRS/I), reported, ‘I don’t teach grammar alone as we do not have specific instruction to teach grammar alone and furthermore we do not have grammar books for students. By the way, it is not in the syllabuses’. The lack of focus on grammar meant students were not prepared to understand types of sentences such as simple, compound and complex sentences. This led difficulties for students to understand sentences that have two or more clauses especially for those student who lacked breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge.

L2 reading comprehension among students in this study was found to be affected by their L2 grammar difficulties. The grammar difficulties were mainly related to word and sentence structure. The finding highlighted the grammatical problems were mainly because of absence of morphological and sentence structure awareness. The findings of this study support other studies (e.g. Akbari, 2014; Han & D’Angelo, 2009; Nassaji, 2007) that had identified the importance of grammar knowledge in facilitating L2 reading comprehension. The study also found that the grammar difficulties among students in this study may have contributed to the fact that grammar was not taught explicitly in English lesson as it was not in the syllabus.

6.5.2 Tools and object: reading approaches and aims of using RCS.

Tools mediate the actions and activity of the subject (Engeström, 1999). In this study, tools had an influence on the actions of the activity. This means that the students’ approaches of reading (act as a tool to mediate learning) had shaped the executing of RCS (actions) and aims of using them when they read an English text.

When the results were obtained from the type 1, 2 and 3 readers, the analysis indicated that type 1, 2 and 3 readers all used similar strategies. However, the way strategies were used mainly differed in terms of how and why the students executed them while they were reading the text. In the sections which follow the four reading strategies: ‘previewing the text’, ‘self-evaluating’”, ‘using background knowledge’ and ‘self-inferring’ are examined in detail, in order to understand why and how the different types of readers used them.

6.5.2.1 Previewing the text.
The type 1 (bottom up) readers did not preview the text by looking at the pictures, except for readers 27 and 28 who looked at the pictures but did not predict the story. Reader 56 looked at the pictures and predicted what the story was about, but she could not elaborate further as to why she did so. She mentioned using strategies such as ‘looking at the pictures’ and ‘predicting the story’ when she looked at the pictures to preview the text as in the examples below:

*I only looked at the pictures* (reader 27)

*I just looked at the picture here (pointing at the picture of a toothbrush)*
(reader 28)

*Before reading I looked at the pictures, while looking at the pictures I predicted the story* (reader 56)

In these accounts, these students were able to use a low level cognitive strategy, ‘looking at pictures’, before reading the text, but they did not know how to execute the strategies effectively.

Type 2 readers, who were characterised as top down readers did not preview the text by looking at the pictures, except for readers 29 and 54 who looked at the pictures only, without predicting what the story was about. Reader 26 simultaneously looked at the pictures and predicted what the story was about; however, he did not elaborate further on his prediction when asked. This suggests that these readers were using a low level strategy before reading a text. They ‘looked at the pictures’ only, but did not execute or extend this strategy further; except for reader 26 who stated that she predicted while looking at the pictures but was unable to explain what she had predicted when she looked at the pictures. Looking at the pictures was not enough to increase comprehension.

*I looked at one of the pictures only and then start reading* (reader 29)

*I looked at the pictures in the passage* (reader 54)

*I looked at the pictures and while looking at it I just predict the pictures* (reader 26)

All the type 3 readers, who were also identified as interactive readers, stated that they looked at the pictures before they read the text. These students used a predicting strategy, simultaneously with the looking at pictures before reading the text. Some of the reasons they stated, as to why they used those strategies were to help them understand the text better later, when they read the text. Such techniques helped them to remember their previous experiences about the story. For examples,
I look at the pictures first and then predict the story so that I know what the story will be about. It was about a surgery because I could see a doctor and tools, and this could be something about an operation (reader 21)

I looked at the pictures first and I think about it, like guess what the story will be about so that it helped me to understand the text better when I read it (reader 25)

I looked at the pictures, then guessed the story, and I was correct. I guessed it was about a dental clinic (reader 32)

Moreover, reader 40, who was a student with MRA who scored 80% in the reading comprehension task, used three strategies simultaneously when she previewed the text. She skimmed the text first and then looked at the pictures and at the same time tried to predict the title and the story of the passage. The reason why she used such strategies, before reading the text, is stated below:

I skimmed the text first and then looked at the pictures; predicted what the title and story was about. It helped me to understand the text when I read the text” (reader 40)

In these accounts, the type 3 readers not only knew what strategies to use, but how to use them effectively before they read the given text. In this case the students’ goal was to understand the text better, which they attempted by looking at the pictures and predicting the pictures before reading the text.

The results suggest that the type 3 readers who used interactive approach to reading knew how to read the text by planning what to do before reading the whole text. For example, reader 40 previewed the text by skimming the text in order to get a general idea of the story, and by looking at the pictures to confirm that what she had predicted was correct. On the other hand, the type 1 ‘bottom up’ readers did not use any strategies at the pre-reading stage, with the exception of readers 27 and 28 who previewed the text by looking at the pictures only and reader 56 who previewed the text by looking at the pictures, and predicting the story, but did not clearly mention why she used such strategies. The type 2, top down, readers did not preview the text while reading, except for reader 26, 29 and 54, who previewed the text by only looking at the pictures.

Results further showed that the use of two or more strategies took place at the pre-reading stage. Type 3 interactive readers, with medium and low reading achievement levels, and who scored
above expectations based on their reading skills, used more strategies (such as skimming, looking at the pictures, predicting and set purpose) at this stage than the other readers. This finding suggests using two or more strategies, in previewing the text, at pre-reading stage was important in increasing these reader’s comprehension. Research has found that strategic readers use pre-reading strategies to understand the text better during reading (Saricoban, 2002). Pre-reading strategies assist students to activate what they know about a topic and foresee what they will read (Nordin, et.al, 2013). The implications of this include the need to expose language learners’ appropriate pre-reading strategies so that they know how to perform any reading task effectively.

6.5.2.2 Using background knowledge.

Statements such as ‘try to remember past experiences’, ‘relate what was read to previous experiences’, and ‘using past experiences’ were descriptions given by some students, when it came to using what they knew. These strategies were then classified under the strategy ‘using background knowledge’.

Research into the use of background knowledge by the students revealed that the type 1 bottom up readers could only remember their previous experience when they read the text. The two exceptions were readers 3 and 4 (MRA/40%), who stated that they did not try to remember their previous experiences when they read the text. They did not elaborate further, as to whether they try to relate their experiences to the information in the text; when asked they simply said they did not know how to relate it, see the examples below:

_I try to remember my past experiences when I was in the dental clinic_  
(reader 2)

_I try to recall my past experiences when I read the text. I don’t know how to relate it with my past_ (reader 47)

Moreover, all the type 2 top down and type 3 interactive readers stated that they remembered their past experiences and related them to the information in the text that they read. However, the type 3 interactive readers were able to elaborate on their use of strategies better than the type 2 readers, as the examples below illustrate:

_I remembered my past experiences when I was in the dental clinic and it was scary. I can see all the instruments and the smells that scared me a lot_
and I think the smells of the dental clinic was the word ‘anaesthetic’ in the passage (type 3: reader 21)

I tried to retrieve my past experience when I was in the dental clinic. I don’t like going to the dental clinic because I am scared of the doctor who checked my teeth and then after that the doctor used the tools to take out my teeth, I don’t like that. I think I understand the text fast because it reminded me of my previous experiences especially the injections, smells of medicines and so on...everything that was described here(type 3: reader 30).
I tried to remember my past experience in the dental clinic and it scared me (type 2: reader 29).

I remembered my past experience when the doctor took out my tooth and it was very painful” (type 2: reader 26)

Results in the use of background knowledge by the type 3 readers provide us with strong evidence that the students who tried, and could remember, their past experiences when they read the text and who knew how to relate their past experiences to the information in the text, scored well in their reading comprehension task. For example, reader 25, who was a student with LRA, scored 73% in the reading comprehension test.

Moreover, it is also evident that these type 2 and 3 readers employed two strategies simultaneously when they tried to relate their previous experiences to the information in the text. However, the difference between the two reader types was that the type 3 readers were able to elaborate their use of the strategies better than the type 2 readers. The type 3 readers predicted some information in the text from their own previous experiences. They used three strategies simultaneously when they used their background knowledge to assist their reading; the strategies being: a) trying to remember past experiences, b) using past experiences to relate to the story and c) predicting information in the text from previous knowledge. Meanwhile, the type 2 readers used two strategies simultaneously: a) trying to remember past experiences and b) relating the experiences to the information in the text.

The noticeable difference between the readers in type 3 and type 1 was that the type 1 readers were not to fully aware that using their previous experiences could help them to understand the text better. This could be seen when they tried to recall their experiences but somehow they did not relate their experiences to the information in the text. One of the reasons mentioned by the readers was that they did not know how to execute such strategies when reading, though they could recall their previous experiences. The use of background knowledge by the readers hence enables us
to conclude that the type 3 readers were more fully aware of the importance of using background knowledge in reading. They knew how to relate their past experiences to the information in the text. This exemplified that using background knowledge effectively, when reading, is essential for comprehension.

In sum, these finding suggests that readers who approached their reading interactively used their background knowledge effectively when they read. This led them to obtain better score in their reading comprehension task. They were actively engaged in the reading process to construct the meaning of what was being read (Babashamsi, et al., 2013). Hence, the findings of this study provide some insight into the importance of developing the use of background knowledge in reading activity among EFL students. It would be an advantage for weaker students to learn to execute background knowledge in their reading effectively. This is because, background knowledge act as a primary support in reading in a second language (McNeil, 2011; Mohammad Hassan, et al., 2013)

6.5.2.3 Self-evaluating.

Self-evaluating was employed by the readers in types 1, 2 and 3; except for readers 2 and 4, who were the type 1 readers who did not mention that they utilised this strategy when they read the text. Comparisons in the use of this strategy among the type 1, 2 and 3 readers showed that type 3 readers in this study better understood how to execute the strategies in reading, than did the other two types. This suggests that the readers who used interactive approaches to reading influence the way they execute RCS when they read an English text.

The type 1 and 2 readers who used this strategy reported that the strategy they used in reading was successful. However, these readers did not score as well as expected in their reading achievement levels, except for reader 26 (type 2), who scored above the expectation for his reading achievement level. The type 1 and 2 readers were unaware of how to identify whether the strategies they used in reading were successful or were not successful. When asked about how they identified success, these readers reported that the strategies were a success when they could answer the comprehension questions in the text, regardless of whether the answer was correct or not. This is unlike the type 3 readers who were fully aware if the strategies they used were successful. For them, a successful strategy in reading was not only measured by answering the questions about the passage; it was also a success if they could understand the text better. They employed this strategy when they had used other strategies, including: reading the text, rereading and guessing the word
meaning. After they used these strategies they simultaneously self-evaluated the strategy, they used and whether it helped them to understand the text better. Support for self-evaluating can be seen from example below:

*I reread the sentence to find the general meaning of the text. I found it works as I could understand the sentence better* (reader 23).

The type 3 readers also used alternative strategies when their first choice strategies did not work out, suggesting they know how to evaluate the use of a strategy in reading, as the example below indicates:

*I still could not understand the text when I read the text so I tried again to read it more carefully* (reader 25).

Analysis of the employment of this strategy by the type 1, 2 and 3 readers showed that the type 3 readers used this strategy more effectively than the type 1 and 2 readers, who were not really aware of how to execute a self-evaluating strategy in reading. This conclusion is supported when the 1 and 2 readers stated that the strategy they used was a success if and when they could answer the questions. But in fact, they did not score as expected for their reading achievement levels. However, given the scope of this study to describe the comparison of the reading strategies used by the students in both groups, the effectiveness of using this strategy was not investigated in detail.

**6.5.2.4 Self-inference.**

The strategy of ‘self-inference’ was only found in type 3 readers. The descriptions for this strategy include ‘have a thought about the moral of the story’, ‘have a thought about what I have learnt from the text’ and ‘comments on the story’. Further analysis indicated that type 1 and 2 readers did not use this strategy in their reading. Three examples of using this strategy are offered below:

*After reading the text I had a thought about the moral of the story. Do not be afraid to see a dentist* (reader 21).

*By reading this text, I have learned to always brush your teeth* (reader 25).

*I think this story tells us about a boy who was so lazy to brush his teeth regularly. Then he got painful teeth* (reader 40).
The readers of type 3 reported that they used this strategy in order to confirm their understanding about the text better. Reader 30 said, ‘I knew I understood the text because I could think about the moral of the story’.

One type 3 reader specified that this strategy was used, not only to understand the text better, but to learn something from it, where he can have an idea of the whole story in the real world. Reader 30 reported, ‘I tried to come up with the conclusion that this story teach us to take care of our teeth and it makes understand the text better’.

It was also shown that these students were aware that reading the text was not mainly to answer the questions but to gain knowledge from reading the text. Reader 21 stated, ‘After reading I think about the moral of the story because reading the text not only to answer the questions but to learn something from it’.

Type 3 readers engaged in ‘self-inference’ strategy, while their counterparts did not employ this strategy in their reading. Type 3 readers also scored better in their reading comprehension task than their other counterparts. These results highlight that self-inferencing strategy is important in reading comprehension.

6.5.2.5 Re-reading.

Analysis revealed that ‘reading the text more than once’ was employed by some type 1, 2 and 3 readers. However, a comparison shows different reasons for using this strategy.

Type 1 and 2 readers who used this strategy in their reading indicated that it enabled them to answer the questions. They indicated that the first reading was mainly to get the general meaning of the story, whereas the second visit to the text was to read it more carefully, in order to find answers.

I read the text twice so that I could answer the questions; my second reading was mainly to find answers for the questions. (Reader 8: type 2)

I read the text two times, the first was to read the text in general, read it faster but my second reading was to read it carefully to find answers (Reader 27: type 1).

However, the type 3 readers who used this strategy indicated that they used it to monitor their comprehension level in reading, as explained in the following example.
I read the text two times. When I read it once I read it carefully to get the
details of the story. Then I read it again the second time to confirm my
understanding about the story (reader 21).

They had read the text twice because when they read it once they could not really
understand the text, but when they read it for the second time their understanding improved. Reader
25 said, ‘I found out that when I read once I could not understand the text fully but when I read it
again one more time I understand the text better’.

The readers who reread the text for the purpose of monitoring comprehension were those
type 3 readers, whereas, those students who reread the text more than twice in order to find answers
to questions were types 1 and 2 readers. It happened to be that these students were the students
whose reading comprehension test scores did not meet their reading achievement level expectations.
This may suggest that rereading the text more than once may enhance comprehension when this
strategy is used for monitoring comprehension, and not merely for finding answers to the questions
that followed.

The analysis in this section highlighted the importance of reading strategies in enhancing
reading comprehension, with results revealing the way the reading strategies were used by the
readers in this study suggesting that there were important factors in enhancing reading
comprehension.

All readers regardless of their reading approaches and levels of reading achievement,
generally, used similar types of reading strategies when they read an English text. However, the
difference was the ways in which the reading strategies were used in their reading activity. Type 3
readers (interactive approach) in this study executed the reading strategies better than their
counterparts. It can be concluded that these readers of all three types were able to employ similar
strategies, the students’ approaches in reading shaped the way they executed the reading strategies.
The results corroborated previous findings that students who approach reading interactively perform
better in reading comprehension (e.g. Salataci & Akyel, 2002; Saricoban, 2002; Seng, 2007; Sidek,
2010; Yitiger, et al., 2005; Zhang, 2008)

The implication of activity theory in this study suggests that students’ reading approaches
(tools) and aims (object) were related to the learning of RCS in L2 RC classrooms, i.e. the tools and
object shaped the ways RCS (actions) were executed to enhance L2 RC. The tools and object molded the actions of the activity system.

6.6 Managing EFL Related Issues

Tools or mediated artifacts are defined as socially cognitive or physical resources (Engeström, 1999). This theory states that tools mediate the actions and activity of the subject. The action of the subjects in an activity is affected by the other actors (e.g. tools) in the activity system. The analysis revealed that the most common strategies used by the participants to manage vocabulary and grammar difficulties were using tools or instrument to mediate their learning such as using a physical tool such as a dictionary and, a non-physical tool, i.e. reading strategies such as guessing meanings of words and ignoring the words.

The following section discusses the important role of tools and community in managing the EFL challenges, in particular: vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar difficulties.

6.6.1 Using tools to manage learning.

6.6.1.1 A physical tool: using a dictionary.

Reader 8 (type 2, LRA) claimed that ‘when I have difficulties in reading English text I refer to the meaning in the dictionary’. Reader 8’s response to his problem was to use a dictionary. He further commented that ‘I prefer to use an English-Malay dictionary, so I refer the meanings in Malay only’. Similarly, reader 12 (type 1, MRA) stated that she preferred to look at the dictionary, whenever she had problems with the words. As she commented: ‘I look at an English-Malay dictionary mainly to find the meaning of the words in Malay’.

In these accounts, using a dictionary was the students’ preferred strategy to address their problems in understanding English texts. Readers 27 and 12 perceived that using a dictionary could help them understand the text better. They found the meaning of the words in Malay in the dictionary, perceiving that when they knew the Malay meanings of the words, that knowledge would enhance their understanding. For example, reader 22 (type 3, HRA) commented: ‘I look at the dictionary for meaning of the words but I read both meanings in Malay and English’. When asked why she read both meanings in English and Malay, she claimed that: ‘I want to improve my
Reader 30 claimed that: ‘I refer to the dictionary whenever I have problems with words in English and so I use the Malay and English dictionary. If I understand the meaning of the words in English, I just read the English version but if I still don’t understand it then I refer to the Malay version of the dictionary’. Reader 30 had the options whether to choose the Malay or English version of the dictionary. She preferred to use the English version first to find the meaning of words. Only when she did not understand the English did she choose to turn to the Malay version of the dictionary to clarify the meaning.

All these students linked their limitations in English vocabulary knowledge with their difficulties in understanding English texts. They also used strategies according to their difficulties. These students used a low level of cognitive strategy in order to address their problems. This was related to the findings found in teachers’ qualitative analysis, presented in chapter 8. Teachers focused their reading instruction in teaching their students to look at the dictionary whenever their students had word problems, in order to accommodate students’ vocabulary limitations. The teachers’ use of the dictionary was reflected in the students’ way of accommodating their difficulties with English words.

The use of dictionary as a tool to facilitate learning hindered comprehension as it slowed down the speed of reading and led to miscomprehension. Previous studies have investigated the use of dictionary in hindering reading comprehension (e.g Shen, 2013). The findings here, extend previous research by providing an example of facilitators of EMI as hindrances to learning RCS.

The implication of the activity theory was that tools act as a mediator in enhancing learning, playing an important part in mediating the subjects towards outcomes (developing reading comprehension). However, in this study, the use of it hindered the learning of RCS because of the motives (objectives) of using tool. This suggests that object of the activity may have shaped the tool.

6.6.1.2 A Non-physical tool: Reading strategies.

6.6.1.2.1 Guessing the meaning of words.
One of the strategies employed by most of the type 2 and 3 students was guessing the meaning of the words, when they had difficulties in understanding unfamiliar words in English. For examples, reader 23 (type 3, HRA) mentioned that ‘Whenever I had problem with unfamiliar word in English text, I just guess the meaning of the words either in Malay or English which ever easy for me’. Readers 21, 22, 30 and 40 (type 3, HRA) similarly mentioned that they would guess the unfamiliar words when they read English texts in order to better understand the text. These type 3 readers perceived that guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words would enhance their comprehension.

Nassaji (2003) categorized four types of knowledge sources, namely: grammatical knowledge, discourse knowledge, world knowledge and morphological knowledge. Grammatical knowledge refers to the using of syntactic categories of grammatical functions such as relative clause verbs or adjectives. Discourse knowledge includes using knowledge of relations between or within sentences and the connectors between words or sentences, such as restatement clues, cause/effect clues. World knowledge involves pre-existing schemata to infer the word meaning. Word knowledge refers to readers’ background knowledge on what constitutes a certain word (Schmit & McCarthy, 1997). Morphological knowledge refers to the internal clues such as the prefixes and suffixes.

In this study of context, when they were asked how they guessed the words, reader 23 simply commented that ‘I reread the sentence, get to understand the sentence and guess the meaning either in Malay or English’. Reader 40 (type 3, HRA) reported, ‘I read the sentence and understand the sentence first and then guess the meaning of the word in L1.’

In above excerpts, readers 23 and 40 reread the sentence first and to understand its sentence level and then came up with their meaning either in L1 or L2. This indicates that these readers used their discourse and then world knowledge to infer the meaning of the words. The analysis highlighted a range of knowledge sources being used to infer unfamiliar words.

This means that these students know what they should do to clarify their comprehension, and they also know how to use guessing to make it work. For example, they made use of several sources of guessing to understand the words in the text, such as using discourse knowledge by rereading sentences, and world knowledge by translating the word into L1. The use of rereading, and translating into Malay, are examples of low cognitive strategies which readers orchestrate with
a compensation strategy, as in guessing the words. These students preferred to use their world knowledge to guess the words either in Malay and English, depending on the level of difficulty.

The findings in this section highlighted that guessing the meaning was the most commonly used strategy by the students who approached reading in top down and interactive ways. The use of different sources in executing guessing strategy may have influenced the students’ reading comprehension score. These findings support previous studies that acknowledge the importance of guessing words or word inferencing to enhancing reading comprehension (e.g Chou, 2011; Rahmawati, 2007; Wu, et al., 2013). However, Papadopoulou (2011) argued that there is a small chance of getting the correct meaning of a word when guessing the meaning of a new word, especially for some slow readers. Even after having been trained in the word guessing strategy, students still have a poor reading comprehension because they have insufficient vocabulary. Therefore, this strategy means to be taught in combination with vocabulary building.

6.6.1.2.2 Ignoring the words and continue reading.

Lexical ignoring has been identified as one of several strategies for processing unknown words (Cai & Lee, 2012). Although less common, some of the students mentioned that they sometimes ignored the unfamiliar words when they read. For example, readers 46 and 56 (type 1, MRA) mentioned that they just ignored the words that were too difficult to understand when they read English text, skipping the words. As reader 46 noted: ‘I sometimes found most of the words in the text difficult to understand, so I just ignore them’. Reader 56 commented that ‘I just ignore them and continue reading’.

These students perceived that ignoring words compensated for their difficulties in reading English. This strategy was used mainly by the type 1 reader who approached bottom-up. Bottom-up approach reading may have shaped the use of ignoring strategy for unfamiliar words. However, it was found that ignoring was least common in this study.

6.6.2 Utilisation of a community to manage learning.

The community is the greater students’ community to which they belong (Engeström, 2001). The community provides the individual with guidance about how to achieve the object. This study found that a community influences the subject in achieving the object of the activity. The following
section provides evidence of how a community was used to manage learning of RCS in L2 RC classrooms.

6.6.2.1 School and home community: teachers, peers and parents.

Most of the students said that, in order to address their vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar problems, they simply asked for help within the classroom (e.g. teachers and peers) and parents (e.g. parents and siblings).

6.6.2.1.1 Asking for help

Asking for help was popular with type 1 students. For instance, readers 3, 25 and 46 mentioned that they would ask for help from their friends or teachers in the classroom if they had vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar difficulties. For examples:

*I like to ask my friend if I don’t understand the meaning of words in the text if it is in the classroom* (reader 3, type 1, MRA/I).

*I ask my best friend when I get stuck with pronunciation when I read”* (reader 4, type 1, MRA).

*I ask my friend first before I ask my teacher when I can’t pronounce the words correctly* (reader 46, type 1, MRA).

*I ask my friends and teacher when I am in the classroom if I don’t understand long sentences* (reader 61, type 2, HRA/I).

They acquired this strategy from their experiences of accessing and receiving adult assistance; reading strategies seem to be best acquired by EFL students through assistance from others. In particular, teachers in school, and parents or sibling at home, provide important guidance to their students or children in acquiring reading strategies to improve their reading comprehension. For example, most students asked for help from their parents or sibling at home if they had language difficulties:

*I ask my big brother or sister at home to teach me how to pronounce the words that I found difficult when I read English text* (reader 32, type 3, HRA/GI).
I ask my mum when I can’t pronounce a word when I do my reading comprehension homework. She taught me how to pronounce the words and meanings (reader 12, type 1 MRA/GI).

These students believed that asking for help would enhance their comprehension; a social-Interaction strategy (Oxford, 2013) in order to address their vocabulary problem.

When asked about ways their parents help them when they have difficulties in understanding meaning of words, reader 3 (Type 1, MRA/GI) elaborated that, ‘I always ask my mother, when I asked my mother about any English words that I did not know, she will normally tell me the meaning of the words in L1’.

The excerpt above indicate that reader 3’s mother provide cognitive and intellectual involvement by giving the direct translation of the English words that he had difficulties with. However, not all homes are the same. This study also revealed that some of the students did not get guidance from home as they lived with their grandparents. For instance, reader 56 (type 1, MRA/GI) commented,

*I live with my grandparents at home and I am the only son in the family so I don’t have anyone to ask at home except my grandparents, unfortunately they were illiterate but they always ask me to read books at home, they advise to study hard.*

In this account, reader 56 could only get personal involvement from her grandparents as she lived with them. Despite the grandparents’ situation of being illiterate, his grandparents provided personal involvement though giving her motivation to read books at home and study hard.

There were also situations where some students did not receive any parental support for their learning. Reader 28 (type 1, HRA/GI) claimed, ‘I don’t ask my parents at home regarding my school work as they do not understand school work very much so I just do it on my own at home’.

Reader 28 did not ask for any guidance from her parents as she understood fully that her parents could not provide any guidance of her school work.

Another factor that limited parental involvement was reported by reader 46 (type 1, MRA/GI). He said, ‘not easy for me to ask for help to my parents when comes to English texts as they did not understand English language’.
In this instance, reader 46’s parents experienced language barriers that restrain them from giving guidance. Limited English was found to be a barrier between parents with English competency in supporting their children’s reading development.

The analysis in this section has provided insights that students wants parents to help them in their learning. This supports previous research that advocated the importance of parents in students’ learning (e.g. Midraj & Midraj, 2011; Walker, et al., 2005; Xu, et al., 2010). The implication of activity theory in this study is that community provides an important role in achieving the object of an activity system. However, the home communities in this study were facing challenges in order to give support or guidance to their children as they had limited school content knowledge and English.

6.7 Summary

The learning of RCS in L2 RC lessons that take place in an EFL social context where students have to work and achieve through EMI has been challenging to Year 6 students in Brunei. These are several factors in students’ reading approaches and EFL background may have facilitated or hindered their learning of RCS in L2 RC classrooms.

Despite the differences in the students’ reading achievement level, the students used similar RCS that were shaped by the students’ reading approaches. The analysis in this chapter revealed that an interactive approach enhanced these students’ reading performances. These findings corroborate those of other researchers in L2 reading who have acknowledged the importance of interactive processing (e.g. Salataci & Akyel, 2002; Saricoban, 2002; Seng, 2007; Sidek, 2010; Yitiger, et al., 2006; Zhang, 2008).

These students lacked English language competency in areas, vocabulary knowledge, grammar awareness and spelling and pronunciation problems and this was a contributing factor to issues of learning RCS in L2 RC lessons, similar to that found in the literature of the implementation of EMI in EFL societal environment in non-dominant English-speaking countries (Garton, 2013; Nguyen, 201; Pearson, 2014). The findings here, extend this research findings in that the effectiveness of EMI in the learning of RCS in L2 RC was impacted by the students’ situation of English as a foreign learner. In addition, studies in vocabulary knowledge (e.g. Moghadam, et al., 2012; Sen & Kuleli, 2015; Shen, 2008), grammar awareness (e.g. Akbari, 2014; Han & D’Angelo, 2009; Nassaji, 2007) and spelling (e.g Ehri, 2000; Little & Hart, 2016; Nunes, et
al., 2012; Pikulski & Chard, 2005) and pronunciation (e.g. Petscher & Kim, 2011) indicated that these components of ESL are crucial in enhancing L2 reading comprehension. In this current study, the Year 6 EFL students had difficulties in ESL due to absence of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge, spelling, morphological and sentence structure awareness. This highlighted the challenges for these students in learning RCS as they also needed to be competent in ESL to achieve better performance in L2 RC in this complex EFL setting. These findings contribute to our understanding of knowledge about the roles of vocabulary, grammar and spelling and pronunciation as factors that contribute to the learning of RCS.

The analysis also generated understanding of the role of the EFL students in managing these challenges. There was evidence that students manage EFL/EMI difficulties in many ways. First, they used dictionaries and reading strategies to accommodate the learning of L2 RC, compensating for their limited vocabulary knowledge. These students’ use of dictionaries only for the purpose of accommodating difficult words in the reading activity rather than enhancing comprehension because of the difficulties in teaching the appropriate meaning in the dictionaries (Shen, 2013). Previous studies have investigated the use of dictionary in weakening reading comprehension (e.g. Shen, 2013). The findings of the current study extend previous research by providing an example of one facilitators of EMI acting as a hindrance to learning RCS in an EFL classroom.

Second, the discussion in this chapter also focused on the Year 6 students as they demonstrated the use of specific strategies to accommodate the challenge of understanding L2 RC. The findings in this chapter highlighted that guessing the meaning of the word was the most common strategy used by the students who approached reading in a top down and interactive way. These students reported that they may had limited vocabulary knowledge, therefore, word guessing strategy is one of the effective ways of learning new vocabulary (Xiao-lei, 2013). The finding of this study support previous studies that acknowledge the importance of guessing words or words inferencing could enhance reading comprehension (e.g. Chou, 2011; Rahmawati, 2007; Wu, et al., 2013).

These Year 6 EFL students also believed that ignoring difficult or unfamiliar words was their way of compensating their difficulties in reading English text. This strategy was used by the students who were bottom-up readers. This finding aligns with Fraser (1999) who found that lexical ignoring was least used.
Third, the findings in this chapter provide some insight that students do need and want other assistance beyond the school such as from parents, siblings or other relatives to help them in their learning. However, language barriers and limited schools content knowledge among the home community were factors that impacted the kind of support parents could provide. This highlights the challenges of learning L2 RCS in L2 RC in EFL/EMI environment among Year 6 students in this study as the types of home involvement they encountered varied depending on students’ home situations.

In conclusion, the implication of the activity theory in the findings in this chapter are that the activity of learning RCS in L2 RC in EFL/EMI setting among Year 6 students in Brunei can be explained by the inter-relatedness of subjects, tools, objects, and community. However, this study also found some challenges around these theory, extending the theory in that the social environment in which the interaction occurs determined the development of the activity.
Chapter 7
Teachers’ Perceptions of RCS and its Implementation in EFL/EMI classrooms

7.1 Introduction

The analysis of the year 6 EFL students’ reading comprehension stimulation task and group interviews in Chapter 6 concluded that the students’ situation of English as a foreign language learner in the EMI setting might have both facilitated and hindered their L2 reading comprehension development. Several factors were identified. First, the absence of depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge, morphological and sentence structure awareness, spelling and word decoding knowledge may have contributed to limit their learning. Second, the students’ reading approaches shaped the purpose for using specific reading strategies regardless of the similarities of RCS used by all students and differences in their reading achievement levels. The analysis also highlighted various sources that were used by the students to manage EFL related issues as to facilitate L2 RC such as using a dictionary, reading strategies and community (e.g. teachers, peers, parents, siblings or other relatives). However, many students also faced hindrances to developing their L2 RC while facilitating their learning of RCS such as ineffective use of dictionary and absence of parental involvement due to parents’ limited content knowledge and language proficiency.

Chapter 7 focuses on the Year 6 teacher participants in the study. It reports the findings of the analysis of teachers’ perceptions about reading strategies and their perceptions about their experiences in teaching RCS in L2 RC in EMI/EFL contexts. Data are drawn primarily from the interviews with eight teachers. The focus of the analysis was to find out the teachers’ perceptions about reading strategies and their teaching of RCS in an EFL/EMI context.

This chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section reports the backgrounds of the teacher participants. The second section presents the analysis of the interviews regarding the teachers’ perceptions of reading strategies and about their EFL students in the teaching of RCS in L2 RC in their classrooms. This section also discusses the ways these teachers managed their EFL students learning in this context. The last section discusses the key issues in the findings.
7.2 Participants' Backgrounds

In the first phase of this study, 53 Year 6 ESL teachers completed the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix 2) about how they taught students to use reading strategies during the teaching of L2 reading comprehension.

The teachers were rated as high, medium, and low users of their teaching of reading strategies according to Oxford’s (1990) criteria for assessing the degree to which strategies were reported as being taught by the teachers. Those teachers who obtained a mean score of 4.49 to 5.0 for teaching the strategies were rated as high users of RCS. Meanwhile, those teachers who obtained an overall mean score of 2.5 to 3.49 teaching the strategies were rated as medium users. Those teachers who scored a mean score of 1.0 to 1.51 for teaching the strategies were rated as low users of RCS.

Based on the mean scores obtained from the questionnaire completed by 53 teachers: 40 rated themselves as high, 10 as medium and 3 as low users of teaching RCS in their L2 reading comprehension lessons. The majority of the teachers in this cohort rated themselves as high users of RCS, reporting that they always or almost always taught RCS in their lessons. Meanwhile, 10 of the teachers rated themselves as medium users, reporting that they sometimes taught RCS. However, three teachers reported themselves as low users of RCS, claiming that they seldom taught RCS. This suggests that, in their attempts to improve student reading comprehension, the majority of the teachers knew about the need to teach how to use RCS. Although those teachers who did not teach RCS might have recognised the importance of RCS, they reported limited teaching of students in how to use them.

Of the 53 teachers who participated in the teacher questionnaire, three teachers from each of the groups of high, medium and low users of RCS volunteered to participate in the second phase of the study: classroom observations and interviews. However, one of the medium users of RCS withdrew from this study as a result of being allocated other subjects to teach. In the end, eight teachers were involved in the second phase. The participants’ backgrounds can be seen in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 shows the participants were in their 20s, 30s and 40s. Four of them were graduates who had studied in the field of English language teaching (TESL). The other four were graduates in the field of primary education. The teachers with a TESL background had longer teaching
experiences (ranging from 12 to 20 years) than the teachers with a primary education background (ranging from two to eight years).

All the participants undertook their professional training at the University of Brunei Darussalam in Brunei. The four teachers with TESL backgrounds and longer teaching experiences reported that they had undergone professional development in the teaching of English reading. However, despite their TESL expertise and longer teaching experiences, only two of them rated themselves as high users of the teaching of RCS; the other six teachers rated themselves as low and medium users of the teaching of RCS. The four teachers from a primary education background and with shorter teaching experience they stated that they had not attended any professional development sessions on the teaching of reading, as they were in the early stages of their careers when professional development was available, and they were not eligible for it. Two of these teachers rated themselves as low users of the teaching of RCS and one as a medium user. One of them rated herself as a high user of the teaching of RCS.
### Table 7.1
Demographics of the Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher’s name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Teaching load (hrs) per week</th>
<th>Professional development in the teaching and learning of English reading</th>
<th>Familiarity with the concept of RS</th>
<th>Reported teach of RS in the teaching of RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>BA in Primary Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>B. Ed in Primary Education (TESL) Master in Language Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BA in Primary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Siti</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Certificate in Education B. Ed in Primary Education (TESL)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Diploma in Primary Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>BA in Primary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B. Ed in Primary Education (TESL)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Liza</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>B. Ed in Primary Education (TESL)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these teachers perceived they had some knowledge about RCS with two teachers considering themselves as being ‘very’ familiar with the concept of RCS. One of these had never attended any professional development (PD) and yet she rated herself as a high user of the teaching of RCS, and as very familiar with the concept of RCS. Another teacher who had undergone professional development rated herself as a low user of the teaching of RCS. Three of the teachers who had not undergone PD considered themselves as being ‘slightly’ familiar with the concept of RCS. The other two teachers who had undergone PD considered themselves as being ‘somewhat’ familiar with the concept of RCS.
These data clearly show that the teachers knew the concept of RCS but why some, rather than others, implemented the teaching of RCS in the classroom remains unclear. As a result, the interview data were explored to discern their perceptions about reading strategies and factors that they perceived may have facilitated or hindered their teaching of RCS in the EFL/EMI classroom. The ways these teachers managed the related factors were also analysed.

7.3. Teachers’ Perceptions

In an activity system, the subject is the group of people, or individual who engage in an activity (Engeström, 2001). In the context of this study, the subjects were the Year 6 EFL students and ESL students. According to Stetsenko and Arievitch (2004), subjects’ actions and decision are shaped by their behaviors. Therefore, during the interviews, the eight teachers were asked about their perceptions of reading strategies and factors that may have facilitated or hindered their teaching of RCS in L2 RC classroom. The analysis identified two factors that may have shaped the teaching of RCS in L2 RC as perceived by the Year 6 ESL teachers. There were the teachers’ perceptions of reading strategies and their students’ conditions as an EFL learners. The next following section discusses the data analysis gather from teachers’ interviews regarding their perceptions of reading strategies.

7.3.1 Definitions of reading strategies.

The aim of the individual interviews with the ESL Year 6 teachers was to gain a deeper understanding of their perceptions of reading strategies in order to acquire insights into their teaching of reading strategies in their classrooms.

Analysis of the interview transcripts revealed that all the teachers shared similar definitions of L2 reading strategies. They perceived reading strategies to be methods that the students use in order to better understand the text they read. This idea corresponds Macaro and Mutton’s (2009) suggestion that reading strategies are how readers conceive reading tasks, that is, by ‘what to do to make meaning from texts and what to do when comprehension breaks down’.

Liza (TESL<17 HRS/Interview) and Siti (TESL<12 MRS/Interview) used common sense definitions of reading strategies. This was expected, since they were teachers with TESL backgrounds, and had no specific background knowledge of reading strategies. However, it can be argued that these TESL teachers did not have, or offer, specific definitions of the term ‘reading
strategies’. This may be because of the way the term has been used in different contexts, such as in first, second or foreign language learning (Macarao, 2007). As Siti commented:

**Reading strategies are ways the children need to know when they read L2 text. For example, in order to understand the story, they need to know the meaning of words in the text so they need to have some sort of strategies of how to tackle the meaning of words from the text.**

In this account, Liza and Siti defined ESL reading strategies, using their own common sense, as they said that reading strategies were the methods used by the students to tackle the meaning of words in the text.

Amy (TESL< 20 HRS/Interview) as expected, made a circular reference to ESL reading strategies, when she defined the term ‘reading strategies’,

**Reading strategies in English reading as far as I learnt in the university, are in order to comprehend the text, to understand each paragraph of the text, the whole text; so using reading strategies can actually help a reader to understand the text. For example: skimming, scanning, summarising, activating prior knowledge, predicting and so on.**

Similarly, Lina (TESL< 12 HRS/Interview) also defined the term ‘reading strategies’ in ESL text, by referring to specific reading strategies such as ‘skimming’ and ‘scanning’:

*I have learnt about reading strategies before when I was in college but something that I remembered is that reading strategies are the approaches used by the students or readers when they want to understand the text better, like trying to guess the meaning of difficult words found in the text, so that you can understand the text better. Some of the reading strategies are like scanning and skimming.*

Amy (TESL< 20HRS/Interview) and Lina (TESL< 12 LRS/Interview) indicated that reading strategies could help the students to understand the text they read. They also listed similar examples of reading strategies such as skimming, scanning, summarising, activation of prior knowledge and prediction. Scanning and skimming are classified as low level cognitive strategies, whereas summarising is a high level cognitive strategy (Oxford, 2013). This familiarity was also evident in the teacher’s survey about teachers’ familiarity of RCS in this study.
Activating prior knowledge and prediction are two metacognitive strategies that allow learners to manage their own learning process (Domey, 2005). These TESL teachers therefore reported knowing a range of reading comprehension strategies, as they explicitly reported the importance of different strategies in helping their students to understand English texts. This indicates that these teachers perceived that cognitive and metacognitive strategies play important roles in helping their students to understand English text better.

The less experienced teachers, Nur (PS< 2 MRS/Interview), Ali (PS< 5 LRS/Interview) and Ana (PS< 3 LRS/Interview) from primary backgrounds, reported that they had not learned about reading strategies when they were in college. However, they were able to describe reading strategies as actions the students perform when they try to understand the text they read. Ana explained:

* I have never heard specifically about reading strategies but I know it is something to do about what you do when you are trying to understand a text you read; for example, like when you do not understand the word, you will try to guess the meaning from the text.

Despite not knowing about specific reading strategies, Nur (PS< 2 MRS/interview), Ali (PS< 5 LRS/Interview) and Ana (PS< 3 LRS/Interview) could define reading strategies and had some sense of teaching reading strategies for reading L2 texts. They listed similar examples of RCS such as ‘guessing the meaning of words’. Overall, however, these teachers from primary education knew a limited range of RCS.

In contrast, Ayu (PS< 8 HRS/Interview) reported that she had already encountered the term ‘reading strategies:

* I have heard my teacher tell us about reading strategies when reading, especially L2 text, when I was in the secondary school back in Singapore. For example, to skim the text first before reading the text, or scanning for keywords, and try to predict the text before reading the text.

Ayu listed some of the specific reading strategies such as scanning, skimming, and predicting the text read. Scanning and skimming are cognitive strategies, whereas predicting the text read focuses on a metacognitive strategy (Oxford, 2013). Ayu had learned about reading strategies when she was in a private secondary school in Singapore. This led her to report a high use
of RCS and to be confident about her understanding. Here, although Ayu was from a primary education background, her experiences as a student had impacted her knowledge of reading comprehension strategies. This indicates that experiences at school may also play an important role in considering the choice of RCS in the teaching of RC in the classroom.

In summary, the majority of teachers, irrespective of their qualifications and teaching experiences, identified a compensation strategy, such as ‘guessing meaning of words’ that helped learners to overcome knowledge limitations in comprehending a text. However, those teachers with a TESL background knew a range of RCS, whereas the primary education trained teachers had limited knowledge. It was evident that teachers’ qualifications shaped the definitions of reading strategies. This diversity of definitions about reading strategies among teachers with different qualification may impact on their teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

Moreover, teachers’ own experiences at school may also affect teachers’ perceptions of RCS, irrespective of their qualifications. For example, Ana who were exposed to range of reading strategies when she was in the secondary school had defined reading strategies based on her secondary school life experiences. She focused not only on comprehension strategies, but also on cognitive and metacognitive strategies, in explaining the definitions of reading strategies. The analysis highlighted that teachers’ perceptions about RCS varied across these teachers’ qualifications and school experiences, which may help to explain their choices of teaching RCS in the classrooms. Therefore, teachers’ perceptions of their teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI classrooms were also examined. The section that follows discusses teachers’ perceptions of their students’ conditions as an EFL learner, and how teachers’ perceptions of EFL students shaped the ways teachers managed their teaching of RCS.

7.3.2 Students’ conditions as an EFL learner.

As English is a second language and the medium of instruction in Brunei, teachers are required to use it as extensively as possible in the classroom, though they perceived that their students have difficulty in using their L2. This situation has caused the teachers to use different reading activities in their teaching of L2 reading comprehension; consequently they have taught different types of reading strategies to accommodate students’ English language difficulties. The analyses of the transcripts around the conflict of English as a foreign language, and its use as a medium of instruction, are presented in two parts. These correspond to the language difficulties the teachers perceived: first in oral skills and second, vocabulary.
7.3.2.1 Difficulties in oral language.

The majority of the teachers perceived that their teaching of reading strategies, in reading comprehension lessons, was linked to their students’ limited oral skills. All of the teachers thought that, despite the fact that the English language was mandated as the second language in Brunei, they could not teach reading strategies that involved oral language because their students had limited oral proficiency, as exemplified by Nur (PS<2 MRS/I):

My students had limited oral skills in English language so I had to accommodate that language barrier in using particular reading strategies in my teaching of reading comprehension in the classroom.

These teachers perceived that their students were not able to speak the language in the classroom fluently, as they were not exposed to English at home, and it remained a foreign language to them. Thus, this led to the students’ limited use of the language in the classroom, both with the teachers and among themselves. Ana (PS< 3 LRS/I) explained, ‘it was difficult for my students to speak in English language with their friends and even with me in the classroom’.

Another example of excerpts that reported a perceived students’ lack of competence in speaking English is from Ali (PS< 3 LRS/I). He reported, ‘almost all my students were unable to talk in English in my English class, which led to difficulties to use reading activities that involved oral skills’.

Similarly, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I), expressed that:

I agree that my students have difficulties in oral English language; it is not easy to ask them to talk in English on their own, so because of this, I have to be careful in choosing reading activities to be done in my L2 RC classroom.

These accounts were representative of one of the challenges of teaching RCS as perceived by the Year 6 ESL teachers. The data analysis also revealed that there were four contributing factors that may have impacted the students’ difficulties in oral English language as perceived by these Year 6 ESL teachers.

First, teachers perceived that their students were afraid to speak in English in the classroom because they were afraid to make mistakes. For example, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I), commented that
‘I think majority of my students did not speak English in the classroom as they were afraid of making mistakes. They were afraid when they talked their English used is wrong so basically they keep silent’. Ali (PS < 3 LRS/ I) agreed that his students did not keen to speak English in the classroom due to anxiety. He stated that ‘my students did not want to speak in English no matter how much I try to encourage them to speak in English in the classroom so that we can discuss text that we read but it seemed failed mainly due to their anxiety. They are worry that they made mistakes when they speak up’.

Second, the difficulties they reported in oral language were related to students’ emotions such as shyness and lack of confidence. For example, Nur (PS<2 MRS/I) reported that ‘my students were very shy especially girls. They were too shy to voice their ideas in front of the classroom’. Similarly, Ana (PS< 3 LRS/Interview) confessed that her students’ were shy to speak English in the classroom making it difficult for her students to engage in the learning of L2 RC effectively. She said, ‘my students are very shy. They are very shy. Not easy for me to ask them to talk especially in front of the class’.

Third, the teachers perceived that oral language development among Year 6 students was hindered by their English proficiency. For instance, Ayu (PS<8 HRS/CO) commented that ‘though my students have learnt English for almost 6 years, they were still have not achieved the expected level of English competency that can necessitate the use of fluent English in the classroom. Their English competency is still not good enough’. Ana (PS< 3 LRS/I) further clarified that ‘my students were still not good in English as they could not speak English in the classroom fluently so I guess they can speak the language well enough’. These accounts suggest that student’s English competency had an impact on their oral language skills and hindered the effective learning of RCS in L2 RC.

Fourth, teachers perceived that their students were having difficulties in English oral language as their students’ home communication was not English. They were not used to speaking English at home and as a result they spoke L1 among themselves. All the students in the schools were of Malay background and spoke Malay as their L1. The limited exposure to English language is predominant in government primary schools (Norlipah, 2011), and students were not exposed widely to communicate in English among themselves or teachers in the schools. For example, Nur (PS< 2 MRS/interview) argued that ‘my students did not use to speak English at home as their parents are majority Malay and basically their communication is using L1 so they are not expose to
use English language effectively’. Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I) commented that ‘my students did not speak English at home. I guess they were not able to speak fluently in school as they were not used to speak English comfortably’. These accounts reveal that the environment of the students did not provide opportunities for them to use the English language for everyday communication and as a result they were not able to use it in the classroom for learning purposes. This led to limited vocabulary knowledge developments due to the fact that they didn’t use English for communication and their productive vocabulary knowledge was limited in use.

In sum, the teachers perceived that their students’ limited oral language skills impacted their teaching of RCS in their classrooms. They attributed the lack of oral language skills to several factors such as fear of making mistakes, shyness and lack of confidence to speak English, lack of English competency and exposure to English. This, in turn, hindered their English reading comprehension as English is a foreign language. These perceptions led teachers to manage the situation in different ways.

Generally, the data from teachers’ classroom observations and interviews showed that the teachers in this study had responded their perceptions about their students’ limited oral language skills by maximising the use of non-physical (reading strategies) and physical (dictionary) tools of the activity system.

**7.3.2.2 Managing difficulties in oral language.**

The analysis of teachers’ interviews data revealed that in order to accommodate the students’ L2 oral difficulties as perceived by them, they solved those challenges in different ways. The reading strategies used were such as drawing a story and retelling using either L1 or L2, using L2 through story mapping, and use L2 for summarizing activity.

*a. Drawing and Retelling story through L1*

The analysis of Ali’s classroom observation data revealed that students faced challenges in expressing their ideas in English. In this study, Ali was the only one who demonstrated the teaching of RCS explicitly through a retelling activity in the L2 RC lesson. In this lesson, the students were asked to read a text and then drew the pictures of the story on the whiteboard.
Ali: can anyone draw the story on the board? Ok, I want you to write them on the board. Can anyone want to do this?
[All students were observed silent, no respond from the students]
Ok draw the story about ... (teacher wrote the word ‘scorpions’ on the board)
Ok, please try to speak in English first.
Student A: Ok aku cuba (O, I try)
[Student started to draw something about a man whose job was to carve a log]
Student A: ada seorang lelaki yg keraja nya mengukir kayu tinggal dekat sungai.
(There was an old man whose job was carving a log and lived near a river)

In this episode, the student could only retell the story in L1 with the help of the drawing that she drew on the board. Ali believed that that all his students had the idea of the story but they had difficulties in constructing the sentences in order to express their idea across.

My students could not express their ideas in English, when I asked them to retell the story I found that they were comfortable in expressing their ideas in Malay and basically they were not confident to speak in English in front of me and the class. So for retelling activity, I asked them to draw the pictures so that they can tell the story in English confidently. But still they could only produce one-word or two words sentence (Ali PS>3LRS/I)

In this instance, Ali perceived that lack of confidence in English language production hindered expression of ideas. In order to manage this challenge, Ali asked his students to draw pictures so that students felt confident to retell the story via the pictures. There was a conflict between providing students opportunities to understand the story in L1 and maintaining the EMI policy.

It is very easy to ask the students to retell the story in L1 but it is very difficult for me to ask them to use L2 to retell the story as I am expected to teach them in English. (Ali PS>3LRS/I)

Ali managed the oral language difficulties by giving space for students to draw the pictures about the story so that the students felt confident to retell the story in L2. However, they could only produce two-three word sentences which hindered the process of retelling the story and thus created a conflict for Ali to shift EMI to L1 used.
Therefore, in Ali’s classroom, the policy to use English as a medium of instruction in the teaching of reading comprehension was sometimes reframed. For example, Ali (PS>3LRS/I) explained:

*Though my students had limited English language oral skills but I sometimes used my students to retell the story they read in my reading lesson. I asked them to retell the story that they had read. And I don’t care if they retell the story in L1 as long as they understand.*

Here, Ali perceived that he was required to address the teaching of RCS in English language but he felt that the limited students’ oral language made him reframe the policy. Knowing that his students had limited oral English language, Ali sometimes asked his students to retell the story in front of the class. He allowed his students to retell the story in their first language (L1), as long as the students understood the story. Here, Ali was teaching his students how to summarise the story they had read, through a retelling activity. Developing a high level of cognitive strategies in students’ approaches to reading was the focus of the reading strategies to be taught implicitly in this class. Ali focused on reading comprehension, more than with specific language use. So his focus was more on the teaching of reading comprehension, whether mediated in L1 or L2. This indicated the reframing process as Ali recognised the importance of using English in the classroom but to some extent he had to achieve it in his own way.

*b. Using story mapping through L2 (English)*

Another practice to deal with oral language difficulties was using story mapping in English. Although seven teachers believed that they needed to use L2 in the classroom as much as possible, there was a tension between using L1, which might lead to more effective reading strategies, and limiting the use of L2 which would lead to less use of L2.

For example, Amy (TESL<20HRS/I) explained

*I need to be aware of the use of L1 in the classroom, so if I asked the students to do activities, such as retelling or asking inference questions they do not have the abilities in terms of oral skills in English language. That could trigger them to use more L1 in the classroom which we are discouraged to do. In the classroom, we have to use English especially in the teaching of English, otherwise they won’t learn much in the language.*
Amy (TESL<20HRS/I) perceived that when class activities involved using English levels above the students’ capacity to understand their use of L1 as the alternative was triggered, hence this could hinder their English learning outcomes. In other words, Amy was caught in a ‘Catch-22’ situation, as she was worried that L1 would dominate in the classroom as a result of students’ limited English language oral skills.

Further, Amy said:

*My students found it difficult to use English in the classroom, it’s the language barrier. So I normally used specific reading strategies in the reading lesson to accommodate their language barrier, such as asking their background knowledge, story mapping. I seldom asked inferential questions because they could not answer it in English, it’s very difficult for them to speak the language in the class, that’s why I just used simple reading strategies like I mentioned before. I did not ask them to retell the story orally, role play and so on that involved them to use the language. It did not work with majority of my students, they cannot do it.*

Amy did not involve her students in doing activities in English, such as retelling and role playing. She seldom asked her students’ inferential questions as she believed that her students could not perform such tasks very well orally when using English as these questions required too high a level of skill for her students. The only reading strategies that she felt she could teach in the classroom were ‘activating students’ background knowledge’, and ‘summarising the story read, using story mapping’. Activating the students’ background knowledge is a higher level cognitive strategy, whereas summarising the story that has been read is a high level metacognitive strategy. In this instance, the teaching of reading strategies also involves written language use. In order to meet the EMI demands in the classroom, Amy restricted the use of L1 in the classroom, by asking students to use L2 in the form of a graphic organiser. This indicates that even though the students’ L2 was poor, she was still using the higher level of reading strategies in her teaching of RC. This choice may have resulted from Amy’s background as a TESL teacher. Generally, TESL teachers were more aware of language structures and techniques in the language used.

Siti (TESL<12 MRS/I), Ana (PS<3 LRS/I), Liza (TESL<17 HRS/I), Nur (PS< 2 MRS/I), and Ayu (PS<8 HRS/I), similarly mentioned that they did not ask their students to do oral activities, such as role plays or retelling, in the reading comprehension lesson due to their students’ limited spoken English. This means that the low, medium and high users of RCS teachers, from all backgrounds, felt that oral activities were a contentious issue for them. This indicates that students’
difficulties in L2 oral, may explain the choice of RCS used in their classrooms. For example, Siti (TESL<12 MRS/I) pointed out that:

*I have tried once asking the students to do role play but it was not a success with my students, they could not do it, only the high ability students could do it and they are not many in the classroom.*

Meanwhile, Ana (PS<3 LRS/I) commented:

*I know activities such as role play, drama or retelling did not work well in my class; the students had limited oral skills, especially in English language.*

The above excerpts showed that these teachers perceived that activities such as retelling or role plays are important activities that could teach the students to learn how to summarise the story or read text orally. Summarising the story read is one of the high levels of cognitive strategies in order to comprehend a text read. However, they stressed that their students could not implement such activities due to their limited spoken English. The teachers were unsuccessful when they used such activities in the class, as students either kept silent or reverted to L1 when they did the assigned task.

Ana (PS<3 LRS/I) employed a high order metacognitive strategy, such as ‘summarising’ with a story mapping activity to try to overcome her students’ difficulties in L2 oral proficiencies. Such activity demands less L2 oral language use but instead enhances students’ deep comprehension. This indicates that although EMI policy has created difficulties for teachers to implement in the classroom, as their students have difficulties in L2 oral proficiency, Ana still reported the use of a high order RCS.

Furthermore, Liza (TESL<17 HRS/I) commented that she could not ask her students to create questions orally from the text, as they were not able to do so, due to their limited oral skills. She explained the problem:

*I once asked my students to create questions based on the text read but it did not work well as the students were reverting to L1 in the classroom. If there is too much use of L1 in the classroom I am worried that my principal would remind me regards to this approach, as you know we are advised not to use L1 in our instruction.*
Instead, she preferred to use story mapping to ask her students to recall the story read in the text. She explained that ‘I prefer to use story mapping so that they can use L2 instead of L1’.

In sum, all the teachers associated their teaching of reading strategies in the classroom with issues around implementing the EMI policy; a policy which caused the teachers to choose to teach particular reading strategies as a result of the students’ perceived difficulties in oral English language. Despite the complexities around the current EMI policy, one teacher occasionally bypassed the policy. This was achieved by allowing the use of L1 in the teaching of summarisation, through using retelling in L1. However, the other seven teachers restricted the use of L1 in the classroom by implementing reading strategies such as ‘activating background knowledge’ and ‘summarising through story-mapping’ that they felt students could complete in English.

In this study, these teachers demonstrated the managing of EMI policy through the process of interpreting. They addressed the requirement for EMI by advocating activities that involved the use of English as they thought that they were expected to do. Generally, these teachers focused on the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to accommodate their students’ difficulties in oral language, and enhancing students’ comprehension. The analysis showed that managing students’ oral language difficulties through interpreting and reframing process influenced the teachers’ selection of the RCS used in their reading comprehension classrooms.

In order to improve students’ oral language skills, it is essential to understand students’ vocabulary knowledge. The next section discusses the teachers’ perceptions of their students’ vocabulary problems.

7.3.2.2 Vocabulary problems.

The analysis of the interview transcripts revealed that all the teachers perceived that students had vocabulary knowledge problems. For example, Nur (PS< 2 MRS/I) commented, ‘it is not surprising that majority of my students did not have enough word knowledge’. Similarly, Ali (PS< 5 LRS/Interview) observed that, ‘my students had very little knowledge of vocabulary. I can see that they were having problems in understanding the text because they did not have enough word knowledge’.

In terms of relevance to reading strategies taught, the majority of the teachers perceived that students’ lack of vocabulary had impacted their teaching of specific reading strategies. Six teachers
assumed that the students needed to have a wider vocabulary knowledge to implement reading strategies such as ‘written summarisation’ and ‘generating questions’. As these reading strategies involved a range of skills, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I), for example, claimed that,

_We have to watch out with activities to use in the classroom that must match with students’ limited vocabulary. For example, we cannot teach them to summarise the text they read in their written exercises, as they could not do it because they were lacking vocabulary knowledge._

Another example where vocabulary is perceived to be one of the factors that contribute to the reading comprehension problems of students in this context is that claimed by Ali (PS< 5 LRS/I), ‘my students had limited vocabulary knowledge, which led to difficulties in understanding the English text they read’. Similarly, Ayu (PS< 8 HRS/Interview) expressed that, ‘I can see my students in my class have little knowledge in vocabulary, which I believe contributes to reading comprehension problems’.

Liza (TESL< 17 HRS/I) also agreed that vocabulary knowledge was one of the most important factors that contribute to the development of L2 RC and without it the knowledge gap could hinder their students’ comprehension competencies. As she said, ‘I agreed my vocabulary knowledge is important for comprehension but in reality my students are lacking it and it’s difficult for them to understand an English text fully without having English words’.

The interview data analysis also revealed the factors that may have contributed to the limited vocabulary knowledge among Year 6 students as perceived by teachers. First, teachers perceived that the students’ limited vocabulary knowledge was related to their reading habit. For example, Ali (PS< 5 LRS/I) commented that ‘my students did not read story books often as most of them said that they do not have any books to read at home’. Similarly, Liza (TESL< 17 HRS/I) said that ‘students’ reading habit is low, I guess that is the reason why my students are limited English vocabulary knowledge, they do not read a lot somehow’. Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I) also observed that her students were not interested in reading story books at home or school during break time, or while waiting for their parents to pick them up from school. She said, ‘so far I did not see any of my students read during break time or while waiting for their parents to pick them up from school’.
These examples suggest that the teachers perceived that reading many English books can enhance students’ English vocabulary knowledge and, students’ low interest in English reading may have impacted on students’ reading comprehension development.

Second, teachers perceived that Year 6 students were not motivated to read story books as they preparing for the national end of year exam. These students were expected to focus on studying other subjects. For example, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I) commented that ‘I think my students were anxious more on examination than reading English books as they were expected to produce good result in other content subject so attention to read English books are hindered by this exam commitment’. She further commented that ‘I could not do anything to motive my students to read more books in the library period during school hours as I took my library period to do English intervention specially for students who are not doing well in English test so I have to spend that time to give more practice on exam paper for these students’. This is an example of where the teachers were conflicted in wanting to provide more opportunities to read more books but having to abandon this due to the exam preparation.

In sum, teachers perceived that their students’ lack of vocabulary knowledge was related to their inadequate English reading, low motivation in reading books due to examination expectations and little home support for reading. The following section discusses how teachers managed their students’ lack of vocabulary knowledge to accommodate the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

7.3.2.2.1 Managing vocabulary problems

All teachers were asked during the interviews about their ways of managing the perceived conflicts around students’ limited vocabulary knowledge, the analysis revealed that teachers managed such challenges through a range of approaches.

a. Using L2 dictionary

Six teachers assumed that the students needed to have a wider vocabulary knowledge to understand the English texts they read as understanding L2 reading involved a wider knowledge about words. The important role of vocabulary knowledge in either language learning or reading comprehension could never be overemphasized (Ma & Lin, 2015). Hence, it is important to understand how well a learner knows a word (Qian, 2002). Nation (2001) distinguished word
knowledge into three aspects; form, meaning and use. Form consists of pronunciation, spelling and word parts. Meaning consists of word form and meaning, concept and referents and association whereas use consists of grammatical patterns, collocations and register and frequency. In this study, the findings from chapter 6 indicated that students predominantly had difficulties in word knowledge that involved form, e.g. pronunciation and spelling, form and meaning, e.g. idioms, and use, e.g. grammatical pattern.

When teachers were asked about what type of word the students normally had problems with in understanding English texts, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I), explained:

*Based on my experience, I found that my students had problem with meaning of words in past tense. If the words are in past tense they normally get confused. As a result they cannot figure out the meaning of the words as they cannot relate the meaning of the words in simple or past tense.*

Similarly Liza (TESL< 12 HRS/I) stated that, *‘My students easily get confused with the meaning of words when the words were in past tense especially the irregular tense’.*

Siti and Liza response to this problem was to use L2 dictionary activities. Siti commented,

*Since my students had limited vocabulary knowledge so I ask my students to highlight the difficult words and then use the L2 dictionary for word meaning, and ask them to take notes of the meaning in the vocabulary book for future use.* (Siti TESL< 12 MRS/I),

Similarly, Liza (TESL< 12 HRS/I) stated, *‘I normally ask my students to find the word meaning in their L2 dictionary’.*

The analysis of Liza’s (TESL< 12 HRS/Co) classroom observation data revealed that Liza’s RCS instructional practices explicitly emphasized the used of L2 dictionary.

*Liza: I want you to read but do not answer the questions. I am giving you a few minutes to read the passage. And then, as usual, do you get your word bank book with you?*

Sts: Yes

*Liza: ok can you please highlight any new words that you find for today. For today you can find only three, three new words. Three new words. Ok. Alright. Aead the passage for one minute or two minutes. While you’re reading please highlight or mark any three new words that you find in the passage. [Pause]*
Liza: Ok find three any three new words in the passage. Three words. After that [pause] we’re going to find the meaning in the English dictionary and you can write down.
Sts: yes

In these accounts, using an L2 dictionary was the preferred activity in order to accommodate students’ problems with vocabulary. This finding indicated the interpreting process. Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/I), and Liza (TESL< 12 HRS/I) both believed that using an L2 dictionary could enhance their students’ reading comprehension. In these dictionary activities, students were asked to highlight unfamiliar words found in the text and then to take notes of the meaning of the words. Although Oxford (1990) regarded using a dictionary as one of the reading strategies, in the research into L2 reading, a relatively modest number of studies focus on dictionary use as a way of learning (Shen, 2013) but not as a reading strategy to enhance students’ comprehension. If these teachers were to teach these students to access the dictionary every time they had difficulties with word meanings in the text, problems may arise with their comprehension skills. This is because a dictionary cannot solve all the learners’ problems with vocabulary, as they need to identify the proper meaning in the dictionary to fit the specific context, and learners sometimes make the wrong meaning of the words (Shen, 2013).

b. Reviewing words meanings and memorizing

Another strategy that was used was advocating memorising and reviewing words meanings. This practice could be observed in Amy’s lesson (Amy (TESL<20HRS/Co) the following episode.

Amy: Ok, Let me ask you again. Who can tell me what the word, what’s the word?
Sts: [giggling]
Tr: Chant. Very good. Thank you. Ok what is ‘chant’, forgot. Ah, come on look it up in your dictionary. You got the meaning? The word chant. A repeated...
Tr: very good. On what page is that? Ok can you... if you have little Oxford dictionary like izzul. You can look it out on page 105. But you are using that one page on 105 also. Whats the meaning? Can you read it aloud?
Sts: A solemn prayer
Tr: Good, now try to memorise the meaning of the word chant.

In this episode, Amy asked her students to review the meaning of ‘chant’. The students were able to give the meaning of the word by looking at the meaning from L2 dictionary. All the students read aloud the meaning of the word ‘chant’. Here, Amy asked the students to memorise the
meaning of the word. This demonstrated the process of reframing. Amy reframed the students’
lacked of vocabulary knowledge by reviewing the meaning by looking at the meaning from L2
dictionary and memorising the meaning of the word.

Amy reported the use of a memorising strategy as one way to increase her students’
vocabulary knowledge. In this case, Amy believed that when the students knew a lot of words, and
their meanings, this would improve vocabulary knowledge, and consequently their reading
comprehension. This instance indicated that Amy perceived the important role of the breadth of the
vocabulary to improve vocabulary knowledge that would lead to better reading comprehension.
Breadth of vocabulary knowledge refers to the number of words that a learner knows at a certain
level of language competence (Nation, 2001). However, the ‘memorising’ strategy used by Amy in
the reading comprehension classroom was mainly to increase students’ word power, rather than as a
means for acquiring deeper comprehension. This indicates that an ESL approach was a
predominantly focus by Amy in the reading comprehension classroom.

Similarly, Ayu (PS< 8 HRS/I) and Lina (TESL< 12 LRS/I) demonstrated the used of
memorising word meaning in order to develop students’ vocabulary knowledge. There is a pattern
here in what the teachers perceived. They could not do summarisation activities in the classroom as
their students were limited in vocabulary knowledge. Summarising has such a high priority for
these teachers for a number of reasons.

First, as reported by Ayu (PS< 8 HRS/I), ‘summarisation was not the type of question that
appeared in the exam.

Summarising was mentioned as one of the activities recommended in the old curriculum to
be done during sustained silent reading activity in the reading lesson (CDD, 2008).

The teachers’ book predetermined a short period of between five and ten minutes for silent
reading at the beginning of every English lesson as sufficient. The book prescribed use of follow up
activities during the sustained silent reading, such as retelling, summarising the text and
dramatising. Ayu’s responded by teaching summarization as prescribed in the syllabus though it did
not appear in the examination format.

Second, summarising had such a priority because summarisation is needed when the
students are in Year 7 (CDD, 2010). As Ayu commented:
I think it’s also important for me to train a little bit on how to summarise text read to my students since they are the year 6 students and I believe that they need that skill when they are in year 7, next year.

Lina (TESL< 12 LRS/I) was concerned about the students’ limited word knowledge and preferred to improve her students’ word knowledge during the English language lesson for use in other subjects. Although her students had limited word knowledge, she perceived that they would need word knowledge for their reading in other content subjects. Therefore, used reading strategies such as memorising word meanings for use in content subjects. As she pointed out,

I asked my students to memorise the words and their meaning so that they can use and better understand when they read text in other subjects, especially science subject. So I used to ask them to take notes of the words to learn from their vocabulary book for use in the future.

Lina (TESL<12 LRS/I) observed that her students needed to be exposed to strategies that could improve their word knowledge, as they were also dealing with English texts in other content subjects such as mathematics, science and social sciences. This instance provides the evidence of reframing process whereby Lina had developed her own initiative to implement activities in the reading lesson, asking her students to always take notes of the words learnt in the vocabulary book for future use, not only in English, but in other subjects. She claimed that she insisted her students memorise word meanings learnt in the classroom. In this case, she perceived that successful use of reading strategies involved knowledge of a wide range of vocabulary. In her opinion, vocabulary played an important role in reading; however, the teaching of vocabulary took primacy over comprehension.

In sum, these instances provide evidence of Ayu and Lina managing students’ inadequate English vocabulary knowledge from interpreting to reframing for ESL. They addressed the vocabulary issues by interpreting and reframing process. In this process, teachers advocated the reviewing and memorising word meaning as the strategies to overcome students’ inadequate vocabulary knowledge. They perceived that these strategies would be able to help improve students’ vocabulary knowledge that may lead to improve results in their reading comprehension. Thus, this study found that the process of interpreting and reframing may have shaped the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lesson.
c. Explaining word meaning in L2 and Translating word meaning to L1.

Another strategy that Year 6 ESL teachers used to enhance students’ limited vocabulary knowledge was by explaining word meaning and L1 translation. Ali (PS< 5 LRS/I) and Nur (PS< 2 MRS/I) observed that due to student vocabulary limitations, they preferred to explain the meaning of the word during the reading stage, and sometimes translated the word meaning into L1. Ali (PS< 5 LRS/I) said, ‘I normally explained the meaning of the words in L2 and sometimes, if it is difficult to explain, I just give the meaning in Malay language’. Nur (PS< 2 MRS/I) reported, ‘I explained the meaning in English and then I normally give L1 so that easy for students to remember the word and know the meaning of the word fast’.

This practice could be observed in Ali’s lesson ((PS< 5 LRS/Co2).

\begin{quote}
Ali: What is ‘model’?
St: untuk scorpion
Sts: scorpions
Ali: just a scorpion?
Ali: just a scorpion? A model is something that has no life. This is... (Teacher put up a chair and show it to the class) this consider a model as well, ok. ‘Benda maufud’ (model) something is not life that’s model, we have so many but in this context this is the meaning, all right. Examples ah, I give you example. Ok we have this so model you just write the arrow there (Teacher draws a line from the word ‘model’ to the picture of a scorpion). For example scorpion.
\end{quote}

The above episode illustrated a session of explaining the meaning of words in L2 and translating the word meaning in L1 to combat students’ limited vocabulary knowledge in L2 RC lesson. This indicated that Ali interpreted his teaching through explaining the meaning of the word ‘model’ in L2 and later reframed his teaching by translating the meaning of the word ‘model’ in L1 to enhance students’ understanding of the text. Similarly, this practice could also be observed in Nur’s lesson ((PS< 2 MRS/Co2).

\begin{quote}
Nur: Ok let’s read one story. Now, this is a story about a haunted house. What do you mean by haunted house? (Teacher pause)
Tr: Scary. Ok a scary house. You know scary’ ‘menakutkan’, Rumah Hantu’ now let’s read this one together about ‘a haunted house’ or ‘rumah hantu’
\end{quote}

In this episode, Nur explained to the students the meaning of the word ‘a haunted house’ and then gave the meaning of the word in L1. Nu interpreted her teaching by explaining the
meaning of the word ‘a haunted house’ and then later reframed her teaching by giving the meaning of the word ‘a haunted house’ in L1.

The instances provide evidence of Ali and Nur changing from interpreting to reframing processes for teaching L2 RC lesson. Ali and Nur perceived that they needed to explain the meaning of words in L2 first and then use L1 as a basis of understanding by ‘translating’ the L2 word meaning into L1. Ali and Nur interpreted the teaching of vocabulary in L2 RC by explaining the meaning of the word in L2 and then reframed the teaching of RCS by using L1 translation. As such, they implicitly taught their students to use a ‘translating’ strategy as one of the ways to accommodate their vocabulary limitations. ‘Translating’ is a low level cognitive strategy. This shows that, although the students’ vocabulary knowledge was limited they were using lower level strategies by using L1 to compensate for the limitations, for comprehension purposes. In order to accommodate these limitations, they used transmission teaching, rather than teaching reading comprehension, by using direct explanation and translation. When they used the transmission teaching, translation use was not a reading strategy but an approach to teaching English. This translation method is associated with the traditional way of teaching English in Brunei, which influenced these teachers’ use of RCS in their reading comprehension lessons. This indicates that managing students’ limited vocabulary knowledge had led these teachers to interpret and reframed the teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

In sum, all the teachers linked their perceptions about their students’ limitations in L2 vocabulary knowledge with their teaching of reading strategies in their reading lessons. They reported that, in order to accommodate such constraints, they preferred to use reading strategies such as ‘using a dictionary’, ‘highlighting difficult words’, ‘memorising word meaning’, ‘reviewing word meaning’, ‘explaining word meaning’, and ‘translating word meaning into L1’. These teachers taught only limited reading strategies for enhancing students’ comprehension, as they were focused more on cognitive and memory strategies to compensate for their students’ vocabulary limitations. However, it was noted that these strategies were not actually laid out in the textbook. This means that such activities might have come from the traditional way of teaching English in Brunei and from the old curriculum textbooks. This provides an evidence of interpreting and reframing what is taught and how, in the managing of EMI and EFL challenges in the teaching of RCS in these L2 RC classrooms.
7.4 Summary

This chapter presented the analysis of the Year 6 ESL teachers’ perceptions of RCS, and teaching practices related to the conditions of the students as EFL learners in the teaching of RCS in L2 EMI setting. The findings showed that teachers’ perceptions of RCS are varied according to teachers’ qualifications and school experiences. This finding highlighted that these variations of perceptions may have contributed to different methods of teaching RCS in L2 RC. Collum (2012) argued that teachers’ perceptions make up their belief system and these beliefs help teachers to decide their method of teaching.

The findings in this chapter also revealed teachers’ perceptions of students’ conditions as EFL learners have influenced the way teachers manage their teaching of RCS within the EMI context. Teachers perceived that oral language and vocabulary difficulties were the factors that have impacted their ways of teaching RCS in L2 RC classrooms. This finding supports the notion that there are factors that may facilitate and hinder the adoption of EMI in schools (Baldauf, et al., 2011). The issues raised within the implementation of EMI in schools were students’ level of English proficiency (Hayes, 2008; Moon, 2005; Nguyen, 2011). For example, Garton (2014) found that one of the negative impacts of the adoption of EMI among young learners in South Korea was the students’ levels of English proficiency. Thus, the findings in this study extend the findings in the literature in that the negative impact of EMI in the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms were related to the students’ English competency. This finding also supports the notion of the interplay between teacher and the contextual factors (Priestley, et al., 2012).

Teachers determine their teaching practices according to their teaching aims (Archer, 2003). This notion aligns with the findings in this chapter that teachers managed students English language difficulties by responding, interpreting and reframing process which were based on teachers’ teaching aims. This finding also supports previous studies that showed that teachers tended to interpret and reframe their English language teaching when they encountered students’ language issues (e.g. Kahn, 2009; Liggett, 2011).

Result also showed that the Year 6 ESL teachers preferred to use reading strategies such as ‘using a dictionary’, ‘highlighting difficult words’, ‘memorising word meaning’, ‘reviewing word meaning’, ‘explaining word meaning’, and ‘translating word meaning into L1’. These teachers taught only limited reading strategies for the enhancing of students’ comprehension, as they were focused more on cognitive and memory strategies to compensate for their students’ vocabulary
limitations. This supports previous findings about the limited use of reading strategies and their negative impact on students’ reading comprehension development (e.g. Alsheikh & Haq, 2011; Mehrdad, et al., 2012; Noli & Sabaraiah, 2011; Nordin, et al., 2013).

The discussion in this chapter focused on the teachers’ perception of RCS and students’ language issues in influencing the teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL classrooms. The findings in this chapter highlighted the interplay between teachers and contextual factors. By understanding the teachers’ perceptions of RCS and the process of managing the EFL issues in EMI contexts of learning may help in developing ways to support ESL teachers in moving towards RCS instruction in L2 RC. Understanding the ways ESL teachers respond, interpret and reframe their teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL contexts may also help in developing effective professional development for teachers that address demands by these teachers.

The implication of the activity theory in this finding was that the interplay of contextual factors of EMI and EFL was governed by the rules and norms of the activity system. The findings in this chapter thus raise questions about their actual implementation of RCS in L2 RC classrooms. The facilitating and hindering factors of teaching RCS in L2 RC are investigated further and discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 8

Reading Comprehension Strategies Pedagogy in EFL/EMI Contexts

8.1 Introduction

The analysis of the interview transcripts in Chapter 7 concluded that teachers’ perceptions of RCS and students’ language issues were related to the teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL classrooms. The findings in the chapter highlighted the interplay between teachers’ ESL role and contextual factors. Teachers’ perception of RCS varied according to teachers’ qualifications and school experiences. The analysis also revealed that teachers managed the teaching of RCS in L2 RC according to their perceptions of students’ language issues. As a result, the teaching of RCS in L2 RC was shaped by responding, interpreting and reframing processes. Teachers responded, interpreted and reframed their teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons based on their teaching aims to support students’ language issues such as oral language and vocabulary difficulties.

Chapter 8 focuses on the Year 6 teacher participants in the study. It reports the findings of the analysis of multiple elements that may contribute to the teaching RCS in L2 RC classrooms, drawn primarily from the data gathered from classroom observations and interviews with eight teachers. The focus of the analysis was to find out the facilitating or hindering factors of the teaching of RCS in the EFL/EMI setting.

This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section presents the analysis of the classroom observations and interviews regarding the factors that may have facilitated or hindered the teaching of RCS in L2 reading comprehension in EMI/EFL classrooms among eight Year 6 teachers. The last section summarises the key issues in the findings.

8.2 Facilitating or Hindering Factors of Teaching RCS in EFL/EMI Contexts

Classroom observations and interviews were conducted to explore the facilitating or hindering factors in teaching L2 RC that contribute to the implementation of reading comprehension strategies pedagogy in the L2 RC lessons.

Eight Year 6 ESL classes from eight government run primary schools were observed. All the classes were identified by the teachers as “mixed abilities” at the time of the study. Each teacher
was observed twice. Sixteen observations were conducted overall. Each observation took place for a 40-50 minute period. The first and second observations took place in the second and third terms of the school year respectively as these were the terms in which the teachers considered their students to be well settled in the classroom for normal classroom teaching.

The teachers were then interviewed immediately after the observations, where possible, to enrich the information gathered from the observations. When an immediate interview was not possible, due to a teacher’s other teaching commitments, they were interviewed at another time when they were available.

The data gathered from the classroom observations and interviews were coded using elements in Engeström’s (2001) activity theory such as subjects, tools, objects, rules or norms, community and division of labour. These elements were appropriate to the language classroom as they contribute to the activity in the classroom specifically the activity of teaching RCS in an EMI/EFL setting. By referring to the elements of activity theory, relationships between teaching of RCS and classroom elements were explored in this study. The theory provides a framework that accounts for social aspects of the teaching of RCS in the L2 RC. However, in this analysis, the focus was first on rules and norms as the rules and norms were found to be the major contributing factor that had influenced the activity of teaching of RCS in these classrooms, followed by tools, subjects and community. The following section discusses the issues around rules or norms that may have influenced the teaching of RCS in these L2 RC classrooms.

8.2.1 Rules and norms.

Rules are the norms, standards and agreements that the community has about participating in the activity (Engeström, 2001). Based on the evidence from classroom observations and interviews, the factors that facilitate or hinder the teaching of RCS in L2 RC were focused primarily on the rules and norms that were pertinent to EMI policy and the exam orientated education system.

8.2.1.1 The policy of EMI.

The rules and norms of an activity system refer to the explicit regulation, laws, policies and conventions that constrain the activity (Engeström, 2001). In this study, the policy of EMI exemplified the rule and norms of the activity theory. The analysis revealed that the teaching of
RCS in these L2 RC classrooms was directed by the EMI policy. This policy also determined the use of tools such as English resources and pedagogical practices, and subjects such as EFL students and teachers’ perceptions of RCS, and community actions in the form of professional development.

8.2.1.2 Exam orientated education system.

The exam orientated education system represents rules and norms in the activity theory. Rules and norms refers as the social norms or standards among the members of the community (Engeström, 1987). The section that follows discusses how the teaching of RCS in L2 RC were shaped within this condition.

8.2.1.2.1 past year examination papers.

Irrespective of the teachers’ qualifications and teaching experiences, all the teachers in this study taught reading comprehension in the classroom in order to meet the needs of the examination preparation. They were very much influenced by the pressure of the year 6 national end of year examination (acronym PSR), since the process of teaching and learning in Brunei primary schools is highly examination oriented.

Nur (PS<2MRS), Ali (PS<5LRS), Ayu (PS<8HRS), and Ana (PS<3LRS), who had rejected the new curriculum, did not create their own reading texts in the teaching of ESL reading comprehension in the classroom, as urged by the new English curriculum. Insteads, these Year 6 primary school teachers used the reading texts from past years’ examination papers for their teaching of reading comprehension. The reading texts in the past years’ papers were previously used in the ESL reading comprehension classroom for the purpose of examination preparation. Ana (PS<3LRS/interview) commented, ‘I also took text from previous examinations in my teaching, so that 6 months before the exam I started to improve my students' reading comprehension performance’.

Similarly, Nur (PS<2MRS/I), Ali (PS<5LRS/I), and Ayu (PS<8HRS/I) mentioned that they used reading texts from previous examination papers to teach reading comprehension in the classroom from the second term of the school onwards, to accommodate examination preparation, with Ali commenting:
I used the text from the past years’ papers to prepare the students for the examination normally from June onwards. I teach them how to answer questions properly, such as for practice I ask them to read the text twice before answering the questions, teach them how to look for keywords for answers, how to find answers for reference and vocabulary questions.

These teachers Nur (PS<2MRS), Ali (PS<5LRS), Ayu (PS<8HRS), and Ana (PS<3LRS) taught ‘test-wise’ (Phakiti, 2010) strategies such as ‘reading the text for answers’, ‘looking for keywords to find answers’ and ‘answering questions in correct and complete sentences’. They believed these strategies would be needed for doing well in the Year 6 year end national exam, so they used past year examination papers for practice in their teaching of L2 reading comprehension. Ana (PS<3LRS/I) said:

For exam practice, I asked them to read the passage silently first. I gave them time to read the text, then asked questions about the text and words and before asking them to do the questions, I pre-teach how to answer the questions giving tips how to answer. For example, how to search keywords for answers, answer the questions in a complete sentence, then asked them to do the questions.

All eight teachers, irrespective of their qualifications and teaching experiences, and whether they were following the new curriculum or not, were still very much influenced by the pressure of the year end examination; as a result this concern impacted on their teaching of RCS in their teaching of reading comprehension in the classroom. They focused mainly on ‘test-wise’ strategies that were needed for doing well in the exam rather than on the teaching of reading strategies for comprehension purposes.

This indicates that examination orientation also played a role in the teachers’ choice of RCS in their teaching of ESL reading comprehension in the classrooms. The implication of the activity theory in this study is that rules and norms of the context of exam pressures were linked with the teaching of RCS in L2 RC, with the examination context governing the activity. As a result, contextual interaction in the activity system created constrains in teaching of RCS. Students’ learning was more focused on test wise strategies rather than comprehension strategies. The findings in this section extend the findings in the literature in that examination orientated education system have influenced the teaching of RCS in L2 RC in Brunei.
8.2.2 Tools.

Tools serve to mediate activity and provide a means for the subjects to engage in social activities (Sezen-Barrie, et al., 2014). In classrooms tools may include the use of English resources such as students’ textbook, workbook and teachers’ guide to teaching English, and teachers’ pedagogical practices. The analysis revealed that the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms were related to the English resources and pedagogical practices. The next section explores how the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms was practiced within the accessibility of English resources.

8.2.2.1 Accessibility of English resources.

Analysis of the interview transcripts revealed that teachers had access to limited resources to support their teaching of RCS in L2 RC as a result of the changes to the English curriculum. Although the changes required a significant shift in pedagogy, no resources such as teachers’ guide, textbooks or students’ workbooks were provided by the Ministry of Education. This had created dilemmas for teachers about how to teach ESL reading comprehension.

Before the new curriculum was enacted, an approach to teaching English language, called ‘reading language acquisition’ (RELA), had been used (CDD, 1993) throughout Brunei. This approach included the use of the ‘big books’ and the ‘shared reading approach’ and the ‘whole language approach’ to support the development of the four macro skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. However, the implementation of the RELA program was limited in Brunei by practical constraints such as teacher shortages and a lack of proper RELA training among its teachers (Ng, 2001), and a new topic-based syllabus and accompanying primary English materials called primary English for Brunei Darussalam (PEBD) was introduced. Teachers were provided with the syllabus and the primary English materials (teachers’ guidebook, pupils’ book and workbook) that contained the underlying principles and classroom methods appropriate to the RELA program.

When the new ‘21st century education system’ (SPN21) was implemented in 2009, once again the primary English curriculum was reviewed. This resulted in a new curriculum that provided only the overall direction and standards to be achieved in the English language curriculum development (MOE, 2013). It prescribed themes for the teaching of English language. This meant
that textbooks accompanying the teaching manuals, and specifying how to teach reading in ESL classrooms, were no longer provided to the teachers.

Analysis of the interview transcripts showed that these eight teachers, irrespective of their qualifications and teaching experiences, viewed lack of resources as creating problems for them, especially since they had received both textbooks and teaching manuals under the old curriculum. They stated that they had been in a dilemma about how to teach ESL reading comprehension since the new English curriculum had been enacted. The theme-based nature of the new curriculum, in particular, was unpopular among these teachers. Nur (PS<2MRS/I) commented, ‘it’s a kind of problem for me with the new curriculum where it only provides us with themes for the year and it’s all up to us to teach reading comprehension during English lessons’.

Teacher Ali (PS<5LRS/Interview) also said that, ‘I don’t really like the idea of the new curriculum, where teachers are only given themes for teaching English reading in the classroom’.

From his perspective, Ali’s work as a teacher changed, as he commented, ‘Oh, it messed up our life as a teacher.

Ayu (PS<8HRS/I), and Ana (PS<3LRS/I) stated that they also faced problems with the new curriculum in teaching reading comprehension as they were used to the old textbooks and teaching manuals. For example, Ana said “it’s a problem for me as I used old textbooks in my teaching all these years.”

In addition, the teachers perceived that the theme-based new curriculum lacked direction in how to teach reading comprehension in the classroom. As Amy (TESL<20HRS/I), Siti (TESL<12MRS/I), Lina (TESL<12LRS/I), and Liza (TESL<17HRS/I) all stated, they were in a predicament when they were asked to teach Year 6, with only themes. For example, Lina (TESL<12LRS/I), said:

\[
\text{So it’s terrible and a real headache for teachers because for the first time when I was asked to teach Year 6 I was like losing my mind because nothing was given to us, other than the themes for the first three months.}
\]

These teachers relied on English resources such as teachers’ guides, textbooks and students’ workbooks to guide in their teaching. For example, Lina (TESL<12LRS/I) commented that ‘we
need English resources so that we can use it to guide our teaching and so that we can easily track our teaching’. Ali (PS<5LRS/I) reported that ‘I cannot teach English without a teacher’s guide book or English workbook and textbook. I am not confident enough to teach without a proper resources’.

Overall, the analysis revealed that these teachers found the new English curriculum had created challenges for them to teach L2 RC as English resources were not provided. Hence, they perceived that this led to the difficulties of implementing RCS teaching in order to develop students’ reading comprehension performance. One reason for these difficulties was the heavy reliance on ready-made English resources to teach English language in particular English reading comprehension. As they were used to being given ready-made resources with the old curriculum they had limited expertise in developing their own resources.

All teachers perceived that they were not competent enough in English language to create their own English resources. The teachers were not yet ready to produce their own texts and worksheet for the students as they were afraid of making English language mistakes. This is evident when Ali (PS<5LRS/I) reported:

"I cannot create my own text as I am not expert enough in writing own resources, for example, creating my own passaged to be used in the classroom. Perhaps, I need a readymade text so that I am confident to teach. I can’t make worksheet on my own as I am afraid I make mistakes of the language I used. I am not competent enough I guess to create English worksheet for students."

Similarly, Nur (PS<2MRS/I) confessed that,

"I am not good enough to make my own text and exercises for my students to be used in my English class. I am afraid I will make mistakes everywhere especially the language and grammar. I am not good enough in English grammar though."

These accounts suggests that their perceptions of feeling inadequate in English language proficiency was another factor that contributed to the unwillingness to adapt the new format of the curriculum without any resources provided. Teachers perceived they were not properly guided in how to teach RCS effectively as the implementation of the new curriculum was not supported by professional development which may have impacted on their pedagogical practices in teaching.
reading comprehension. This situation led to these teachers managing their teaching of RCS in different ways.

Petrovic and Kuntz (2013) argued that there are three ways to implement a policy. First, by responding within the existing frame. In responding, teachers teach based on what has been described in the syllabus. The second way is the interpretation of existing frame where teachers are aware of the needs of EMI and at the same time address the needs of EMI in the ways they are expected to. Third is reframing in which teachers are fully aware of the EMI but to some extent they address the students’ needs in their own way. In this context, teachers were aware of EMI policies and managed their teaching of RCS in L2 RC using their forms of response.

First, the analysis of interview transcripts indicated that one of the teachers’ challenges of teaching RCS in L2 RC under EMI policy was the conflict caused by the lack of English resources. In addressing this situation, these teachers accommodated this challenge by responding and reframing the implementation of the policy.

Four other teachers who were in the field of teaching English as a second language (TES), and who had teaching experience ranging from 12 to 20 years, were more concerned about following the new curriculum. These teachers responded to the lack of resources through the use of internet resources as a tool to teach RCS in L2 RC classrooms.

8.2.2.1.1 Internet resources.

Physical tools such as internet resources were selected by the teachers who had TESL background to manage the challenges of not having proper English resources under the new curriculum. Liza (TESL<17HRS/I), Siti (TESL<12MRS/I), Amy (TESL<20HRS/I) and Lina (TESL<12LRS/I), found new reading texts from the internet to support their implementation of the new curriculum. For example, Siti (TESL<12MRS/I) commented, ‘I try to find a passage from the internet that follows the new curriculum based on the prescribed theme’. Amy (TESL<20HRS/I) also said, ‘Yes, I follow the new curriculum, so I browse the internet to adapt reading texts for teaching reading’.
While this insight that resources from the internet is important in helping ESL teachers to manage their teaching of L2 RC, half of the teachers were still not confident enough to make their own resources.

Their responding also led them interpret or reframe the policy in focusing more on the examination preparation rather than comprehension towards developing students’ reading comprehension performance.

For Amy (TESL<20HRS/I), while Amy used the internet to develop resources she also reframed the curriculum by focusing her teaching on examination requirements rather than comprehension.

*I make sure the questions for the written reading comprehension exercises are based on the examination format. I used the texts taken or adapted from the internet for examination practice, asked them to read the text silently, and teach them how to find keywords for answering comprehension questions correctly.*

Similarly, Siti (TESL<12MRS/I) commented that ‘...written exercise reading comprehension exercises were following the examination format, so I teach them how to read the text to find answers for examination preparation’.

In the excerpts above, Amy and Siti perceived that the policy was fulfilled by responding to what was required to address the new changes of curriculum but at the same time reframed their response by addressing the needs on their own way.

According to Priestley et al. (2012) teachers’ ways of teaching are related to their contextual factors. That is, teachers determine their practices under the circumstances of their teaching aim (Archer, 2003). In this study, the analysis revealed that these teachers’ main aims for teaching are directed towards students doing well in the end of year examination, and the learning and teaching of RCS was focused in terms of students able to answer reading comprehension questions for examination preparation. This may impact students’ long term development in reading comprehension, thus, the poor performance of Year 6 students reading development skills in Brunei. Teachers need to be aware of the purpose of reading comprehension not only to be able to answer questions but also to get a deeper understanding about the text they read.
8.2.2.1.2 Reliance on previous textbooks.

Teachers Nur (PS<2MRS), Ali (PS<5LRS), Ayu (PS<8HRS) and Ana (PS<3LRS), who had graduated in the field of primary education, and who had less than 10 years of teaching, reframed the new curriculum by teaching ESL reading comprehension in the classroom using the old textbooks. These old textbooks and teaching manuals assisted the teachers in planning their lessons and pedagogy, as Ayu (PS<8HRS/I) pointed out, ‘I used the old textbook for my teaching of reading. It is still very useful to me because it describes what to teach and how to teach with ready text and worksheets for students’.

Ayu (PS<8HRS/I), commented further that she used the reading texts in the textbook and the teaching manual to help her in her teaching according to topics based on the old curriculum. Ayu said, ‘I choose the text in the textbook to teach reading and refer to the teaching manual of how to teach reading using the text. This really helped me a lot in my teaching’.

Similarly, Nur (PS<2MRS/I), Ali (PS<5LRS/I), and Ana (PS<3LRS/I) observed that using the textbooks with teaching manuals in their teaching was helpful: they could use them to plan lessons and they added to their pedagogies; but teaching without the textbooks and teaching manuals was a difficult task for them, as Ali explained, ‘I used the textbook with teaching manuals as they help me to plan my lessons and how to teach in the classroom, but without it I think it is very difficult to teach’.

In these accounts, these teachers did not mention the teaching of specific reading strategies. However, according to the Teachers’ Textbook (2008), the typical activities for reading lessons found were: sustained silent reading, guided reading and K-W-L (what I Know, what I Want to learn and what I have Learned). The K-W-L model was described as a comprehension strategy used in student reading factual texts to help students to gain greater understanding of the passage (PEBD, 2008). To provide opportunity for extended reading, the Teachers’ Textbook (PEBD, 2008) recommended a short period of time (of between five and ten minutes) be used for sustained silent reading before the L2 reading comprehension lesson started. The children should be asked to read their own reading material during the sustained silent reading (SSR). The reading activities that were recommended for completion during the SSR activity were retelling, summarisation and dramatisation. However, the analysis of classroom observation data did not reveal the teaching of
retelling, summarization and dramatization as the teachers perceived these activities could not be done due to students’ limited of English competency.

In the guided reading section of the textbooks, the reading comprehension lesson should be divided into pre-reading, during reading and post-reading stages. During the first reading stage, teachers should pre-teach unfamiliar vocabulary by using a variety of ways of introducing the words, such as by pictures, mime or translation. Teachers should initiate discussion around the theme of the passage. In order to activate children’s background knowledge, teachers should guide children’s reading by asking relevant questions and facilitating relevant discussion about the text theme. Teachers were encouraged to ask different questions, including those requiring Yes/No answers, closed questions, and open ended questions that required the students to guess and hypothesise, give an opinion, a reason or an explanation. It was advised that questions should also be asked to check comprehension and clarify information. The reading strategies focused on here were predicting, and hypothesising. However, the classroom observation and interviews analysis in chapter 7 did not identify such activities. In the analysis teachers’ predominant teaching practices were characterised by teacher-directed instruction and focused more on Yes/NO and closed types of questions. The use of open ended questions were limited in their teaching.

The textbook did not specifically mention reading strategies that needed to be taught explicitly in the reading lesson. Instead, the teaching of reading strategies was embedded in the reading activities as prescribed in the textbook. However, because the textbooks were very prescriptive and comprehensively written, teachers became dependent on the guidebooks to teach the lessons (Asmah, 2001). This resulted in teachers only teaching what was in the textbook and using only the exercises in the students’ workbooks for the teaching of L2 reading comprehension. This situation was compounded by the fact that the textbooks were not effective for the teaching of ESL reading comprehension, as they had been “designed for the teaching of oral English skills and vocabulary” (Anderson, 2008, p.9). It was also found that the reading comprehension material in the textbook maintained the traditional format of text and questions about the content and vocabulary (Chamberlain, 2008). As a result, the teaching of reading comprehension consisted mainly of texts accompanied by exercises in the workbook for students to complete in a given time. Thus, ESL teaching took primacy over the teaching of reading comprehension. However, the findings in chapter 7 found that the teaching of oral skills and vocabulary was not evident in the classroom observations as the analysis revealed that they mainly focused on examination preparation ‘test wise’ strategies rather than comprehension.
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In sum, the analysis in this section highlighted that teachers managed the EMI challenges by responding and reframing. This was apparent when TESL teachers responded by adapting resources from the internet to use own resources to teach L2 RC. The non- TESL teachers however, reframed the policy by using the old textbooks in teaching L2 RC in the classroom. However, all teachers irrespective of their qualification reframed the purpose of teaching L2 RC by focusing more on examination preparation ‘test wise strategy’ instruction rather than comprehension. This implies that the over focus on examination may have hindered the teaching of various kinds of RCS in L2 RC. All the Year 6 ESL teachers were characterised the teacher directed instruction, testing reading comprehension as they taught. As the analysis of teacher interview transcripts revealed in section 7.3.1.2, this could be due to conflicts in rules and norms of the activity system as the exam oriented Brunei education system directed teachers’ teaching practices. The findings in this chapter highlighted the relationship between rules (EMI and examination orientated education system) and tools (teaching practices) in an activity system of an EFL/EMI setting (Engeström, 2001). This relationship impacted on the eight teachers’ practices in teaching RCS. The conflicts of examination orientated instruction mentioned above may be evident in the teachers’ teaching practices. The next section discusses teachers’ pedagogical practices.

8.2.2.2 Pedagogical practices.

Classroom observations were undertaken to explore teaching practices teaching reading strategies in the reading comprehension lessons. Transcripts were developed from 16 videotaped lessons in eight classrooms in eight government owned primary schools. The transcript analyses focus on the reading strategies taught by Year 6 ESL teachers in their teaching of ESL reading.

The analysis found that the teaching practices related to RCS in L2 RC were also another challenge for teachers to practice RCS methodology. The teaching of L2 RC was primarily completed through the division of labour (Engeström, 2001) between teachers and students. As such, the teaching of RCS in L2 RC was mainly dominated by teachers. The teaching practices that all the participants used were transmission teaching, questioning, reading aloud, silent reading, and group work. This section explores how these teaching practices contributed to the learning of reading strategies in these classrooms.
8.2.2.2.1 Transmission teaching.

The most widely used instructional practice in the teaching of reading in these classrooms was transmission teaching. All teachers did this in different ways such as by transmitting the information about the text directly, explicitly teaching the meaning of words, and grammar rules. First, teachers transmitted information about the text read directly to the students:

Nur: And this person, there is one boy named Mike. He was not good at sports. Not even one sport. And, whenever his friends go to his house and ask him to play and say, “Hi Mike, come play with us” and what did he say? Sts: No
Nur: He said, “No, I don’t want” and so what happened to him? His friends would no longer go to his house.
Sts: Yes

In this excerpt, Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) focused on her own interpretation rather than on the learners’ thoughts, as she kept on talking about the text though she was also simultaneously asking the students yes/no questions. Here, students were passively listening to their teachers, rather than actively engaging with the text. In so doing, less emphasis was given to the children’s own ideas.

Second, teachers such as Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co), Ali (PS<5 LRS/Co), and Ana (PS< 3 LRS/Co) explicitly explained the meanings of the words in the text. For instance, Nur gave word definitions:

Nur: Ok. What do you mean by lonely? If I say, last night my family went outside for open-house in my cousin’s house, but I didn’t go with them because I had homework to do. So I felt lonely at home.
Nu: So what is ‘lonely’ It means you are only one person, no friends or family around you.

Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) used questioning but time was not given for the students to answer. She continued to give examples of the meaning of the words to support her explanations. Students’ interaction and participation were associated with teacher-centeredness in the teaching, whereby Nur played the main role (Lerkkanen, et al., 2016). This type of teaching style is dominant in Brunei, which may be due to social-cultural expectations and roles. Brunei students are described as polite, well behaved and used to being firmly and clearly directed by their elders (CfBT, 2006). Therefore, students listen to the teachers and are accustomed to being provided with help from
teachers such that they do not need to think for themselves especially for their learning purposes. Such a situation adds complexity to the teaching and learning in the classroom, making it difficult to train students to rely more on themselves in implementing reading strategies, as language learning strategies encourage learners to become self-directed (Cohen & Macarao, 2007).

Third, Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co), Ayu (PS<8 HRS/Co), and Liza (TESL< 17 HRS/Co) sometimes transmitted information about grammar rules when teaching reading. For example:

*Liza: Tell me what is the tense for the sentences in the text?*
*Students: past tense*
*Liza: why is it in past tense?*
*St: already past*
*Liza: Ok, good, tell me what is the past tense for ‘kill’ this sentence in paragraph 1*
*St: Killed*
*Liza: Ok, killed is the past tense of ‘kill’, so you used ‘killed’ with ed at the end when you make sentence that is already in past.*
*Liza: Past tense means ‘sudah terjadi’, ‘kalau sudah terjadi perkatan kata kerja mesti di tukar kepada ‘past tense’ [Past tense means something that already happen, so if it is already happened you should change the verb to past tense]*
*Liza: Remember this, don’t forget in exam, if you see the word ‘did’, when you answer the questions, what should you do first?*
*St: change the verb to past tense*
*Liza: Remember that. OK?*

In this instance, Liza (TESL< 17 HRS/Co) explained the tenses involved in the text and students were asked to memorise grammar rules. Such practices are associated with a grammar-translation method (Hanafiyeh, 2015) of teaching, whereby the focus is on the rote memorisation of the explicit rules of grammar. As such, no teaching of reading strategies, either explicitly or implicitly, was used in order to enhance students’ understanding of the text. However, the teacher implicitly taught the students to use a memorising strategy in order to understand the grammar rules when answering comprehension questions. All of the teachers used transmission teaching to explain grammar rules for the students to memorise for future use, especially for the end of year examination. This indicates that these teachers use some grammar translation methods (Hanafiyeh, 2015) in their teaching of reading. However, in using this method, teachers only involved the students in using reading strategies such as the ‘memorising’ strategy (Oxford, 1990) to understand grammar rules so they can answer the comprehension test for examination preparation. The translating to L1 strategy was also used implicitly when teachers explained information about a text, meanings of words and grammar rules. The students were taught implicitly to use a ‘translating to
L1’ strategy in order to better understand the text. In these instances transmission teaching limited these teachers’ teaching of reading strategies in the classroom, as they used low levels of cognitive (translating) and memorising strategies. Transmission teaching still exerts a strong influence on teachers’ practice, with the potential to limit the teaching of wider and deeper reading strategies.

Previous research has indicated that the development of reading skills is associated with a high level of child-centred teaching practices in the classroom (Lerkkanen, et al., 2016). Hence, teacher directed practices limited the opportunities for students to explore more than the low level cognitive strategies (such as memorising and translating to L1) in the classes that were observed. These practices may have also impacted the way these teachers used questioning in their teaching of L2 RC.

8.2.2.2.2 Questioning.

Anthony and Raphael (2004) argued that questioning is the most frequent technique used by teachers for teaching or improving comprehension, and that questioning includes teachers asking students about the text they have read. All the teachers in this study used questioning as the predominant method of teaching L2 reading comprehension.

Analysis of observational data found that the types of questions which were most used by these teachers were yes/no and literal questions from the text, which are closed questions. For example, Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) used yes/no questions in order to check her students’ understanding about the text:

*Tr*: So what is the story all about?  
*St*: Mike is...  
*Tr*: Mike... What happened to Mike? Tell me how is his character? Was he really good at sports, Saidun?  
*St*: No!!

While Amy (TESL<20 HRS/Co) used yes/no questions to confirm students’ knowledge about a particular word:

*Tr*: Alright, as I told you today, we are going to learn comprehension. Right! The title of our passage today is...  
*Tr*: Right, what is that?  
*Sts*: Echidna, echidna, echidna...
Tr: No, you don’t know what an Echidna is?
Sts: No

Ali (PS <5 LRS/Co) also used yes/no and closed questions simultaneously to engage the students, as shown below:

(Yes/no questions)
Ali: we cut some mushrooms and onions. Ok. So the girls cut some of the mushrooms and hotdogs. You know. Anymore? Is that all the things that you need to do?
Sts: No
Anymore?
Student A: Yes
Ali: What is it?
Student A: The sauce

In an example of using literal types of questions, Siti (TESL< 12 MRS/Co) asked her students about the paragraph, where exactly the answers could be found in the text, as shown in the following excerpt:

Siti: Ok, now... what is all about in paragraph 1? What is the story about?
Sts: [murmuring]
Siti: How did the flood happen, ok? How did the flood happen to Kampong Pasir Baru?
Sts: [murmuring]
Siti: How did it begin?
Student A: The Klang River burst its bank

As can be seen from these examples, no specific reading strategies were taught by the teachers, as the closed questions did not require higher thinking responses. The questions were mainly procedural for checking or confirming students’ understanding about the text and to encourage the students to talk. This is problematic, because teachers asked questions and evaluated students on the correctness of their answers, not on their comprehension. This means that the focus on comprehension was not explicit to students which may impact on their reading comprehension development.
In the following account, Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) asked her students to work out the cause and effect of not having hobbies in their real life situation. Her students responded with several effects of not having hobbies in their lives.

Nur: Yes. What will happen to you... or what will happen to us if we don’t have hobbies?
St: Lonely
St: We don’t have any talent
Nur: Very good, good answer. Can you repeat your answer? If you don’t have any hobbies what will happen?
St: We will not have talent
Nur: We will not have talent at all. What do you mean by talent? Something that you are very good at. Is that true or not?
Sts: Yes

Here, Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) used inferential questions that involved taking a message from the text that was not explicitly stated, but which could be justified by reference to the text (Day and Jeong-suk, 2005). Handsfield and Jimenez (2008) argued that teachers use questioning to link the passage to previous knowledge and experience, in order to improve students’ comprehension. Lina (TESL<12 LRS) provided an example of this when she asked her students to give their opinions about the text they had read. In this instance Lina implicitly taught her students to reflect on their background knowledge or experience in order to draw inferences about the text. In response, her students came up with ideas for good things about Facebook which were not in the text.

Lina: Tell me what is good about Facebook?
Student A: in touch with friends
Student B: to get information
Student C: business
Lina: oh that’s interesting, tell me more
Student C: I can sell things from Facebook
Student D: wasting time
Lina: why?
Student D: too much doing it

Overall, these teachers predominantly used yes/no and literal questions to promote interaction and check students’ comprehension of the text they read, rather than teaching any particular reading strategies. However, drawing inference questions were used by three of the teachers in the questioning activity. This is one of the important reading activities that can teach the students to use reading strategies, such as ‘making inferences’ of the text they read, as it requires higher order thinking, and develops a deeper understanding of the text they have read. The types of questioning used by some of the teachers in this study limited their ability to teach reading
strategies emphasising the important role of questioning in developing the wider use of reading strategies in the classroom.

8.2.2.2.3 Reading aloud.

Another predominant practice used in the teaching of reading was reading aloud. Reading aloud (RA) was used by the teachers as a whole class, group or individual activity. However, the use of reading aloud has been consistently discouraged for more than three decades because of the wider preference for communicative teaching (Alshumaimeri, 2011). In the communicative approach, RA is considered an obsolete method that might hinder the development of L2 proficiency (Gibson, 2008). Despite this criticism, RA was widely used in these classrooms. Although, RA was preferred as a learning method, the emphasis was on the development of EFL proficiency and not on comprehension.

The most common reading aloud practiced in classroom was the Round Robin reading. Teachers selected students to read the text aloud in turn while the other students listened and at the same time teachers corrected students’ mispronunciations immediately. For example, Ana (PS<3 LRS/Co) focused on the accuracy of the students’ pronunciation while they read aloud.

Ana: Very good! Ok now... I want some of you to read on your own, not with your friends. Who wants to start first? Zulaikah? Ok, Zulaikah, do you want to go first? Can you read it for the class? Stand up please. Louder!
Student A: [One student reads out loud from the text]
Ana: Very good! Excellent. Who like to continue the reading? Give her a clap please for her effort
[Students are clapping their hands]
Ana: Who wants to try, boys? I want boys. Come on! Otherwise, I am going to pick you randomly. Anik, would you like to try? Come on, Anik.. Come on! Don’t say “Oh No!” say “Oh Yes!”
Teacher: The next day...
Student B: [Student continues reading the text out loud]
Teacher: Louder please
Teacher: ‘comforted’... say it again, ‘comforted’
Student B: comforted... [Student continues reading the text out loud]
Teacher: Very good! Excellent! Next...

Similarly, Lina (TESL<12 LRS/Co) read the text aloud and asked the students to listen and read the text silently along with her. First, Lina modeled for her students how to read the whole text
with correct intonation and pronunciation, and then she selected students to read the text aloud, as illustrated below:

*Lina:* Ok, listen as I read. Listen. After this I will select you to read. So you need to listen to me.
*Lina:* [Teacher reads the text aloud]
*Sts:* Students listened while the teacher was reading the text aloud

Again, the focus in teaching was on reading for accuracy and pronunciation, rather than on meaning. Amy (TESL<20 HRS/Co) demonstrated how to read the text aloud and, at the same time, all the students were asked to read aloud together with Amy. This is usually done to promote fluency. She corrected students’ mispronunciation immediately during the reading, as illustrated below:

*Amy:* Ok, we will read together, listen the way I read and follow exactly how I read the text, Ok, 1,2,3
*Amy:* reads the text aloud together with the students
*Amy:* ‘anteater’, Ok, repeat after me ‘anteater’
*Students:* anteater
*Amy and Students:* continue reading the text

In these examples, the teachers began reading the text aloud with attention to accuracy and students were asked to either follow their teachers’ reading or listen and read together by silent reading. In terms of the relevance of the use of reading strategies, these teachers implicitly taught the students to use the practicing strategy, which is a low level cognitive strategy. However, the practicing strategy used in this instance was mainly for ESL learning, rather than for reading comprehension. Reading aloud is associated with an audio-lingual model of ESL teaching. Abu-Melhim (2009) stated that the term ‘audio-lingual’ refers to two components of the communication process: ‘audio’ emphasising listening; and ‘lingual’ stressing the speaking aspect. Thus it emphasises the aural and oral skills of L2, rather than the reading comprehension skills. It is only recognised as an important language skill to produce fluent readers, so in this instance, ESL teaching took primacy over reading comprehension. This focus on ESL rather than comprehension may have hindered Year 6 students’ reading comprehension development.
8.2.2.2.4 Silent reading.

Silent reading is when the students are given the time and space to read the text silently on their own. According to the new English curriculum, silent reading is one of the recommended activities in the teaching of reading process in the classroom (MOE, 2010).

Six out of eight teachers used silent reading for the purpose of getting the idea of the text. This suggests that a low level cognitive strategy was being implemented, at the ‘while reading’ stage, by a majority of the teachers. However, two teachers, Ali (PS<5 LRS) and Ana (PS<3 LRS), did not practice silent reading. Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) and Ayu (PS<8 HRS/Co) initiated silent reading with their students before they read the text aloud. This suggests that those teachers who rated themselves as high users of reading strategies methodologies, though they were not in the field of TESL, implemented silent reading activities in the teaching of the reading process. These teachers (Nur and Ayu) followed the lesson guide from the teachers’ book in the old curriculum, as it outlined the use of silent reading in the teaching of reading (PEBD, 2008).

All the TESL specialised teachers with teaching experience of more than 12 years, irrespective of their reported rate of use of RS, implemented silent reading activities during and after reading stages. This might have been influenced by their TESL teacher training at the university. Moreover, as reported earlier, these teachers had attended the RELA training which advocates the use of silent reading in the teaching of reading in the classroom, as one of the reading strategies that provides students with an opportunity to understand the text. For example, Amy (TESL<20 HRS/Co) asked her students to read silently for five minutes before she asked her students to read aloud before they discussed the text further. However, she did not explain why this might help them as this was more like a teaching procedure than a strategy to develop comprehension.

Amy: Let me give you the text on ‘Echidna’. Please pass the paper to your friends
Amy: Read silently first on your own. Get to know what the text is about before we talk about the text.
Students read the text silently
Amy: Read and no talking please, 5 minutes. I give you 5 minutes

Similarly, Liza (TESL<17 HRS/Co) asked her students to read the text silently during the ‘while reading’ stage to understand the whole idea of the text before they read the text aloud.
Liza: Ok, I give you 5 minutes to read the text first, get to know the whole idea of the text. Read silently please. Now [Students read the text silently] After 5 minutes…

Liza: Ok, done?

Students: Yes

In the next example, Liza (TESL<17 HRS/Co) asked her students to read silently at the post reading stage, before she asked them to do the reading comprehension exercises. However, in this instance, she gave them a purpose for reading: “think about the answers”, which was an implicit strategy, reminding her students to think about the possible answers to the questions in the exercises, while reading the text.

Liza: Ok, class, listen…Before you do the exercises, please read the text silently once again. Think about the answers for the questions while you are reading the text. [Students read the text silently]

In sum, the teachers who used silent reading activities in this study tended to implicitly teach the students to use silent reading to get the idea of the text for the purpose of finding the answers to comprehension questions. Silent reading involved the students using a ‘test wise’ strategy rather than comprehension. Silent reading should focus on the understanding of deeper level of meaning embedded in text (Rasinski, 2004 cited in Turkyilmaz, et al., 2014). However, in this study, the silent reading was not focused on comprehension.

8.2.2.2.5 Grouping or pairing.

Across the lesson observations, it was observed that only four teachers of low, medium and high users of RCS teaching (Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co) Ayu (PS<8 HRS/Co), Amy (TESL<20 HRS/Co), Ana (PS<3 LRS/Co) implicitly taught a social strategy (i.e. collaborative strategy) by engaging the students in pairs or group work, during either the pre- or post-reading stage. For instance, Ayu (PS<8 HRS/Co) asked her students to work in pairs during the pre-reading stage to stimulate students’ interest in the text to be read in the lesson. She asked her students to work in pairs: one to read a short text and the other student to draw a house, after listening to the details of the text read by her or his partner. At the end of the activity, each pair was asked to show its work to the whole
class. Ayu assessed students’ work immediately when they shared their drawings with the whole class.

Ayu: Ok are you ready?
Sts: Yes
Ayu: Ok stop. Put your pencils down. You put everything down. Each pair please show your work to the whole class.
Ayu: I think yours is ok. Yours is alright. Ok this exercise. Do you know why I gave you this exercise? I want to see whether you can work with one another. It’s done on purpose. One to do the colouring, one to do the reading, one tries to understand. One does the drawing. Ok. Some of you did well I but I need you to actually encourage your partner right. So basically, what do you think you have learned? What do you think? Basically what? Ok what topic is this? Tell me what topic are we going to read next?
Sts: Houses
Ayu: We are going to do a reading comprehension text, something about houses.

In this example, Ayu (PS<8 HRS/Co) asked the students to work in pairs to predict what the story would be about. Here, Ayu was not only implementing a predicting strategy, but she was also teaching a collaborative strategy, i.e. working with peers so that they could understand the text better. Collaboration is a social strategy that could help learners get the meaning easily and aid their understanding. In group work Ayu focused on using a range of reading strategies, so as to enhance her students’ comprehension and, at the same time, her teaching of reading focused more on comprehension than on the correctness of answers.

In another classroom, a group work activity was conducted at the post-reading stage by Nur (PS<2 MRS/Co):

Nur: I am going to give you each this paper. Now, what are you going to write is, you… we are going to discuss together about the moral of this story. Discuss together with your friends and write down one moral of the story.
St: Satu saja buat kah? [Do one only, right?] [Students are given time to discuss the moral of the story] After some time
Nur: Do you want to know what your friends have written?
Sts: Yes
Nur: Okay now. Let’s share together. Let’s start with... Anyone wants to volunteer?
St: Yes
Nur: First group? Okay now, Saidun’s group come to the front. All of you listen and share with your friends.
St: If we don’t have any hobbies, we will become lazy because we don’t do any activities.
Nur: Is that true?
Sts: Yes

In Nur’s lesson, the students were asked to discuss the moral of the story contained within the text read in the group. Nur involved her students in collaborating to discuss the moral of the text read. This gave the students the opportunity to talk to each other. Students were also given the opportunity to share their ideas with the whole class at the end of the activity. One of the students from each group was asked to talk about their ideas in front of the class. Here, Nur implicitly taught her students the use of a ‘sharing ideas’ strategy, in order to enhance their comprehension.

Another example of using group work can be seen in Ana’s lesson:

Ana: I am going to ask you to work in groups to write about what happened in the story. What you have just discussed like now. So, the more information you get the better. So, you discuss with your friend. Ok, ok class?
Ana: ok
Ana: Do a mind map based on these questions [Teacher writes the questions on the board]. Can you see my writing class?
Sts: Yes
Ana: Your answer will be on who are the characters in this passage, where the incident happened. What happened? You can find these four on the passage. Like for example, Wahid is having a new bicycle, that is one incident. There is already one thing happened in the passage. What else?

In this example, students were asked to discuss the main ideas of the story in a mind map. Ana used several strategies such as collaborating and summarising by using a mind map during the group work activity. In this activity the students were given the opportunity to engage in making meaning from the text. As seen, Ana implicitly taught the students to use ‘cooperating’ and ‘summarising’ strategies to understand the text.

The three teachers who used pairs or group work activities in this study tended to implicitly teach the students to use a range of reading strategies such as ‘predicting’, ‘cooperating with peers’, ‘summarising’ and ‘sharing ideas’ in order to enhance students’ reading comprehension. Cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies were taught implicitly by these teachers.

Teaching practices such as transmission teaching, reading aloud, silent reading and group work were predominantly implemented in these classrooms. However, the analysis revealed that the
teaching of L2 RC was dominated by teachers. That is, such practices were completed through a division of labour between teachers and students (Engeström, 2001). These exemplified teacher directed instruction. As a result, teachers were found to focus on assessing students’ comprehension (‘test wise’ strategy) rather than comprehension. The focus on assessing students’ reading comprehension rather than strategies to comprehend the text has been found in several studies (e.g. Taylor, et al., 2002; Norsidah, 2012; Muhammad, 2013). The results in this chapter build on these findings by identifying various types of reading activities that shaped the teaching of RCS. First, transmission teaching limited the teaching of reading strategies in the classroom as using this approach meant that teachers felt they could only teach low level cognitive (translating) and memory (memorising) strategies. Second, teachers were predominantly used yes/no and literal questions which were not related specifically to any reading strategies and thus constituted a procedure for teaching the lesson rather than reading comprehension strategies instruction. Third, in reading aloud activities, teachers only taught students the practising strategy (cognitive strategy) that mainly focuses on the accuracy of the students’ pronunciation and intonation and not on comprehension. Thus, it emphasises the aural and oral skills rather than the reading comprehension skills. Fourth, a low level cognitive strategy was implicitly taught as in reading the text silently students get to know the whole idea of the text. Fifth, ranges of reading strategies were implemented by the students when group work was activated in the classroom. So group work activities played an important role in influencing teachers’ practice on a wider RS used in the classroom. Hence, these findings suggested that the teaching of RCS were related to the reading activities in L2 RC. The understanding of the different types of reading activities in shaping the teaching of RCS created implications for ESL teachers of how to address the teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

These finding raised a question on the role of the community in helping teachers to enhance the development of students’ L2 RC. The following section explores this.

### 8.2.3 Community.

The community refers to the ‘who’ who work together to reach the objective (goal) of the activity (Engeström, 2001). This aspect frames the analysis of the involvement of other stakeholders in working together to reach the objective of the activity.
8.2.3.1 Professional development.

The finding revealed that teachers linked their teaching of RCS in L2 RC with the involvement of Ministry of Education, school, and individual personal history.

For example, the analysis of the interview transcripts revealed that teachers who had graduated in the field of primary education, and who had less than 10 years of teaching experience, attributed their limited methods of teaching reading strategies to a lack of professional development about how to teach reading comprehension. As early career teachers, they reported that they had had little access to PD. Nur (PS< 2MRS/I) reported that ‘I don’t know much about how to teach reading effectively. I have never attended any professional development on how to teach reading comprehension’. Ana (PS< 3 LRS/I) said that ‘I never attended any workshop on the teaching of reading before’.

The other two teachers, Ali (PS< 5 LRS/I) and Ayu (PS< 8 LRS/I), stated that they had never attended any training on the teaching of reading comprehension, although they had been teaching English for five and eight years respectively.

On the other hand, the other four teachers, who had graduated in the field of TESL and who had teaching experience of more than 12 years, reported that they had attended professional development on how to teach reading comprehension in the classroom, using the RELA methods, although this was several years ago. As examples, Amy (TESL< 20 HRS/I) commented that ‘It was way back in the 1990’s that I attended workshops every week on how to teach English language using the RELA method’. Similarly, Lina (TESL<12 HRS/I) reported that, ‘I have attended professional development on how to teach reading using the RELA method before’.

Siti (TESL<12 MRS/I) stated that the recent professional development that she had attended focused on the structure of the new curriculum and how to teach reading comprehension using a guided reading method. In her words:

*We don’t have any specific training on how to teach reading comprehension using reading strategies. The training that I have attended so far was all about the new themes in the new curriculum and how to teach reading comprehension, for instance, using the guided reading method.*
8.2.3.2 Socio-historical.

The teachers also linked their teaching of RCS with their personal history as a secondary student or student-teacher. For example, Siti (TESL<12 MRS/I) continued, saying that she mostly relied on the knowledge that she gained at the university. Siti commented further, ‘I rely mostly on what I had learnt from the university so far’.

Ayu (PS< 8MRS) reported,

_I used to teach based on my experience as a secondary student when I was in Singapore secondary school by skimming the text first, scanning keywords, predicting the text before reading. And I believed it worked for me so I used that also to teach my students._

Similarly, Nur Nur (PS< 2MRS/I) said that, ‘I teach L2 reading to my students sometimes based on my experience as a student when I was in primary and secondary schools’.

The excerpts above indicated that these teachers linked the lack of specific and recent professional development to their teaching of reading strategies in reading comprehension lessons. However, in this context, they also drew on their experiences at school or in their early careers as ways to overcome their lack of PD.

8.2.3.3 School leadership.

The teachers also linked their teaching of RCS with the school culture in terms of the school principals’ expectations in their teaching of English in L2 classrooms. For example, Liza (TESL<17HRS/I) commented that she could not ask her students to generate questions using L1 as she was concerned about the principal’s reaction. She reported,

_I once asked my students to create questions based on the text read but it did not work well as the students were reverting to L1 in the classroom, too much use of L1 in the classroom that I am worried that my principal would remind me regards the approach as you know we are not advised to use L1 in our instruction._
In this instance Liza indicated the role of the school leadership in shaping her teaching of RCS in L2 RC. This was a particular issue for her as the principal was a strong supporter of EMI policy and a negative appraisal could have impacted her career performance. In Brunei, a teacher yearly performance appraisal is undertaken by the principal and was important for a teacher’s future career track.

In sum, the analysis in this section revealed that the teaching of RCS in L2 RC was also related to the role of the community. As stated by Engeström (2001) that teaching occurs within social, cultural or historical contexts and community explains the importance in providing the social-cultural or historical context in which the activity occurs. Teachers in this study linked their teaching of RCS in L2 RC with their access to PD, experiences as a students, and school’s leadership expectations. This indicated that the interplay between the teaching of RCS and social-cultural and historical contexts of the study. This findings support the notion that interaction of sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts in an activity system (e.g. Gibbes & Carson, 2014; McCafferty, et al., 2011). The implication of activity theory is that teaching and learning is a social event that takes place as a result of interaction between the learner/teacher and the environment (Engeström, 2008). Understanding the interplay of sociocultural and historical and the teaching of RCS in L2 RC may have helped in developing teachers’ PD to address demands of teaching RCS in EMI/EFL contexts.

8.3 Summary

Although the teaching of RCS in L2 RC among Year 6 ESL teachers in this study were conflicted with regard to the contextual issues around the EMI policy and examination orientated education system they still taught reading strategies in their L2 RC lessons. Nevertheless, there were some constraints and affordances in the implementation of RCS in L2 RC classrooms around the issues.

First, the analysis revealed that the teachers’ constraints in this study within the EMI policy was found to be limited access to English resources. Teachers relied heavily on ready-made English resources in order to teach L2 RC lessons as they perceived that they were not competent enough to create their own English resources, and they perceived that English resources were necessary to guide their teaching of L2 RC. Hence, this led teachers to manage the teaching of L2 RC in different ways that may have facilitated or hindered the teaching of RCS. First, teachers managed the EMI challenges by responding and reframing. For example, TESL teachers responded by
adapting resources from internet websites as they were expected to use their own resources to teach L2 RC. The non- TESL teachers however, reframed the policy by using the old textbooks in teaching L2 RC in the classroom. However, all teachers irrespective of their qualification reframed the purpose of teaching L2 RC by focusing more on examination preparation ‘test wise strategy’ instruction rather than comprehension. This over focus on examination has hindered the teaching of various kinds of RCS in L2 RC.

The findings in this section highlighted that the teaching practices such as transmission teaching, reading aloud, silent reading and group work were predominantly implemented. However, the teaching of L2 RC was dominated by teachers. As a result, teachers were found to focus on assessing students’ comprehension (‘test wise’ strategy) rather than comprehension. The focus on assessing students’ reading comprehension rather than ways to comprehend the text has been found in several studies (studies (e.g. Taylor, et al., 2002; Norsidah, 2011; Muhammad, 2013). The results in this chapter builds on these findings by identifying various types of reading activities that shaped the teaching of RCS. First, transmission teaching limited the teaching of reading strategies in the classroom as using this approach meant that teachers felt they could only teach low level cognitive (translating) and memory (memorising) strategies. Second, teachers predominantly used yes/no and literal questions which were not related specifically to any reading strategies and thus constituted a procedure for teaching the lesson rather than reading comprehension strategies instruction. Third, in reading aloud activities, however, teachers only taught students the practising strategy (cognitive strategy) that mainly focuses on the accuracy of the students’ pronunciation and intonation and not on comprehension. Fourth, a low level cognitive strategy was implicitly taught as in reading the text silently students get to know the whole idea of the text. Fifth, different ranges of reading strategies were implemented by the students when group work was activated in the classroom. So group work activities played an important role in influencing teachers’ practice on a wider RCS used in the classroom. Hence, these findings suggested that the teaching of RCS was related to the reading activities in L2 RC.

Second, the analysis also revealed that the examination orientated education system affected the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. Teachers used past year examination paper as a tool to teach L2 RC lessons. As a result, test wise strategy were advocated in their teaching of RCS in L2 RC. The implication of the activity theory in this context is that rules and norms of the contexts were linked with the teaching of RCS in L2 RC. That is the examination contexts in this study governed the activity.
The findings of the analysis highlighted that the teaching of RCS in L2 RC were governed by the interplay of EMI and EFL issues within the context of the study. The effectiveness of EMI in the teaching of RCS was negatively impacted by the limited access to English resources and professional development. These findings extend findings in the literature in that due to the limited access to English resources and professional development teachers tended to manage such constrains by using internet resources and previous textbooks to facilitate the teaching of RCS. However, the way teachers responded, interpreted and reframed the EMI policy in their teaching of RCS in L2 RC had shaped these teachers’ objectives to comply within the context of education orientated education system. Regardless of teachers’ qualifications and types of resources used, a test wise strategy rather than comprehension was found predominantly used by the teachers in this study. The findings of this study provides insights into the interplay between the EMI policy and examination education system within the EFL societal setting and the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.
Chapter 9

Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter discusses the key findings and conclusions of the study and begins with a brief overview of the research. The main section of the chapter discusses the findings in terms of the research questions that guided the study. This is followed by limitations of the study, and implications for future research, policy and practice. The chapter finishes with some concluding remarks.

9.1 Overview of the Study

This study investigated the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in EFL/EMI contexts, and explored the ways Year 6 students and their teachers managed EFL and EMI issues in the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms within an EFL/EMI context. In order to answer the research questions (RQs), an embedded mixed methods design was adopted. The participants comprised 477 students and 57 teachers were involved in the study.

The study was conducted in two phases. In phase 1, teacher participants were asked to complete a self-report survey about their familiarity with RCS and their use of RCS in the teaching of English reading comprehension. The student participants completed a self-report survey about their use of RCS when they read English texts. Then, teachers who self-reported high, medium and low teaching of RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension in the classroom were identified. Three teachers from each group took part in the second phase of the study. Nine students of each of the nine teachers who participated in the first phase of the study participated in the second phase of the study. In phase 2, a stimulated reading comprehension recall task was conducted with the students. They were asked to read an English reading passage and answer the reading comprehension tasks. The test scores were then collected to measure the students’ reading comprehension performance. Group interviews with the students, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews with the teachers were also conducted to explore the research questions in depth.

Key findings of this study were the interplay between EFL and EMI in the teaching of RCS in L2 RC. The implementation of EMI has created both negative and positive impacts on the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC. While the learning and teaching of RCS are essential to
developing L2 reading comprehension, the implementation process in the classroom created facilitating or hindering factors for these teachers and their students.

The analysis of the students’ self-report survey about their use of RCS showed that students’ reported use of RCS, and with respect to the stages of reading were shaped by the students’ reading achievement levels, gender and teachers’ reported use of teaching RCS (see chapter 5).

The analysis of the students’ stimulated reading comprehension recall task and group interviews in chapter 6 further revealed that the negative impact of EMI in the learning RCS in L2 RC was related to EFL issues such as vocabulary knowledge, nexus between spelling, and pronunciation and grammar. Students’ language issues shaped the learning of RCS, and their reading approaches shaped the learning of RCS in EFL/EMI classrooms. Readers who reported an interactive approach in their reading scored better in reading comprehension tests than the bottom-up and top-down readers.

The findings highlighted that teachers’ perceptions of RCS were related to teachers’ qualifications and their own school experiences. Teachers perceived that their teaching of RCS was also shaped by how they managed their students’ language issues. For example, these teachers managed students’ language issues by reframing and interpreting the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons.

Chapter 8 reported that the teaching of RCS in L2 RC in these classrooms was related to the limited access to English resources and teacher-directed pedagogical practices. The Year 6 ESL teachers managed the challenge around English resources by using internet websites and outdated textbooks to accommodate the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. However, regardless of the use of internet access or previous books, these teachers reframed their teaching by focusing more on developing students’ test wise strategies than comprehension due to the tensions created by the examination orientated education system. Within this context, teachers also used past year examination papers to enable them to focus more on teaching test-wise strategies. In addition, the L2 RC classroom interactions were dominated by teachers whereby focused more on assessing students’ comprehension rather than developing comprehension skills. Moreover, the community also played an important role in creating the positive and negative factors influencing their reading. The Year 6 ESL teachers also linked their teaching of RCS in L2 RC with their limited access to professional development, their own experiences as students and the school leader’s expectation.
In the following sections, these key findings are discussed in more detail under each of the research questions.

1a. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the learning of RCS among year 6 EFL Bruneian students in EFL/EMI settings?
   b. What are the factors that facilitate or hinder the teaching of RCS among year 6 ESL Bruneian teachers in EFL/EMI settings?

2a. How do year 6 EFL Bruneian students manage the EFL and EMI issues in the learning of RCS in L2 RC?
   b. How do Year 6 ESL Bruneian teachers manage the EFL and EMI issues in teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI?

As the results of this study were gathered from different phases of the study, the key findings are discussed according to research questions.

9.2 Research Question 1a: What are the Factors that Facilitate or Hinder the Learning of RCS among Year 6 Bruneian Students in EFL/EMI Settings?

This study identified several factors that facilitated or hindered the learning of RCS in L2 RCS in these classrooms. These were identified from their reported use of RCS, the stimulated reading comprehension task and focus group interviews. The factors were related to students’ background such as different levels of reading achievements, gender (see chapter 5), different reading approaches (see chapter 6), and teacher related factors such as teacher reported teaching of RCS (see chapter 5). Other factors were related to student’s language difficulties in vocabulary knowledge, the nexus between spelling and pronunciation skills, and grammar knowledge (see chapter 6).

9.2.1. Use and relationship of RCS and students reading achievements.

The research found that students with high RA preferred to use more strategies and a greater variety of strategies than students with medium and low RA. In this current research, the significant difference in the use of reading strategies by reading achievements (RA) in terms of high, medium and low levels were also investigated. A one-way ANOVA statistic indicated that reading achievements levels had a significant effects on overall strategy use, F (2.474) =22.57, p<.05. This
means that there was a significant relationship between strategy use and reading achievements. That is, a significant relationship of strategy use between students with high and low RA and between students with medium and low RA. Such findings between RA and strategy use support those of previous research (e.g. Akkakoson, 2013; Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Ghosh & Madhumathi, 2012; Hong-Nam, et al., 2014; Lee & Liao, 2007; Karbalaei, 2013; Shah, et al., 2010; Singhal, 2006; Sheorey & Boboczky, 2008; Zhang & Wu, 2009). These findings provide strong evidence for the influence of reading achievements in strategies use in Brunei as an additional context for RCS research, and confirm that RCS use is related to reading achievements.

A more detailed analysis of the students’ self-report survey about their use of RCS found there was evidence of significant differences in the three categories of strategies (cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies) among the students with high, medium and low RA. The high RA groups used cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently than the other groups whereas the medium RA group favoured social strategies more than the other RA groups. These findings support previous research (e.g. Lau, 2006) that argued good readers use more strategies more frequently than poor readers. Hence, this findings also extends the study in that students with high RA used cognitive and metacognitive strategies more frequently. This explains that there are differences in the means in the use of cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies between reading achievement levels. This result implies that helping EFL students develop cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies might have an overall benefit to their reading achievements.

Interestingly, when looking at six categories of strategy use, those students with high, medium and low RA, preferred to use cognitive strategies the most, and affective strategies the least. This finding supported earlier studies that found the students with high RA preferred to use cognitive strategies most (Afghari & Ghafournia, 2013; Ozek & Civelek, 2006; Phakiti, 2003). However, this finding was incongruent with previous studies that did not find students with low and medium RA preferring the cognitive strategy the most e.g. (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Yang, 2006; Zhang, 2001; Zhang & Wu, 2009). This implies that reading achievement is not exclusively connected to using certain strategies, for example cognitive strategies, and that other factors contribute to the differentiation of high, medium and low reading achievement. One possible factor that might account for this finding is that there are pedagogical issues associated with the education system in Brunei, for example, the way the examination is based on rote learning; the way English reading lessons were carried out in the classroom reflects this rote learning.
In addition, this study also examined the use of reading strategies related to reading processes by reading achievement levels. Students with high RA used reading strategies more frequently in pre, during and post reading than the medium and low groups of RA. The students with high RA most frequently used the strategies at the pre-reading phase than at any other phases of reading. This extends the finding in the study conducted by Noli and Sabariah (2011) in that readers who used pre-reading strategies were identified as strategic readers. In this study, the readers who advocated the interactive approach used more pre-reading strategies than other readers. Hence, it can be concluded that the strategic readers are those who approach reading interactively. This finding provides insights into the learning and teaching of RCS in the classroom and the importance of executing effective strategies at the pre-reading stage of reading. Therefore, it is imperative to expose language learners on pre-reading strategies so that they know how to perform reading strategies effectively.

9.2.2 Use and relationship of RCS and gender.

Gender was associated with the use of reading strategies and the reading process. There was a significant difference between males and females in the overall use of reading strategies. This means that females were found to use the overall reading strategies and strategies related to the reading process more frequently than males. In terms of strategy groupings, female used memory, cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies more frequently than males. The finding of the current study align with results of other research within EFL/EMI contexts where female learners reported more strategy use than males (e.g. Boonkongsanen, 2014; Denton, et al., 2015; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Green & Oxford, 1995; Lee, 2012; Madhumathi & Arijit, 2012; Oxford & Nykos, 1989; Poole, 2005; Sheorey & Baboczky, 2008; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Veloo, et al., 2014). Cultural behaviors may be the possible reason that females use more strategies than males as suggested by some of the previous studies. ‘Gender difference trends in strategy use are quite pronounced within and across cultures and this means that women and men are using different approached to language learning’ (Green & Oxford, 1995, p.29). Meanwhile, Wharton (2000) stated that different strategy use found between female and male was more due to previous language learning experience or bilingualism. Thus, this finding provides further evidence that the use of RCS in learning English reading comprehension is related to gender differences in Brunei.
9.2.3 Use and relationship of RCS and students reading approaches

The study found that there was a close relationship between students’ performance in their reading comprehension task and reading approaches. Readers who advocated interactive approach (type 3 readers) in their reading tend to perform better in the reading comprehension task than the other students who practiced bottom-up (type 1 readers) and top-down (type 2 readers) approaches. This finding provides some insight that successful reading process for these students was the interaction of both bottom-up and top-down processing reading that occurred at several stages. These findings of this study align with those of the researchers in L2 reading who have acknowledged the importance of interactive processing in reading a text (e.g. Salataci & Akyel, 2002; Saricoban, 2002; Seng, 2007; Sidek, 2010; Yitiger, et al., 2005; Zhang, 2008). This is particularly important in order to understand the problems in Brunei where students need to move their reading to an English-based curriculum and use interactive reading approaches to understand content area materials.

9.2.3.1 Reading approaches and aims of using RCS.

Results of the analysis of the students’ stimulated reading comprehension recall task and group interviews indicated that all readers, regardless of their reading approaches and levels of reading achievement, used similar types of reading strategies when they read an English text. The reading strategies that were predominantly used were previewing the text, using background knowledge, self-evaluating, self-inferring and rereading. However, the difference was the way the reading strategies were used in their reading activity. The students’ reading approaches shaped the purpose of using specific reading strategies. For example, some of the readers in all three types read the text more than once, but the purpose was more on monitoring comprehension for the type 3 readers, while the type 1 and 2 readers read the text more than once to more easily answer the questions that followed. The aims of using specific strategies were factors that contributed to their low reading comprehension task scores in this study. Moreover, reading strategies were not taught explicitly by the teachers as reported in chapter 7 whereby teachers focused more on test wise strategies rather than comprehension strategies. Hence, the findings of this study support those of researchers in L2 who have acknowledged the importance of purpose in reading to enhance comprehension (e.g. Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2006; Alsheikh & Haq, 2011).

The implications of activity theory in this study are that students’ reading approaches (tools) and aims (object) are related to the learning of RCS in L2 RC classrooms. This means that the tools
and object shaped the ways RCS (actions) were executed to enhance L2 RC. The tools and object molded the actions of the activity system. Thus, the findings of this study provide some insight into addressing reading comprehension difficulties by advocating teaching of a range of reading strategies explicitly in the learning and teaching of L2 RC lessons in order to enhance reading comprehension problems in Brunei.

**9.2.4 Use and relationship of RCS and teachers’ reported teaching of RCS.**

The students’ uses of overall reading strategies were associated with the teachers’ reported teaching of reading strategies in their English reading comprehension lessons. The mean scores for the highest use of reading strategies were the students of the teachers who reported high teaching of reading strategies. The teachers who reported high and medium/low teaching of RCS in their teaching influenced the students’ use of memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies. The highest means of using cognitive strategies were reported by the students of the teachers who reported high teaching of RCS in their teaching. In general, the teachers who reported high and medium/low teaching of RCS in their teaching highly related to the students’ use of reading strategies in the pre and during rather than the post reading. The highest means of using reading strategies occurred in the pre-reading stage by the students of the teachers who reported high teaching of RCS in their teaching. This finding was not explored in detail as it was not one of the focuses of the study. However, this finding is important for future research as it raises an issue about the extent to teachers’ differences of teaching RCS are related to the students’ use of RCS. This means that teachers should place more emphasis on the teaching of RCS in the classroom.

**9.2.5 Students’ EFL issues.**

A key finding was that students perceived that their learning of RCS were shaped by EFL issues. These students perceived that they had difficulties in English vocabulary knowledge, spelling and pronunciation and grammar. This finding support the notion of activity theory that social environment (EFL/EMI settings) in which interaction occurs determines the activity system that can be categorized as affordances that promote learning and constrains that deter learning (Allen, 2010). Hence, this finding is important because it enhances our understanding that the interplay of EFL and EMI had facilitated or hindered the learning of RCS in L2 RC in the context of this study. Moreover, this finding was also useful in understanding the importance of individual background and social factors in the learning of RCS in L2 RC lessons.
9.2.5.1 Vocabulary Knowledge.

Students perceived that their reading comprehension performance may have been impacted by their lack of vocabulary knowledge. The study found that they believed that they had difficulties in words with idiomatic expression, grammatical and meaning features due to limited breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge. The findings of this study confirm those of researchers in L2 reading who acknowledge the importance of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension (e.g. Ma & Lin, 2015; Sen & Kuleli, 2015; Mehrpour & Rahimi, 2010; Moghadam, et al., 2012; Shen, 2008).

9.2.5.2 Nexus between spelling and pronunciation.

The findings indicated that pronunciation may have impacted the readers’ reading comprehension as these students reported that they could not pronounce the word and thus had no idea about the meaning of the words. Droop and Verhoeven (2003) claimed that decoding skills contributed to comprehension outcomes. In these instances, these readers could not decode the word, nor did they know the word as they had not previously encountered the word either written or spoken. This finding highlighted that a limited breadth of vocabulary may influence students’ pronunciation difficulties. It was also found that students perceived they were having problems in sounding out the words as they could not spell the word. Spelling has also been identified as a skill that is related to success in reading comprehension (Nunes, et al., 2012) in that spelling plays an important role in word-decoding, reading and writing (Little & Hart, 2016). This study has highlighted that difficulties in sounding out words and spelling may have impacted Year 6 EFL students’ reading comprehension.

9.2.5.3 Grammar.

Grammar knowledge may also contribute to the success of L2 reading comprehension. For example, students in this study reported that their L2 reading comprehension during the reading comprehension task was affected by their L2 grammar difficulties. These difficulties were mainly related to word and sentence structure. The finding highlighted that grammatical problems were mainly because of absence of morphological and sentence structure awareness. This finding contributes to our understanding about students’ limited morphological and syntactic awareness and how this may have contributed to L2 reading comprehension performance. The findings of this study support other studies (e.g. Akbari, 2014; Nagy, et al., 2006; Ku & Anderson, 2003; McBride-
Chang et al., 2008; Zhang & Koda, 2013) that had reported the importance of grammar knowledge in facilitating L2 reading comprehension.

The study also found that the grammar difficulties among students in this study may have been impacted by the fact that grammar was not taught explicitly in English lesson as it was not in the syllabus. Grammar was not taught explicitly in the observed English language lessons, for example as reported by Liza (TESL<17HRS/I), ‘we do not teach grammar lesson separately’. Similarly, Ali (PS<5LRS/I), reported, ‘I don’t teach grammar alone as we do not have specific instruction to teach grammar alone and furthermore we do not have grammar books for students. By the way, it is not in the syllabuses’. This means that students were not prepared to understand different types of sentences such as simple, compound and complex sentences. This led difficulties for students in understanding sentences with two or more clauses especially for those students who also lacked breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge.

This study provides an insight that students’ reading comprehension among Year 6 EFL students was linked with the students’ background knowledge about ESL that may limit the use of reading strategies to compensate their limitation.

9.3 Research Question 1b: What are the Factors that Facilitate or Hinder the Teaching of RCS among Year 6 Bruneian Teachers in EFL/EMI Settings?

There are several factors related to teachers’ perception of RCS and students’ abilities as EFL learners as perceived by Year 6 ESL teachers. These included difficulties in oral language and vocabulary knowledge difficulties (see chapter 7). Issues around EFL in an EMI context were related to limited English resources and teacher dominated pedagogical practices (see chapter 8), limited opportunities for professional development, the participants’ personal histories as a student or student teacher, and school’s principal expectations (see chapter 8). A further factor was the exam orientated education system that may have linked to the teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

9.3.1 Teachers’ perceptions of RCS and students’ conditions as EFL learner.

These teachers’ perceptions of RCS varied according to their qualifications and school experiences and contributed to different methods of teaching RCS. Collum (2012) argued that teachers’ perceptions make up their belief system and these beliefs help teachers to decide their method of teaching.
The findings also revealed these teacher’s perceptions of students’ abilities as EFL learners influenced the way they managed their teaching of RCS within this EMI setting. These teachers perceived that their teaching of RCS in their L2 RC classrooms were impacted by their perceptions of their students’ oral language and vocabulary difficulties. The issues raised in the previous research about the implementation of EMI in schools were students’ level of English proficiency (Garton, 2013; Hayes, 2008; Moon, 2005; Nguyen, 2011). This findings extends our understanding of knowledge about the negative impact of EMI in the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms was related to these teachers’ perceptions of students’ English proficiency. This finding also supports the notion of the interplay between teacher and the contextual factors (Priestley, et al., 2012).

Teachers determine their teaching practices according to their teaching aims (Archer, 2003). This notion was evident in the findings in this study where the teachers’ managed students’ English language difficulties by responding, interpreting and reframing processes which were based on their aims. This finding supports previous studies that showed that teachers’ tended to interpret and reframe their English language teaching when encountered students’ language issues (e.g. Kahn, 2009; Liggett, 2011).

Results of the analysis of teachers’ interview also showed that the ESL teachers preferred to use reading strategies such as ‘using a dictionary’, ‘highlighting difficult words’, ‘memorising word meaning’, ‘reviewing word meaning’, ‘explaining word meaning’, and ‘translating word meaning into L1’. These teachers taught only limited reading strategies for the enhancing of students’ comprehension, as they were focused more on cognitive and memory strategies to compensate for their students’ vocabulary limitations. This findings revealed in this study support previous research which found that the limited used of reading strategies could hinder students’ reading comprehension development (Alsheikh & Haq, 2011; Malcolm, 2009: Mehrdad, et al., 2012).

Understanding the teachers’ perceptions of RCS and the process of managing the EFL issues in EMI contexts of learning may help in developing ways to support ESL teachers in moving towards RCS instruction in L2 RC. Understanding the ways ESL teachers respond, interpret and reframe their teaching of RCS in EMI/EFL contexts may also help in developing effective professional development for teachers that address demands more by these teachers for further support.
9.3.2 The policy of EMI.

The main findings about the teaching of RCS experienced by the teachers, as identified from their interviews, were related to EMI and EFL. The interplay of EMI and EFL led to complexities in using RCS in order to enhance the teaching and learning of L2 reading comprehension. These findings, as a whole, support those earlier research that examined the negative effects of EMI in EFL setting (e.g. Mohamed, 2013; Pearson, 2014, Trudell & Piper, 2014), and some shows no negative evidence of English medium of instruction (e.g. Dang, et al., 2013). Given that negative and positive effects of EMI in EFLs setting were identified in the previous studies, the findings in the present study also corroborate these findings. Challenges were identified within the EFL/EMI contexts in the teaching of RCS in English reading comprehension classrooms. Furthermore, these findings provide evidence for the use of RCS in the classrooms beyond cognitive factors and provide more information about socio-cultural perspective influences. Challenges for EMI in EFLs setting were also found in Hoa & Tuan (2007) study, therefore, these findings extend previous research in the field by identifying specific effects of EMI in EFL in the teaching of L2 reading comprehension. An important contribution of this finding is that it indicates that the teaching of RCS was closely related to EFL and EMI settings.

9.3.2.1 Limited English resources.

The analysis of classroom observations and teachers’ interviews revealed the EMI challenges that impacted on the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms. The EMI challenges raised by the year 6 teachers were insufficient English resources and teacher directed pedagogical practices.

This finding showed that the ambiguities in the new revised curriculum requirement for ESL teachers to address the teaching of RCS in L2 RC. These teachers perceived that the unavailability of English resources restricted their ability to teach RCS to enhance students’ reading comprehension. As a result, these teachers taught in their own way to fulfill examination requirements. This finding supports those reported by Hayes (2008), Moon (2005), Hoa & Tuan,(2007), and Pearson (2014) in that there remain factors to be investigated that hinder the effectiveness of the teaching of English language learning such as teaching materials and English language curriculum. Thus, this finding extends previous research in the field of identifying the impact of EMI in the use of RCS in the teaching of L2 reading comprehension.
9.3.2.2 Teacher directed pedagogical practices.

The findings revealed that the teaching of L2 RC was dominated by teachers and their teaching practices exemplified teacher directed instruction. As a result, teachers were found to focus on assessing students’ comprehension (‘test wise’ strategy) rather than comprehension. This pedagogical focus on assessing students’ reading comprehension rather than ways to comprehend the text was also found in previous research (e.g. Taylor, et al., 2002; Norsidah, 2011; Muhammad, 2013).

The types of reading activities used by teachers influenced the teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI classrooms. For example, in reading aloud activities, teachers only taught students the practicing strategy to teach students on accuracy of the students’ pronunciation and intonation and not comprehension. They emphasized aural and oral skills rather than reading comprehension skills. These teachers used limited RCS in their reading activities as they focused on ESL learning rather than for reading comprehension. ESL teaching took primacy over reading comprehension. This finding contributes to our understanding of knowledge about the different types of reading activities in shaping the teaching of RCS created implications for ESL.

9.3.2.3 Local community involvement.

The teaching of RCS in L2 RC was also related to the role of the community. As stated by Engeström (2001) teaching occurs within social, cultural or historical contexts and community explains the importance of understanding the social-cultural or historical context in which the activity occurs. Teachers in this study linked their teaching of RCS in L2 RC with their access to PD, experiences as a students, and school leader’s expectations.

The teachers also linked the lack of specific and recent professional development to their teaching of reading strategies. In this context, they also drew on their own experiences at school or in their early careers to decide what and how to teach reading comprehension strategies. This finding provides strong evidence about the importance of not only teacher training and professional development but also teachers’ experiences as a student at school or at their early careers in the teaching of RCS in EFL/EMI contexts. It was evident that, experiences at school also played an important role in the implementation of RCS. This finding support McCafferty’s et al., (2011) study that found that individuals’ tasks or activities were administered with the interaction of their sociohistorical contexts. This finding contributes to our understanding of knowledge that teachers
did not only learn how to teach reading strategies from PD but they tended to use their past experiences at school or in the early careers to support their teaching of RCS in L2 RC. The teachers’ training also played an important role in the implementation of reading strategies. The teachers who were trained in primary education were focused on reading comprehension; meanwhile teachers from a TESL background, focused more on the specific language use and teaching methodology and used L2 in their reading lessons.

The study also found that some teachers also linked their teaching of RCS with the school culture in terms of the school principals’ expectations of their teaching of English in L2 classrooms. For example, Liza was worried about the thought of negative reactions from her principal to her use of L1 in the classroom. This indicated that the teachers’ social-cultural contexts may have shaped their teaching of RCS in L2 RC.

Overall, these findings mentioned signpost the interplay between the teaching of RCS and social-cultural and historical contexts of the study. This findings support the notion that there is an interaction of sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts in an activity system (e.g. Gibbes & Carson, 2014; McCafferty, et al., 2011). Teaching and learning is a social event that take place as a result of interaction between the learner or teacher and the environment (Engeström, 2008). Understanding the interplay of sociocultural and historical and the teaching of RCS in L2 RC may have helped in developing teachers PD that address teachers’ social-cultural and historical contexts in the demands of teaching RCS in EFL/EMI contexts.

9.3.3 Examination orientated education system.

The analysis of the teachers’ interviews also revealed that the examination orientated education system impacted on the teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. Teachers used past year examination papers as a tool to teach L2 RC lesson. As a result, test wise strategies were adopted in their teaching of RCS in L2 RC. This examination orientation also therefore, played a role in the teachers’ choice of RCS in their teaching of ESL reading comprehension in the classrooms. Rules and norms of the contexts were linked with the teaching in that the examination contexts in this study governed the activity. As a result, these contextual interactions in the activity system led to constraints in students’ learning of RCS. Students’ learning was more focused on developing test wise strategies rather than comprehension strategies.
9.4 Research Question 2a: How do Year 6 EFL Bruneian Students Manage the EMI and EFL Issues in the Learning of RCS in L2 RC Lessons?

The findings in Chapters 6 and 8 highlighted that specific RCS practices in L2 RC lessons among year 6 EFL students and ESL teachers were accommodated according to the challenges faced in learning of RCS in EFL/EMI contexts. The analysis generated findings about the teachers’ and students’ specific practices in managing the complexities of learning RCS in this contexts.

The analysis also generated understanding of the role of these EFL students in managing the challenges of EFL in learning RCS in L2 RC in EMI settings, providing evidence that students managed the EFL/EMI difficulties in many ways. First, they used dictionaries to accommodate their limited vocabulary knowledge. However, the use of dictionaries was only for the purpose of decoding difficult words in the reading activity, contributing to our understanding of knowledge from previous research by providing an example of a facilitator of EMI being also a hindrance to learning of RCS as the use of bilingual or non-bilingual dictionary may have slowed down the speed of reading which led to miscomprehension.

Second, the Year 6 students demonstrated the use of specific strategies to address the challenge of understanding L2 RC. For example, guessing the meaning of the word was the most common strategy used by the students who approached reading in top down and interactive way. This supports previous studies that acknowledged the importance of guessing words or word inferencing could enhance reading comprehension (e.g. Limawati, 2007; Rahmawati, 2012).

Year 6 EFL students also believed that ignoring the words compensated for their difficulties in reading English text. This strategy was used by the students who approached reading using bottom-up strategies which may have shaped their strategy to ignore unfamiliar words.

Third, the findings of the study provide insights that students need other community support such as parents, siblings or other relatives to help them in their learning. This study found that students and teachers perceived that language barriers and absence of school knowledge among home community impacted the types of parental involvement in students’ learning. Thus the finding of this study highlighted the perceived challenges of learning RCS in L2 RC in this EFL/EMI environment.
The activity of learning RCS in L2 RC in EFL/EMI setting among Year 6 students in Brunei can be explained by the inter-relatedness of the elements of activity theory such as subjects, tools, objects, and community. The management of the learning of RCS within this EFL/EMI context were shaped by the students’ background (subjects) which constructed the use of tools in learning RCS such as using bilingual or non-bilingual dictionary and specific reading strategies. The community also shaped the specific strategies used by the learners. This posits the importance of individual and social contexts in an activity system (Engeström, 2008). That is, learners played an active role with their own goals and drive their activities according to their community, norms and rules. Hence, second languages are acquired by different learners, in different situations, in different ways, depending on contextual variables and the personal and socio-cultural circumstances of the learners (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

However, this study also found some challenges around the elements of activity theory. For example, the use of specific RCS for some subjects was seen as an effective way to reach language goals and for others the outcomes did not align those goals and restricted in poor performance in reading comprehension scores.

9. 5 Research Question 2b: How do Year 6 ESL Bruneian Teachers Manage the EMI and EFL Issues in the Teaching of RCS in L2 RC Lessons?

A key finding was that teachers managed the EMI challenges by responding and reframing their pedagogies. For example, the TESL teachers in the study responded to the lack of resources by adapting resources from internet websites. The primary trained teachers however, reframed the curriculum policy by previous teacher guides, pupil textbooks and workbooks. Dang et al. (2013) investigated the impact of EMI to address the positive impact of using English materials from internet to teach speaking and pronunciation. The findings in this study also extend Dang et al.’s (2013) study by providing new information about the use of internet resources and previous English textbooks as facilitating factors in the implementation of EMI. However, in this study, all teachers irrespective of their qualification reframed the purpose of teaching L2 RC by focusing more on examination preparation rather than comprehension. This over focus on examination may have hindered the teaching of various kinds of RCS in L2 RC. This finding provided an evidence for a facilitator of EMI being also a hindrance to teaching RCS in L2 RC lessons.

This practice could be due to the conflict of rules and norms of the activity system as the Brunei education system was primarily in examination orientated. The finding in this study
highlighted the relationship between rules (EMI and examination orientated education system) and tools (teaching practices) in an activity system (Engeström, 2001). Hence, this finding is important as it contributes to our understanding of knowledge about the facilitators of EMI as potential hindrances of teaching RCS, and the negative impact of rules (examination orientated education system) towards tools (RCS teaching practices).

In order to accommodate EFL issues such as the students’ L2 oral difficulties as perceived by teachers, they tried to solve those challenges in different ways. Reading strategies used such as drawing a story and retelling using either L1 or L2, using L2 through story mapping, and using L2 for a summarizing activity. In this regard, these Year 6 ESL teachers managed EMI policy through the process of interpreting. They taught activities involving the use of English as they thought that this was what they were expected to do. In so doing these teachers focused on the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to accommodate their students’ difficulties in oral language, and enhancing students’ comprehension.

All Year 6 ESL teachers linked their perceptions of their students’ limitations in L2 vocabulary knowledge with their teaching of reading strategies in their reading lessons. They reported that, in order to accommodate such constraints, they preferred to use reading strategies such as ‘using a dictionary’, ‘highlighting difficult words’, ‘memorising word meaning’, ‘reviewing word meaning’, ‘explaining word meaning’, and ‘translating word meaning into L1’. These teachers taught only limited reading strategies for the enhancing of students’ comprehension, as they were focused more on cognitive and memory strategies to compensate for their students’ vocabulary limitations. This provides evidence of interpreting and reframing processes in the managing of EMI and EFL challenges in the teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms and is important for developing our understanding the way ESL teachers responded, interpreted and reframed their teaching of RCS in L2 RC in this context.

9.6 Limitations

This study has provided information about perceptions and uses of reading strategies in the teaching and learning of EFL reading comprehension from the perspectives of both students and teachers in six government owned primary schools in Brunei Darussalam. However, we do not know the extent to which findings from this study can be generalized to other settings within the Bruneian context, or beyond, since this study was conducted in only one of the districts in Brunei Darussalam. As Brunei consists of five districts and is a diverse geographical region,
generalisibility would be gained by expanding the study to include different levels of schooling and different settings in each district as well as examining the issue in the context of some rural areas. This expansion would provide wider range perspectives which would enrich the knowledge of the use of reading strategies in the teaching and learning of reading comprehension in the EFL and EMI context.

A total of 477 Year 6 students and 53 teachers participated in the first phase of the study. This was followed by 67 Year 6 students and eight ESL teachers who were recruited for the second phase of the study. Thus, this may not represent the Year 6 EFL students and teachers as only 67 students from 477, and eight from 53 teachers were recruited for the main study to investigate their experiences in learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms.

This study was conducted in a context where English is used as a medium of instruction but a foreign language to students in this study. This may not represent other EFL/EMI settings as the students were all Malay students from the government primary schools in Brunei.

In this study, the teachers and the students did not discuss other aspects of comprehension problems such as difficulties in negotiating text structures, text organisations, and understanding complex or long sentences during the interviews. This may have been due to limitations in the interview protocols whereby the researcher did not probe further about these factors. Future research should draw on a broader range of understandings about reading comprehension to generate a deeper understanding about the range of challenges teachers and students face.

Another limitation is that only one reading text was used in the reading comprehension simulation task in this study. It was felt that at least two reading texts should be used in this study to provide a wider range of students’ responses in their RCS implementation.

9.7 The Contributions of Activity Theory

Viewed from the perspective of activity theory, this study found that the activities, processes and goals of learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classroom in this EFL/EMI context were influenced by the interaction between students and teachers and the environment. The findings of the study have several implications for using activity theory in this kind of research. First, the finding related to the importance of the interplay between students and teachers’ backgrounds in shaping the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC in EFL/EMI contexts aligns with activity
theory’s emphasis on the important roles played by individuals who are engaged in an activity and confirms the influence of individual background and experience in a new context.

Second, using activity theory’s concepts of tools and objects enabled the analysis to highlight that students’ reading approaches (tools) and aims (objects) are related to the learning of RCS in L2 RC classroom. The range of approaches used by the students, and the students’ and teachers’ goals in teaching reading and reading comprehension tools and objects shaped the ways RCS (actions) were executed to enhance L2 RC.

Third, an important finding was that the learning and teaching of RCS in these L2 RC classrooms was influenced by the rules or norms of the activity system. For example, the pressures of an examination orientated education system, the students’ perceived English competencies, the limited availability of instructional resources, and teacher directed pedagogical practices led to complexities in implementing RCS in the learning and teaching of L2 RC. This finding implied that the activity in this study was related to interactions among EFL issues, EMI policy and examination orientated education system that together shaped the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC in Brunei primary schools.

A fourth finding in this study highlighted the role of the community of the activity system on learning and teaching RCS. The learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC classrooms was shaped by all of the stakeholders including systems, teachers and students contributing in different ways and from different perspectives to the goal of developing reading comprehension. The range of perspectives of the stakeholders, particularly, school leaders, parents and the students, created a complex social and cultural learning environment which led to challenges in the teaching and learning of RCS.

These findings provide evidence that AT not only posits the importance of individual but also social contexts in an activity system. AT constructs learning and teaching as a social event taking place as a result of interaction between the learners/teachers and the environment. That is, the social environment in which the interaction occurs determined the activity that had facilitated or hindered the learning and teaching of RCS in the EFL/EMI L2 RC classroom.
These findings provide evidence of the efficacy of using activity theory as a lens to investigate facilitators and hindrances of the learning and teaching of L2 RC. The study found that the roles of individuals and the construction of learning as a social event were the result of interactions between the learners/teachers and the environment. These findings have enabled the development of a deeper understanding of the impact of EFL/EMI in the use of RCS in bilingual classrooms, and the ways students and teachers manage the learning and teaching of L2 RC within a complex educational system.

9.8 Implications for Future Research

There are several potential future research projects emerging from this study. First, this study revealed that there are not just individual student differences based on strategy use but also structural differences dependent on the home background of the student. Future research might look into a further impact of the differences of reading strategy use based on the students’ home background in EMI/EFL contexts.

Second, there was some evidence that there were issues around teacher pedagogy with regards to RCS and generally LLS as part of the EMI context. The results reveal that grammar was not explicitly taught in the Brunei context and yet students perceived that they were struggling with reading comprehension as they had difficulties in grammar. Further investigation about aspects of grammar teaching in influencing reading strategies use in the EMI/EFL context can deepen our understanding about whether students who are taught grammar explicitly improve on their reading comprehension performance.

Third, teachers in this study linked their teaching of RCS in L2 RC with their school leadership expectations. Future research will be on the relationship of teachers’ pedagogy in relation to the teaching of L2 RCS in the EMI/EFL context with their school leaders’ expectations. Research on this issue might promote our understanding about the teachers’ struggles to implement a pedagogy that is needed to improve students’ reading outcomes.

9.9 Implications for Policy

The findings of this study have important implications for improving the English curriculum in Brunei. Through the Curriculum Department, the Ministry of Education could use the findings to design more explicit teaching of RCS in the EFL reading comprehension lessons. This is critical in
order to help strengthen teachers’ pedagogical skills especially in the implementation of RCS for enhancing students’ reading comprehension performance. For example, there needs to be more emphasis on the importance of using higher order RCS in the curriculum framework in order to recognize higher level thinking that leads the students to be more critical and analytical about their learning. Teaching and learning practices should be researched based to help the teachers to plan well in enhancing the students’ reading comprehension performance.

Second, understanding the multifaceted use of RCS, through students’ and teachers’ practices of using these strategies in the EFL/EMI classrooms, is necessary and important to lead to effective language learning and teaching. In essence, this study raises awareness of RCS for policy-makers, curriculum designers, teachers, and students. Education policy-makers and curriculum designers will be more aware of the importance and complex use of RCS in EFL/EMI settings and should therefore consider the complexities of the learning and teaching of RCS in their agenda in future policy making and curriculum designing.

Third, the findings of this study could be useful for schools in Brunei to organize professional development programs for teachers to improve their knowledge about RCS and pedagogical skills so that they can develop their own teaching skills. Moreover, schools also need to provide supportive resources for teachers to implement the reading strategies that they have learnt from professional development program. Hence, this would contribute to better learning outcomes for the students.

Fourth, the study found that students’ EFL language issues in EMI setting had created difficulties for teachers to implement high order reading strategies in L2 RC lessons. These challenges influenced their pedagogy and their instructional practices. Therefore, it is important for schools to provide opportunities for all EFL students to develop their language skills such as oral language and vocabulary skills through the habit of reading English books. This could be achieved by providing a program to encourage all students to read English books every day at school and at home. Parents should be given awareness regarding the importance of extensive reading outside school hours to enhance their children reading comprehension not only in English but extended to other content subjects which are instructed in English.

Fifth, the study found that teachers managed their limited English resources by adopting other resources from the internet to facilitate their teaching of RCS in L2 RC. However, they focused predominantly on test wise strategies to teach RCs in L2 RC which had limited the teaching
of range of RCS in the classroom, Therefore, it is important for the English teachers to form a learning community among themselves so that they share knowledge and experience with, as well as support each other in their efforts to create their own materials for the teaching RCS in L2 RC lessons.

Last but not least, the study found that one of the factors of absence of parental involvement was language barrier. This constrained them from helping their children. Parents speak a language different from school was difficult to assist their children. That is, English language was found to be the barrier between parents who have limited or no English competency in supporting their children’s reading development. Therefore, it is important for schools to provide a supporting community for parents to help their children to succeed in their L2 reading.

9.10 Implications for Practice

First, findings reinforce the importance of teaching RCS explicitly to provide the students better understanding of how to use RCS in their learning of reading comprehension. In addition, this study has implications for teachers as it could help them to create a supportive classroom atmosphere for students to provide RCS such as creating activities that invite students to fully engage in learning.

Second, this study also suggests that the implementation of RCS in the teaching and learning of English reading comprehension could be of benefit for pre-service teachers in the universities. They need to be taught how to implement RCS in their teaching of English reading comprehension and to practice the activities related to teaching RCS in the EFL reading comprehension lesson. This will prepare them with effective methodologies that they can use when they teach.

Third, since this study has shown that some of the teachers in the study were still using textbooks to help them in planning their lessons and pedagogies, therefore, in the future if textbooks are to provide to teachers, the textbook guide should have varieties of certain RCS in the activities in the reading comprehension lesson. In addition, teachers should be provided with guidance in the textbook about how to teach reading strategies explicitly in the classroom, more specifically in using higher order reading strategies.
9.11 Concluding Remarks

The aim of this study was to investigate the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in primary schools in a context where English is used as medium of instruction but is also a foreign language to students and teachers. The study also explored how students and teachers managed EMI and EFL issues in their L2 RC lessons. The findings contribute to our knowledge and understanding of the facilitating and hindering factors that mitigate learning and teaching RCS in L2 RC lessons within EFL/EMI classroom settings, and shed light on the approaches students and teachers take in managing these issues in their classrooms.

The findings contribute to our understanding of the importance of social-cultural perspectives to explain second language learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons. The study drew on theoretical insights from activity theory to shed light on the existing body of knowledge in the field of second language acquisition and teaching. From this perspective, it has become clear that the findings of this research contribute to SLA by highlighting the contribution of not only individual factors but also social factors in the learning and teaching of RCS, in order to enhance reading comprehension in EFL/EMI contexts. This study provides evidence that in Brunei, English as a foreign language is acquired or taught by different learners/teachers in different situations in different ways, depending on the interactions of contextual variables, and the individual personal and socio-cultural circumstances of the learners/teachers.

The study contributes to the development of the existing theory of second language acquisition (SLA) in the field of language learning strategies employed in developing reading skills by broadening the scope of this research in the new context of Brunei. In doing so, the study also unpacked issues related to the learning and teaching of RCS within primary classrooms and has deepened our understanding of ways in which primary ESL teachers and EFL students manage the learning and teaching of RCS within this context. The findings thus extend our knowledge and understanding of how primary students and teachers learn and are taught RCS in an EFL/EMI setting.
In conclusion, the learning and teaching of RCS in L2 RC lessons in primary classrooms is complex. Given the complexities and interactions of these complexities identified in this study, it is clear that, if students’ reading comprehension strategies are to be enhanced, addressing the enabling and hindering factors that impact on learning and teaching of RCS in the EFL and EMI context of Brunei, will require ongoing attention from all stakeholders.
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Appendix 1
Student Self-Report Survey

STUDENT SELF-REPORT SURVEY/KAJI SELIDIK UNTUK MURID

Part I: Background information- About you / Tentang kamu
Directions: This part of the questionnaire seeks general information about you. Please provide the correct information in the space provided, or tick (√) the box/answer as appropriate./Sila jawab soalan mengenai diri kamu dengan menandakan (√) pada soalan yang berkenaan dan menjawab solan yang diberikan.

1. Name/Nama: …………………………………………………………………………………

2. Name of school/Nama sekolah: ……………………………………………………………

3. Year/Tahun: …………………………………………………………………………………

4. Age/Umur: …………………………………………………………………………………

5. Gender/Kelamin: ……………………………………………………………………………

6. How long do you have been studying English?/ Berapa lama sudah kamu belajar Bahasa Inggeris?
                                                                                   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. How important do you think English reading is?/ Bagaimana pandangan kamu mengenai kepentingan Bahasa Inggeris?

   Very important/ Begitu penting
   Important/ Penting
   Moderate/ Sederhana penting
   Unimportant/ Tidak penting

8. How would you rate learning English reading comprehension?/ Bagaimana awak fikir tentang pembelajaran kefahaman bacaan dalam Bahasa Inggeris?

   Very easy / Begitu senang
   Easy / Senang
   Moderate/ Sederhana senang
   Difficult / Sukar
   Very Difficult / Terlalu sukar
You have finished Part III. Thank you very much.

Part II. Reading Comprehension Strategies Questionnaire / Kaji Selidik Mengenai Strategic Fahaman Bacaan.

Directions: In the following section you will read a list of statements that refer to how you feel about your reading in English texts. Be sure to read each statement carefully and select a number from 1 to 5 that best describes your feelings. Please give your first reaction to each statement and mark an answer for every statement. There are no right and wrong answers.


1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hampir selalu saya tidak buat
2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat
3: Somewhat true of me/ Kadang-kadang saya buat
4: Usually true of me/ Kebaisanya saya buat
5: Always or almost always true of me/ Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Saya baca tajuk teks.</td>
<td>I read the topic or heading of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Saya lihat gambar yang ada dalam teks.</td>
<td>I look at the pictures or graphs of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Saya fikirkan sebab saya membaca teks tersebut.</td>
<td>I think about the reasons why I am reading the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Saya membaca ayat pertama dalam teks.</td>
<td>I read the first sentence of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Saya cuba sangkakan apa yang ada dalam teks tersebut.</td>
<td>I try to predict what the passage will be about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Saya tanya diri saya sendiri mengenai sebab penulis menulis teks.</td>
<td>I ask myself about the author’s purpose for writing the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bahasa Melayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Saya baca soalan sebelum saya baca teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Saya baca keseluruhan teks secara cepat untuk memahami isi penting teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Saya menunakarkan kepada bahasa Melayu isi penting teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Saya menyemak ramalan yang saya buat tentang isi teks semasa saya membaca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Saya gunakan perbendaharaan kata dan struktur ayat untuk memahami tajuk utama teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Saya cuba memahami setiap patah perkataan yang ada dalam teks untuk memahami tajuk utama teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Saya memecah ayat kepada perkataan untuk memahami teks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Saya buat nota atau menggariskan perkara penting yang ada dalam teks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hamper selalu saya tidak buat
2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat
3: Somewhat true of me/Kadang-kadang saya buat
4: Usually true of me/Kebaisaannya saya buat
5: Always or almost always true of me/Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Saya mengenapikan perkataan yang saya tidak tahu maknanya.</td>
<td>I skip the words if I do not know the meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Saya menyangka makna perkataan melalui konteks teks.</td>
<td>I guess the meaning of some words from the context clues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Saya gunakan kamus Bahasa Inggeris dan Bahasa Melayu untuk mencari makna perkataan yang saya tidak tahu,.</td>
<td>I use English-Malay dictionary whenever I find an unknown word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Saya gunakan Kamus Bahasa Inggeris apabila saya ingin tahu makna perkataan yang saya tidak tahu dalam teks yang saya baca.</td>
<td>I use an English-English Dictionary whenever I find an unknown word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Saya ramal apa yang akan terjadi dalam teks yang saya baca.</td>
<td>I predict what is going to happen next while reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Saya baca teks dengan habis untuk menjawab soalan</td>
<td>I read the passage in detail to answer the questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hamper selalu saya tidak buat

2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat

3: Somewhat true of me/Kadang-kadang saya buat

4: Usually true of me/Kebaisaanya saya buat

5: Always or almost always true of me/Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Saya mentafsirkan apa yang telah saya baca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I make inferences after finishing reading the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Saya menyimpulkan teks yang telah saya baca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I summarise the passage after finish reading the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Saya berpatah balik membaca sebahagian dari teks apabila saya tidak yakin tentang teks tersebut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I go back to read some parts of the passage that I am not sure about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong></td>
<td>Saya membaca semula kesemua yang ada dalam teks untuk mencari jawaban pada soalan yang diberikan.</td>
<td>I go back to read the details of the passage for the answers of some questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong></td>
<td>Saya gunakan kamus setelah saya mengetahui cerita penting dalam teks.</td>
<td>I use a dictionary after I understand the main idea of the passage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong></td>
<td>Saya buat nota tentang semua perkataan baru kedalam baku perbendaharaan kata saya.</td>
<td>I take notes on all the new words or phrases for their vocabulary bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30.</strong></td>
<td>Saya gunakan semua ulasan untuk membantu saya dengan skill bahasa Inggeris yang lain seperti skill dalam penulisan, percakapan dan pendengaran.</td>
<td>I use the feedback to help me with other English language skills (writing, speaking and listening).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31.</strong></td>
<td>Saya gunakan pengetahuan untuk memahami teks dalam aktiviti harian saya.</td>
<td>I apply the knowledge from some texts in my everyday activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32.</strong></td>
<td>Saya berikan diri sendiri hadiah apabila saya habis membaca teks.</td>
<td>I reward myself when I finish reading the passage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have finished Part III. Thank you very much/Kamu telah selesai menyiapkan Part III. Terima Kaseh
Appendix 2
Teacher Self-Report Survey

Participant’s code/ Kod
(Please leave this blank)/(Tolong jangan isikan tempat ini)

TEACHER SELF-REPORT SURVEY /KAJI SELIDIK UNTUK GURU

Part I: Background information- About you / Tentang kamu
Directions: This part of the questionnaire seeks general information about you. Please provide the correct information in the space provided, or tick (√) the box/answer as appropriate.

Sila jawab soalan mengenai diri kamu dengan menandakan (√) pada soalan yang berkenaan dan menjawab solan yang diberikan.

1. Gender/Kelamin: Male/Lelaki [ ] Female/Perampuan [ ]
2. Age/Uomr: [ ]
3. Name of school/ Nama sekolah: ............................................................
4. How many languages can you speak?/Berapa bahasa yang awak faham bercakap?
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................
5. How many hours do you teach in the school per week on average?/Berapa jam awak mengajar dalam seminggu?
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................................................
6. In a few words, how would you describe your workload in the school? / Dalam beberapa patah perkataan, macamana awak menjelaskan tentang bebanan mengajar di sekolah awak?
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11. How long have you been teaching in school?/Berapa lamakah awak sudah berkhidmat sebagai guru di sekolah?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
12. How long have you been teaching English in school?/Berapa lamakah awak sudah mengajar Bahasa Inggeris di sekolah?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
13. Have you ever taken professional development training in an English-speaking country?/Pernahkah awak menghadiri perkembangan staf di Negara yang mana English adalah ibunda percakapan Negara tersebut?
No/Tidak
Yes/Ya

If Yes, please specify where and when/Jika ya, sila jelaskan dimana dan bila?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
14. Have you ever taken professional development training in the teaching and learning of English in Brunei?/Pernahkah awak menghadiri perkembangan staf di Brunei mengenai pengajaran dan pembelajaran bahasa Inggeris?
No/Tidak
Yes/Ya
If Yes, please specify what, where and when/ Jika ya, sila jelaskan dimana dan bila?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

15. How many professional conferences/workshops in the teaching and learning of English reading have you attended? / Berapa banyakkah konferen secara professional atau workshop dalam bidang pengajaran dan pembelajaran membaca dalam bahasa Inggeris yang telah awak hadiri?
.................................................................................................................................
Please specify what, where and when/ Jika ada, sila jelaskan dimana dan bila?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

You have finished Part I. Thank you very much/Awak telah menyelesaikan Part I. Terima Kaseh

Part II. Teachers’ familiarity with the concept of reading strategies/ Kefahaman Guru tentang konsep strategi bacaan dalam bahasa Inggeris.

Directions: On the scales below, please indicate the degree to which you believe the following statement “I am familiar with the concept of reading comprehension strategies in English as a second language”/ “Saya faham dengan pengertian strategi kefahaman bacaan dalam bahasa Inggeris”

1. Very / Ya begitu faham
2. Somewhat/ Tidak begitu faham
3. Slightly/Hanya sedikit faham
4. Not at all/ Tidak sama sekali
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You have finished Part II. Thank you very much/Awak telah menyelesaikan Part II. Terima Kasih

Part III. Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies Questionnaire/ Kaji Selidik mengenai pengajaran Strategi kefahaman bacaan.

Directions: In the following section you will read a list of statements that refer to how you feel about your teaching reading in the classroom. Be sure to read each statement carefully and select a number from 1 to 5 that best describes your feelings. Please give your first reaction to each statement and mark an answer for every statement. There are no right and wrong answers.

Sila baca statemen di bawah ini yang menunjukkan perkara yang awak rasakan awak buat dalam pengajaran bacaan Inggeris di bilik darjah. Baca dengan teliti dan sila pilih numbor yang telah disediakan mengikut apa yang awak rasakan betul bagi awak. Sila isikan kesemuanya. Tidak ada jawaban betul dan salah.

1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hampir selalu saya tidak buat

2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat

3: Somewhat true of me/ Kadang-kadang saya buat

4: Usually true of me/ Kebiasaanya saya buat

5: Always or almost always true of me/ Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>1 11</th>
<th>2 22</th>
<th>3 33</th>
<th>4 44</th>
<th>5 55</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Saya menyuruh murid membaca tajuk dan sangka mengenai teks yang akan di baca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students to read the titles and predict what the text is about.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hampir selalu saya tidak buat

2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat

3: Somewhat true of me/ Kadang-kadang saya buat

4: Usually true of me/ Kebiasaanya saya buat

5: Always or almost always true of me/ Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Saya menyuruh murid melihat gambar and cuba sangka bagaimana mereka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students to look at illustrations/pictures and try to guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menyesuaikan makna teks dengan gambar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>how they relate to the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Saya menggunakan situasi sebelum murid membaca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I set a context before students begin reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Saya menggunakan bahan mengajar seperti musik atau relia untuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I use instructional aids (e.g. relia, music, etc) to set context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menyesuaikan suasana.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Saya menyuruh murid melihat teks sebelum membaca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have the students quickly look over the text before reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Saya menyoal murid beberapa soalan yang berkenaan dengan teks sebelum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students warm-up questions related to the text before reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membaca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Saya mengajar perbendaharaan kata sebelum murid membaca teks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I teach vocabulary before students read the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Sebelum memulakan perbincangan mengenai teks saya suruh murid membaca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before doing discussions or any other activity, I have students read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teks dahulu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Saya menyarankan murid menyatukan hasil bacaan tadi dengan pengalaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students to relate the text/topic to their experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mereka.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Never or almost never true of me / Tidak pernah atau hampir selalu saya tidak buat

2: Usually not true of me / Kebiasannya saya tidak buat

3: Somewhat true of me / Kadang-kadang saya buat

4: Usually true of me / Kebiasaanya saya buat

5: Always or almost always true of me / Selalu atau hampir selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111. Saya menuruh murid menyatukan apa yang dibaca dengan apa yang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students to relate what they read to what they already know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Melayu</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221. Saya menyuruh murid untuk menggariskan perkataan penting.</td>
<td>I ask students to underline key words and/or phrases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. Saya beritahu murid untuk membaca dengan pelalan dan teliti.</td>
<td>I tell students to read carefully and slowly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. Saya menekankan kepentingan setiap perkataan dalam bacaan.</td>
<td>I stress the importance of reading every word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid membaca teks lebih dari sekali.</td>
<td>I ask students to read the text more than one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid untuk mencuba menggambarkan apa yang di baca.</td>
<td>I ask students to try to visualize what they read.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid menyangka apa yang akan berlaku di bacaan seterusnya.</td>
<td>I tell students to make guesses about up-coming information in the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid membaca secara nyaring di bilik darjah.</td>
<td>I have students to read aloud in class one at a time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>Saya mengajar murid untuk membaca dahulu dan selepas itu membaca setiap perenggan dengan teliti.</td>
<td>I teach students to read the first and last paragraphs more carefully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hamper selalu saya tidak buat
2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat
3: Somewhat true of me/Kadang-kadang saya buat
4: Usually true of me/Kebiasaanya saya buat
5: Always or almost always true of me/Selalu atau 250ember selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>Saya menyoal soalan kefahaman mengenai teks yang dibaca.</td>
<td>I ask comprehension questions about the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid untuk menyimpulkan apa yang telah di baca.</td>
<td>I ask students to draw conclusions about the text they have read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid untuk berbincang mengenai teks yang dibaca.</td>
<td>I ask students to discuss the text after reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332.</td>
<td>Saya menyuruh murid 250ember pendapat atau komen mengenai teks yang telah dibaca.</td>
<td>I ask students to comment on the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333.</td>
<td>Saya suruh murid untuk membuat simpulan mengenai teks yang telah di baca.</td>
<td>I ask students to summarize the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334.</td>
<td>Saya member soalan kuiz tentang teks yang di baca.</td>
<td>I give students a quiz about the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335.</td>
<td>Saya berikan murid kerja aktiviti mengenai teks.</td>
<td>I give students follow-up activities related to the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1: Never or almost never true of me/ Tidak pernah atau hamper selalu saya tidak buat
2: Usually not true of me/ Kebiasannya saya tidak buat
3: Somewhat true of me/ Kadang-kadang saya buat
4: Usually true of me/ Kebaisaanya saya buat
5: Always or almost always true of me/ Selalu atau 251ember selalu saya buat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa Melayu</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>336. Saya memberikan kerja mengenai informasi yang ada pada teks.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I assign students tasks to do using the information in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337. Saya menyuruh murid untuk menyatakan apa yang dapat mereka pelajari dari bacaan teks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ask students to interpret the texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have finished Part III. Thank you very much/Awak telah menyelesaikan Part III. Terima Kaseh
Appendix 3

Reading Comprehension Stimulation Task

Read the Story.

Bashir didn’t have a wink of sleep the whole night through. One of his molars had gone bad and was causing 1. him great pain. His left cheek was swollen and he could hardly open his mouth. He has to get rid of 2. it in the morning even though he dreaded the thought of visiting a dental clinic.

This was the very thought that had kept him away from a dentist for the past ten years. The next day he put on a brave front and went to the dental clinic. Once inside, the smell of anaesthetic greeted him. The drilling sound from the dentist’s room nearly made him turn back and dash for home. 3. It was a very frightening sound but the intense pain of the rotten tooth made him take a card and wait for his turn. He felt more and more nervous so his turn drew nearer.

Suddenly, he heard his name and hesitantly Bashir went into the dentist’s surgery. He saw the ‘executioner’ in his white overalls and face mask. Beside him he saw a tray of shiny instruments. 4. They looked like instruments of torture to Bashir and he shuddered. And that was the last thing that Bashir remembered before everything turned dark to him.

When he opened his eyes again, he was lying on a small bed. The smell of anaesthetic still lingered around him. Then he saw a woman in a white uniform smiling at him. 5. She told him that he had had the rotten tooth extracted and it was all finally over! The nurse told him not to forget to brush his teeth after every meal.
Section A: Look at the words which are numbered in the passage. What do they mean? Write the answer below.

1. him _______________
2. it _______________
3. it _______________
4. they _______________
5. she _______________

Section B: Underline the correct answer

6. ‘swollen’ means
   a. black
   b. bigger than usual
   c. smaller than usual
   d. white

7. ‘brave front’ means
   a. pretended not to be scared
   b. pretended not to be angry
   c. pretended not to be sad
   d. pretended not to be happy

8. ‘anaesthetic’ means
   a. perfume
   b. crying gas
   c. laughing gas
   d. running gas

9. ‘executioner’ is
   a. Bashir
   b. The nurse
   c. The dentist
   d. patients

10. ‘shuddered’ means
    a. laughed
    b. shook
    c. ran
    d. yelled

Section C: Answer the questions

11. What was Bashir suffering from?

12. Where did he decide to go?

13. What did he find very frightening?

14. What made Bashir stay for his appointment?

15. What happened to Bashir’s tooth in the end?
Appendix 4

Student Group Interview Guide

Student’s code:
Date:
Time of interview:
Place:
Interviewer:

The researcher thanks the interviewees for their presence and willingness to participate in the study. The purpose of the interview, the interviewees’ confidentiality and the duration of the interview are explained before the interview is carried out.

The researcher turns on the audio tape recorder.

Questions:

1. When your teacher gives you an English to read during English reading lesson, what do you do to understand the text? How do you read the text in order to help you understand the text and able to answer the questions given?
2. Why do you think you do that?
3. When you do that do you expect you can understand the text fully?
4. When you do that do you experience frustration? Why?
5. When you do that do you experience success? Why?
6. Do you have any other comments that you would like to share with me, for example, anything that you think is important that has not been addressed in this interview?

The researcher thanks the interviewees for their cooperation and participation in the interview.
Appendix 5

Teacher Interview Guide

School:
Date:
Time of interview:
Place:
Interviewer:

The researcher thanks the interviewees for their presence and willingness to participate in the study. The purpose of the interview, the interviewees’ confidentiality and the duration of the interview are explained before the interview is carried out.

The researcher turns on the audio tape recorder.

Questions:
1. Can you tell me about your experience in using reading comprehension strategies in your teaching?
2. How do you normally use them in the classroom?
3. Why do you think you prefer to use such strategies?
4. What are your expectations when you use the strategies in your teaching?
5. Do you experience frustration? Why?
6. Do you experience success? Why?
7. What do you think the factors that contribute to the use of the particular strategies in your teaching? And why do you think so?
8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to share with me, for example, anything that you think is important that has not been addressed in this interview?

The researcher thanks the interviewees for their cooperation and participation in the interview.
Appendix 6
Classroom Observation Field Note

Date:  
Teacher:  
Subject:  
Number of Students:  
Start time:  
End time:  

A. General Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features to be observed</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Room descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Lesson Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What teachers do?</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. While reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Post-reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 8

**Students’ Reading Comprehension Scores and Types of RCS Used in Reading Stages**

**Table 6.1**

*Reading Comprehension scores and number of strategies used by individual students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Students</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Scores</th>
<th>Number of strategies used</th>
<th>Phases of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>VQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 1 (H) (B)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 2 (H) (G)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 3 (M) (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 4 (M) (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 5 (M) (B)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 6 (L) (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 7 (L) (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 8 (L) (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 9 (H) (G)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Students</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Scores</th>
<th>Number of strategies used</th>
<th>Phases of Reading</th>
<th>cognitive</th>
<th>metacognitive</th>
<th>compensation</th>
<th>memory</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>affective</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>VQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Total in %</td>
<td>Phases of Reading</td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 10 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 11 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 12 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 13 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 14 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 15 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 16 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 17 (L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 18 (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Students</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension Scores</td>
<td>Number of strategies used</td>
<td>Phases of Reading</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>metacognitive</td>
<td>compensation</td>
<td>memory</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ VQ CQ Total</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 19 (H)</td>
<td>4 4 4 80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 20 (H)</td>
<td>4 4 3 73.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 21 (M)</td>
<td>2 4 3 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 22 (M)</td>
<td>2 2 3 46.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 23 (M)</td>
<td>4 3 2 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 24 (L)</td>
<td>1 3 2 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 25 (L)</td>
<td>1 5 1 46.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>