

Reading Strategy Use and Its Relation to EFL Teachers' Reading Self-Efficacy *

กลยุทธ์ที่ใช้ในการอ่านกับความสัมพันธ์ของความเชื่อในความสามารถในการอ่านของตนเอง ของครุพัฒนาภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

(Sakesit Petchinalert) เสาร์สิทธิ์ เพ็ชรชินเลิศ **
(Prachamon Aksornjarung) ปรัชมน อัคชรจรุํ ***

Abstract

The present study sought to investigate reading strategies used and reading self-efficacy perceived by EFL teachers. It was intended 1) to explore the reading strategies EFL teachers employed in reading English academic texts and 2) to study the relationship between their use of reading strategies and their self-reported reading self-efficacy. Fifty EFL teachers responded to a questionnaire consisting of three parts - *demographic data, English reading strategy use, and English reading self-efficacy*, and participated in think-aloud protocol sessions. Statistical analyses revealed the following results: 1) all the subjects reported having used overall reading strategies at a moderate-frequency level; 2) the subjects' reading self-efficacy was significantly, strongly, and positively correlated with the overall reading strategy use; and 3) statistically significant differences were found between the subjects with high and low reading self-efficacy in using reading strategies and assessing their reading self-efficacy.

Keywords: Reading Strategies, EFL, English Teachers, English Reading Self-Efficacy

* บทความวิจัยเพื่อสำเร็จการศึกษาระดับบัณฑิตศึกษา สาขาวิชาสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาบ้านภาษาติ ภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

To fulfill the requirement for M.A. in Teaching English as an International Language, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

** นักศึกษาปริญญาโท สาขาวิชาสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาบ้านภาษาติ ภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

M.A. Student, Program in Teaching English as an International Language, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, E-mail: sakesit.petchinalert@gmail.com

*** ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
Assistant Professor, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, E-mail: prachamon.a@psu.ac.th

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยขึ้นนี้มุ่งศึกษาการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านและความเชื่อในความความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของตนเองของครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ จุดมุ่งหมายคือ 1) ศึกษาการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านเนื้อหาภาษาอังกฤษเชิงวิชาการของครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ 2) ศึกษาความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างกลยุทธ์ในการอ่านและความเชื่อในความความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของตนเอง ของครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ครูผู้เข้ารับการวิจัยจำนวน 50 คน ตอบแบบสอบถามอันประกอบไปด้วย 3 ส่วน คือ ข้อมูลพื้นฐานของครู การใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่าน และความเชื่อในความความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ และเข้ารับการสัมภาษณ์ผ่านเทคนิคการคิดออกเสียง ผลการศึกษาพบว่า 1) ครูทุกคนใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านในระดับปานกลาง 2) ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านโดยรวมและความเชื่อในความความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของตนเองของครูมีความสัมพันธ์กันในเชิงบวกอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติ และ 3) พบความแตกต่างในการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านและการประเมินความสามารถในการอ่านของตนเองของครูที่จัดว่าตนเองเป็นผู้มีระดับความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษสูงและต่ำอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติ

คำสำคัญ: กลยุทธ์ในการอ่าน ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ ครูภาษาอังกฤษ ความเชื่อในความสามารถในการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของตนเอง

Introduction

1. Background of the Study

Successful reading in a foreign language can successfully be achieved when the learner is equipped with a wide array of effective reading strategies along with high level of reading self-efficacy (Hammadou, 1991; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2001; Oxford, 1990). To become constructive and responsive readers, students, especially those with low proficiency in English, have to experience several and suitable meaningful reading activities that can help them develop their own set of effective reading strategies (Wan-a-rom, 2012; Zhang, 2005). To teach reading strategies to Thai EFL learners seems to be inevitable because a number of Thai researchers have found that the majority of Thai EFL students possess low to intermediate proficiency levels in English and, as a result, struggle in reading English (Anusornorakarn, 2002; Chawwang, 2008; Oranpattanachai, 2010; Pratoomrat & Rajprasit, 2014).

However, reading activities promoting the effective use of reading strategies for Thai EFL learners have rarely been conducted. Instead, the teaching of reading seems to involve the process of teachers administering reading materials to learners, having them interact with the text at hand, and assessing their reading comprehension through various types of reading texts, which fails to assess the teacher's own strategic knowledge in the reading domain (Dorkchandra, 2010). Such an approach to teaching English reading could lead Thai EFL learners

to become passive when reading English materials because the learners would never have a chance to practice using various kinds of reading strategies with different types of texts by themselves (Anusornorakarn, 2002; Dorkchandra, 2010; Oxford, 1990).

To achieve academic competence, one factor believed to have influence on students' academic performance is self-efficacy which has been regarded as a significant and reliable predictor of students' intellectual achievement (Bandura, 1977; Ferrara, 2005; Schwarzer & Fuchs, 1995; Tobing, 2013). Self-efficacy represents the learners' beliefs and confidence in what they can do even though in reality they might not be able to accomplish the goal at their current levels (Bandura, 1977; Freedman, 2006).

Students with strong self-efficacy are more likely to put efforts to perform their best in academic tasks regardless of its difficulty and risk (Bandura, 1977; Mason, 2004; Schunk & Pajares, 2010; Tobing, 2013). Conversely, those having low self-efficacy are more likely to feel discouraged and thereby decreasing their attempts to complete a risky task. They prefer effortless, non-challenging, non-threatening, uncomplicated, and easy-to-accomplish tasks and tend to avoid activities that they consider beyond their ability to manage to (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 2006; Pajares & Kranzler, 1995; Schunk & Rice, 1991).

In this regard, over the past decade, research studies across the globe have paid immense attention to examining the second and foreign language learners' reading comprehension ability in relation to the use of reading strategies and reading self-efficacy (e.g., Shang, 2010; Su & Duo, 2012; Tilfarlioglu & Ciftci, 2011; Tilfarlioglu & Cinkaram, 2009; Tobing, 2013; Zare & Mobarakeh, 2011). Despite extensive studies with EFL learners, little on EFL teachers has been investigated, which might query being whether the teachers are aware of effective use of reading strategies and holding high reading self-efficacy to play a principal role in assisting their students to master reading comprehension (Amer, Barwani, & Ibrahim, 2010; Tapinta, 2006; Tercanlioglu, 2003). The present study, therefore, aimed at investigating Thai EFL teachers' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy. It also studied the relationship between the use of reading strategies and EFL teachers' reading self-efficacy.

2. Purposes of the Study

The present study aimed to:

- 1) investigate the reading strategies EFL teachers use in reading English academic texts.
- 2) study the relationship between the EFL teachers' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy

3) determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in the use of reading strategies between those with high and low English reading self-efficacy.

Research Methodology

1. Participants

Fifty Thai EFL teachers from two large-sized schools in Hat Yai area of Songkhla province, and Mueang Yala, Yala. Their ages ranged from 27 to 55 years old. The subjects were purposively selected to represent the teachers of extra large-sized secondary schools and those of large-sized secondary ones, respectively. The subjects were divided into two groups according to the English reading proficiency test results.

2. Instruments

The instruments employed in the present study included: 1) a questionnaire comprising three sets of information involving the subjects' demographic data, reading strategy use, and reading self-efficacy, and 2) think-aloud protocols to reflect on the difficulties and challenges the subjects faced while reading.

2.1 A Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisting of three parts.

1. Demographic Data

This part elicited the subjects' gender, age, teaching status, length of teaching experiences, years of exposures to studying English, overseas experiences, etc.

2. The Teachers' Use of Reading Strategies

Established by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), this part of the questionnaire was a modified Thai version of the original Survey of Reading Strategies covering the three categories of reading strategies, namely global reading strategies (GLOB) (e.g., having a purpose in mind, and trying to guess what the content of the text is about, etc.), problem-solving strategies (PROB) (e.g., trying to get back on track when losing concentration, and visualizing information to help remember, etc.), and support strategies (SUP) (e.g., underlining or circling information in the text, and translating from English into the native language, etc.).

3. The Teachers' English Reading Self-Efficacy

Comprising 20 items, this part was adapted from Tobing (2013) and translated into Thai by the researcher. Prior to administrating this instrument, its accuracy and suitability of the language use were assessed and validated by the thesis adviser. All the items were assessed in the form of 5-point Likert scales ranging from 1 ('not at all true') to 5 ('completely true').

The items in part 2 and part 3 were tested for internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha; the coefficient values of the modified survey of reading strategies and reading self-efficacy questionnaire exceeded the acceptable level, i.e. $\alpha = .929$, $N=27$ and $\alpha = .886$, $N=20$, respectively. Theoretically, the internal consistency reliabilities in a range of .70 to .79 are considered to be acceptable (Sekaran, 1992).

2.2 Think-Aloud Protocols

In addition to the subjects' responses in the questionnaire, think-aloud sessions were arranged to gain more in-depth information about their actual use of reading strategies while reading English academic texts and to shed some light on the difficulties and challenges the subjects encountered while reading English academic texts. After responding to the questionnaire, ten teachers (five subjects with high English reading self-efficacy and five subjects with low English reading self-efficacy) were chosen in a think-aloud in the native Thai language for about 10 minutes each. The subjects were presented with the reading tasks they had been assigned. They were required to recall what they were thinking, how they solved certain reading problems, to what extent and what circumstances they employed certain reading strategies, the difficulties they encountered while reading the texts, and how their English reading self-efficacy influenced their reading behavior. The think-aloud procedures were tape-recorded and transcribed immediately afterwards.

3. Data Collection

The subjects were asked to provide their background information and mark the number on each reading strategy statement. In addition, they were requested to rate their English reading self-efficacy. Following that, the selected subjects participated in think-aloud sessions. All the collected data were, then, statistically analyzed and interpreted.

4. Data Analysis

All the data gathered were aimed to answer three research questions.

1. What reading strategies do EFL teachers use in reading English academic texts and which are used most and least frequently?
2. Is there a relationship between the EFL teachers' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy?
3. Are there any statistically significant differences in the use of reading strategies between those with high and low English reading self-efficacy?

To answer research question 1, data from the modified survey of reading strategies were collected. Descriptive statistics were performed to identify the frequency, mean scores,

and standard deviations (S.D.) of each strategy item used, the overall used, and the use of the three categories of reading strategies (GLOB, PROB, and SUP).

To answer research question 2, data from the modified survey of reading strategies and the questionnaire involving the subjects' reading self-efficacy were gathered. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Test was performed to estimate the relationship between the subjects' use of reading strategy items and their perceived reading self-efficacy.

In answering research question 3, data from the modified survey of reading strategies and the questionnaire involving the subjects' reading self-efficacy were obtained. Independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to identify whether there are any statistically significant differences in the use of reading strategies between the readers with high and low reading self-efficacy.

Results and Findings

Research Question 1: What reading strategies do EFL teachers use in reading English academic texts and which are used most and least frequently?

The fifty participants reported having used reading strategies at a moderate frequency level, the overall mean value being 3.40. Regarding each reading strategy category, the problem-solving reading strategy category (PROB) received the most positive evaluation, the mean value being 3.58, followed by the support reading strategy category ($\bar{X} = 3.34$) and the global reading strategy category ($\bar{X} = 3.30$) (See Table 1).

As presented in Table 1, statistically, the category of PROB exclusively possessed a high level of usage, whereas the other two categories of reading strategies, GLOB and SUP, revealed a moderate level of usage.

Table 1: Use of each strategy category

Category	Mean	S.D.	Level of Usage
Global (GLOB)	3.30	0.988	Moderate
Support (SUP)	3.34	1.048	Moderate
Problem-solving (PROB)	3.58	1.006	High
Overall	3.40	1.020	Moderate

In terms of the frequencies of usage of the reading strategies, the strategies concerned were categorized into two groups (the most frequently used and the least frequently used) based on their mean scores. However, since there were two reading strategies

that showed the exact same mean scores of 3.64 as the fifth most favored reading strategies (See the last two strategies in Table 2), those two strategies were, therefore, kept in the list. Six strategies in this category starting with 1) visualizing information ($\bar{X} = 4.00$, S.D. = 0.969), 2) underlying or circling information in the text ($\bar{X} = 3.92$, S.D. = 0.922), 3) getting back on track when losing concentration ($\bar{X} = 3.80$, S.D. = 0.948), 4) guessing what the content of the text is about ($\bar{X} = 3.72$, S.D. = 0.701), 5) re-reading the text when it becomes difficult ($\bar{X} = 3.64$, S.D. = 1.005), and 6) guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases ($\bar{X} = 3.64$, S.D. = 0.827) were found at the high level of usage. In addition, all of them were in the three categories of reading strategies.

Table 2: Six most frequently used reading strategies

Category	Strategy	Mean	S.D.	Level of Usage
PROB15	Visualizing information	4.00	0.969	High
SUP6	Underlying or circling information in the text	3.92	0.922	High
PROB5	Getting back on track	3.80	0.948	High
GLOB17.2	Guessing what the content is about	3.72	0.701	High
PROB19	Re-reading the text	3.64	1.005	High
PROB20	Guessing the meaning of unknown words	3.64	0.827	High

Regarding the least frequently used reading strategies, five strategies fall into this category. As denoted in Table 3, the five least frequently used strategies were listed in order from highest to lowest as follows: 1) using context clues to help understand the text ($\bar{X} = 3.08$, S.D. = 1.007), 2) paraphrasing for better understanding ($\bar{X} = 3.00$, S.D. = 1.050), 3) using text features (e.g., tables, figures, and pictures) ($\bar{X} = 2.98$, S.D. = 1.186), 4) knowing what to read closely and what to ignore ($\bar{X} = 2.90$, S.D. = 0.074), and 5) reading aloud when the text becomes difficult ($\bar{X} = 2.80$, S.D. = 1.125). All the five strategies achieved a moderate level of usage. It was also found that no reading strategies under the problem-solving strategies existed.

Table 3: Five least frequently used reading strategies

Category	Strategy	Mean	S.D.	Level of Usage
GLOB13	Using context clues	3.08	1.007	Moderate
SUP14	Paraphrasing for a better understanding	3.00	1.050	Moderate
GLOB11	Using text features	2.98	1.186	Moderate
GLOB8	Knowing what to read closely and to ignore	2.90	0.974	Moderate
SUP4	Reading aloud	2.80	1.125	Moderate

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the EFL teachers' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy?

As shown in Table 4, the relationship between the subjects' use of reading strategies and their reading self-efficacy was located by performing Pearson's Product Moment Correlation test. It was found that $r = .715$ ($p < .01$). In other words, the use of reading strategies by the subjects had a strong positive relationship with their self-rated reading self-efficacy, or vice versa.

Table 4: Correlations between the subjects' reading self-efficacy and their use of the three subcategories of reading strategies

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Reading Self-Efficacy	1	.620 **	.687 **	.654 **	.715 **
2. Problem-Solving		1	.805 **	.756 **	.924 **
3. Global			1	.744 **	.929 **
4. Support				1	.904 **
5. Overall Strategies					1

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

In a closer examination, it was found that the overall strategy use (ORS) bore a significant, strong, and positive correlation with the subjects' self-reported reading self-efficacy (RSE) beliefs ($r = .715$, $p < .01$). This indicates that the higher reading self-efficacious the subjects become, the more reading strategies they would employ. However, a significantly positive, but moderate relationship can be seen between the subjects' English reading self-efficacy and all the three categories of reading strategies ($r = .620$, $.687$, $.654$ respectively, $p < .01$). Furthermore, under all categories of reading strategies, there existed significantly strong

and positive correlations between the use of reading strategies from the problem-solving strategy category (PROB) and the global (GLOB), support (SUP), and overall strategies used ($r = .805, .756, .924$ respectively, $p < .01$). The strategies under the global reading strategy category were strongly and positively correlated with support and overall reading strategies used as well ($r = .744, .929$ respectively, $p < .01$). In addition, the relationship between the support reading strategies and overall use of reading strategies was found to be significant and positively strong ($r = .904$, $p < .01$). These correlations mean that the subjects with a higher level of English reading self-efficacy were inclined to be keen on exerting more effort to effectively use appropriate reading strategies in coping with comprehension issues.

Research Question 3: Are there any statistically significant differences in the use of reading strategies between those with high and low English reading self-efficacy?

The result of the independent samples t -test revealed statistically significant differences between the subjects with high and low reading self-efficacy in using reading strategies (RS) [$t = 4.453$, $df = 39.421$, $p < .05$, sig (2-tailed) = .000] and assessing their reading self-efficacy (RSE) [$t = 10.351$, $df = 48$, $p < .05$, sig (2-tailed) = .000].

When taking a closer look at the differences in the use of reading strategies by both parties of the participants, it is evident that, in general, readers with higher self-efficacy employed reading strategies at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.76$, S.D. = 0.312), while those rating themselves as possessing low reading self-efficacy employed strategies in reading at a moderate level ($\bar{X} = 2.97$, S.D. = 0.513) as documented in Table 5.

Table 5: Means and standard deviations (S.D.) of the use of reading strategies of the subjects with high and low reading self-efficacy

Self-Efficacy Levels	N	GLOB	PROB	SUP	Overall
High	26	3.69 (0.308)	3.95 (0.399)	3.66 (0.480)	3.76 (0.312)
		High	High	High	High
Low	24	2.85 (0.516)	3.15 (0.600)	2.96 (0.573)	2.97 (0.513)
		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Note: S.D. is represented by numbers in parentheses.

Discussion and Conclusions

1. The teachers' use of reading strategies in reading English academic texts

The overall mean value of reading strategies reported by fifty Thai EFL teachers was 3.40 (S.D. = 1.020). Based on the interpretation key developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), it can be interpreted that Thai EFL teachers showed modest usage of reading strategies when they read English academic texts. Regarding the frequency of reading strategies used by the subjects, the result was both in agreement with and in contradiction to previous studies conducted with EFL/ESL learners (e.g., Ostovar-Namaghi, 2014; Othman & Zare, 2013; Park, 2010; Sinthopruangchai, 2011; Wang, 2011; Zhang, 2009).

In terms of each reading strategy category, the problem-solving strategy category was used the most frequently ($\bar{X} = 3.58$, S.D.=1.006), followed by the support reading strategy category ($\bar{X} = 3.34$, S.D.=1.048) and global reading strategy category ($\bar{X} = 3.30$, S.D.=0.988). The subjects in the present study showed a greater use of reading strategies under the problem-solving strategy category. It seems apparent that reading strategies from that category, such as *re-reading when the text becomes difficult, getting back on tract when losing concentration, and reading slowly and carefully for a better understanding*, did not seem to require additional recourses from the subjects in employing such strategies. Consistent with the data from the think-aloud sessions, most of the subjects (8 out of 10) claimed that they could decide to employ those effective strategies whenever they faced comprehension failure while interacting with the text. This could be the reason why the subjects tended to resort to reading strategies underneath the problem-solving strategy category. Taking the ability to get back on track when losing concentration as an example, the subjects' highly frequent use of this particular reading strategy reflected their sudden awareness of their reading process. It can be interpreted that the subjects were able to monitor their reading process effectively when they were distracted by sensory stimuli via the use of one proper reading strategy from the problem-solving strategy category like getting back on track.

Conversely, the subjects tended to use reading strategies from the support and global reading strategy categories considerably less frequently than those of the problem-solving strategy category despite the fact that they still employed the strategies from those two categories at a moderate level. In-depth information elicited from the think-aloud sessions showed that reading strategies from both support and global reading strategy categories led the subjects to establish more sophisticated or unfamiliar procedures or techniques during text interaction compared to the problem-solving strategy usage. To elaborate this point, some strategies, such as *reading aloud when the text becomes difficult, checking and confirming*

predictions, paraphrasing for a better understanding, taking notes while reading, and asking oneself questions, might be challenging for the subjects to carry out. Some subjects insisted that they were not aware of how and when to use those strategies during text processing. Another explanation to convince the finding could be that it could be the subjects' culture. They themselves were both EFL teachers and learners. In Thailand, being respectful to the elder or teachers is considered a good example of gracious manners; we were taught to never be critical of the teachers. Ideally, we were advised to obey everything the teachers instruct. Challenging or questioning the teachers or even expressing one's own ideas could sometimes be seen as you being not trusting or believing in teachers' knowledge, which is indeed considered rude and inappropriate in Thai culture. As a result, under those conditions, the students were passively attending what was being transmitted from their teachers, resulting in their gradual feeling, acceptance, and formation of a sense of powerlessness without insatiable curiosity. In the end, the students' critical self-awareness could slowly but surely be diminished (Buriyameathagul, 2013; Deveney, 2005; Knutson, 2004).

2. The Relationship between the Teachers' Use of Reading Strategies and Their Reading Self-Efficacy

According to the correlation analysis, it revealed that the subjects' reading self-efficacy and their overall use of reading strategies were strongly and positively correlated ($r = .715, p < .01$). In details, as shown in Table 5, the subjects with high reading self-efficacy reported using overall reading strategies including the three categories of reading strategies with a high degree of action ($\bar{X} = 3.69$ for GLOB, 3.95 for PROB, 3.66 for SUP, and 3.76 for overall use). Compared with those with high reading self-efficacy, a medium usage of reading strategies across the three categories among those with low reading self-efficacy was found ($\bar{X} = 2.85$ for GLOB, 3.15 for PROB, 2.96 for SUP, and 2.97 for overall use). In short, those with high reading self-efficacy completely outperformed those with low reading self-efficacy in all categories of reading strategies. In other words, as the subjects' degree of confidence in reading English academic texts increased, so did their frequency of overall reading strategy use. This lends additional support from previous studies in different settings from both ESL and EFL learning contexts (Barkley, 2006; Changlek & Palanukulwong, 2015; Li & Wang, 2010; Lin, 2002; Mondi, 2013; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Zhang, 2004) which indicated that readers/learners with high self-efficacy or motivation would normally and automatically make an effort to apply effective strategies in order to achieve their intellectual goals. In contrast, those readers/learners who fell into the group of low reading self-efficacy tended to possess

negative attitudes towards the language. Thus, they were not making enough efforts to use certain strategies to enhance their reading comprehension.

It can be interpreted from the finding that the subjects having high level of English reading self-efficacy seem to view reading obstacles as stepping stones to step onto and academically grow further; it is like a cycle of successful reading processes. Once the subjects with a high degree of reading self-efficacy can accomplish their reading tasks with the help of various reading strategies, based on the analysis from the present study, their English reading self-efficacy could be maintained, or even increased or developed to a higher degree of confidence. And once again, with that high degree of reading confidence, no reading difficulties could interrupt them again. This is how the cycle of reading processes works. Here, the subjects' self-efficacy functioned as a facilitating tool on their reading strategy use. The concept of the reading cycle can be supported by a research study by Fu (2008 cited in Wang 2011) finding that the use of reading strategies could lead to successful English language learning, and could, in turn, strengthen the learners' self-perceptions of how good in reading English they might be. On the other hand, the subjects possessing low reading self-efficacy would avoid confronting reading difficulties by escaping and ignoring them. Such actions can be reflected by infrequent use of various useful reading strategies. To them, the stones in front were a long, huge, and thick barrier that prevented everything they threw through to go further and relatively faster. Thus, there seemed to have nothing to stimulate them to find means or strategies to successfully and directly overcome comprehension problems. During the think-aloud session, one high self-efficacious reader confirmed that, after entering the university, she always received compliments from friends and English teachers regarding her English academic reading ability. Since then, she started to believe that her language ability was somewhat second to none, no matter what language. She further elaborated on her confidence that, a year later, she took two Chinese reading courses as elective ones in the same semester. It should be noted here that she had never studied Chinese before. However, with a high degree of self-efficacy she already had, she studied the language with ease. She viewed language barrios as something that could enhance her Chinese expertise, and she enjoyed the learning process of the language. As a result, she remained focused to what she was doing and did everything she could to attain 'A' in the two courses. She confidently uttered "with a high level of self-efficacy, nothing is impossible" as her concluding remark

Recommendations

It is recommended that the subjects should realize the necessity of possessing a high level of reading self-efficacy as it can push forwards students to seek for means to overcome possible reading difficulties and involve their students in various types of meaningful reading activities and tasks to trigger and increase the students' reading self-efficacy to a certain degree of confidence. It is also suggested that a reading strategy training program be introduced to EFL teachers, especially those teaching reading, in order to raise awareness of the effective use of reading strategies.

Future studies are advised to investigate the use of reading strategies through alternative assessments such as classroom observations, the use of portfolios or journal entries for fruitful and precise research findings. Because the present study investigated the use of reading strategies in offline reading environments, it is advisable that future research investigate online reading strategies to find out whether or not the results yield the same pattern of strategy usage. In addition, future studies are suggested to include more independent variables (e.g., language proficiency, gender or cultural differences, age, learning styles, academic success, races, years of education, etc.).

References

Amer, A., Barwani, T., Ibrahim, M. (2010). Student teachers' perceived use of online reading strategies. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 6(4), 102-113.

Anusornorakarn, W. (2002). *Problems in reading comprehension*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yala Rajabhat University, Yala, Thailand.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.

Barkley, J. M. (2006). Reading education: Is self-efficacy important? *Reading Improvement*, 43(4), 194–210.

Buriyameathagul, K. (2013). Characteristics of culture in Thai society and virtual communities. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 13(2), 207-270.

Changlek, A., Palanukulwong, T. (2015). Motivation and Grit: Predictors of language learning achievement, *Veridian E-Journal Silpakorn University*, 8(4), 23-38.

Deveney, B. (2005). An investigation into aspects of Thai culture and its impact on Thai students in an international school in Thailand. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4, 153-171.

Dorkchandra, D. (2010). Improving Thai university EFL students' reading comprehension and use of English tenses through question-generating strategy. Retrieved June 10, 2015, from www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2010/.../Dentisakra...%20Dorkchandra...

Ferrara, S. L. N., (2005). Reading fluency and self-efficacy: A case study. *International Journal of Disability, Developmental and Education*, 52(3), 215-231.

Freedman, L. (2006). *Actions that create, actions that destroy: Practices and processes for building secondary students' reading proficiency*. Symposium presentation at National Reading, Los Angeles, CA.

Hammadou, J. (1991). Interrelationships among prior knowledge, inference, and language proficiency in foreign language reading. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 27-38.

Knutson, T. (2004). Thai cultural values: Smiles and Sawasdee as implication for intercultural communication effectiveness. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 33(3), 147-157.

Li, Y. & Wang, C. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 12(2), 144-162.

Lin, Q. Y. (2002). *The study of the effects of English learning motivation regulating training group in self-efficacy, learning motivation and the academic performance for senior high school students*. Unpublished Master's thesis, National Changhua University of Education, Changhua, Taiwan.

Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System*, 35, 338-352.

Mason, L. H. (2004). Explicit self-regulated strategy development versus reciprocal questioning: Effects on exploratory reading comprehension among struggling readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 283-296.

Mokhtari, K & Sheorey, R. (2001). Differences in the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies among Native and Non-native speakers. *System*, 29(4), 431-449

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

Mondi, D. (2013). *Effects of strategy-based reading instruction on English reading ability and reading self-efficacy of lower secondary school students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.

Ostovar-Namaghi, S.A. (2014). A Comparison of perceived use of the metacognitive reading strategies by Iranian Master of science students for hypertext and printed academic materials, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 865-872.

Othman, M., & Zare, P. (2013). The Relationship between Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategy Use among Malaysian ESL Learners, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(13), 187-193.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies. What Every Teacher Should Know*. NewYork : Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Pajares, F. (2006). Self-efficacy during childhood and adolescence: Implications for teachers and parents. In Pajares, F. &Urdan, T. (eds) *Self –Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Pajares, F. & Kranzler, J. (1995). Self-efficacy beliefs and general mental ability in mathematical problem-solving. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 20, 426-443.

Park, Y. H. (2010). *Korean EFL College Students' Reading Strategy Use to Comprehend Authentic Expository/Technical Texts in English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, USA.

Pratoomrat, P., & Rajprasit, K. (2014). Exploring current situations and corporate needs of English language use in workplace: Thai professionals' voices to Tertiary Education. *Veridian E-Journal Silpakorn University*, 7(1), 28-47.

Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research Methods for Business – A skill building approach*. (2nd Ed). United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sinthopruangchai, S. (2011). *A study of Thai EFL learners' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Thammasat University, Thailand.

Schunk, D. H. & Pajares, F. (2010). Self-efficacy beliefs. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford, UK: Academic Press.

Schunk, D. H. & Rice, J. M. (1991). Learning goals and progress feedback during reading comprehension instruction. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23, 351-364.

Schwarzer, R. & Fuchs, R. (1995). Self-efficacy and health. In Bandura, A. (ed.) *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shang, H. F. (2010). Reading strategy use, self-efficacy and EFL reading comprehension. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 12(2), 18-42.

Su, M. H., & Duo, P. C. (2012). EFL learners' language learning strategy use and perceived self-efficacy. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 27(3), 335-345.

Tapinta, P. (2006). *Exploring Thai EFL students' awareness of their knowledge, use, and control of strategies in reading and writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Tercanlioglu, L. (2003). Strategy use, reading efficacy and academic achievement. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 31, 53-70.

Tilfarlioglu, F. T., & Ciftci, F. S. (2011). Supporting self-efficacy and learner autonomy in relation to academic success in EFL classrooms (A Case Study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1284-1294.

Tilfarlioglu, F. Y., & Cinkaram, E. (2009). Self-efficacy in EFL: Differences among proficiency groups and relationship with success. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 3(2), 129-142.

Tobing, I. R. A. (2013). *The relationship of reading strategies and self-efficacy with the reading comprehension of high school students in Indonesia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Wan-a-rom, U. (2012). The effects of control for ability level on EFL reading of graded readers. *ELT Journal*, 5(1), 50-60.

Wang, J. J. (2011). *A study of English self-efficacy, English reading strategies, and English reading proficiency of Taiwanese junior high school students*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Ming Chuan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Zare, M., & Mobarakeh, S. D. (2011). The relationship between self-efficacy and use of reading strategies: The case of Iranian senior high school students. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3(3), 98-105.

Zhang, Q. (2004). Self-efficacy and intercultural adaptation of Chinese students at U.S. universities. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 27, 103-120.

Zhang, G. Z. (2005). A tentative study of English reading comprehension process. *Journal of Higher Education of Southwest University of Science and Technology*, 2, 56-63.

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