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The purpose of this research was to conduct case studies to explore and describe Thai university students’ awareness and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies when reading and writing in English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL). Four participants, including two high and two low English language proficiency learners, were selected from 14 students enrolled in a five-week course called English for Social Sciences offered at Kasetsart University in Bangkok, Thailand in 2005.

The major sources of data for the analyses included the transcripts of the participants’ pair discussions, think-aloud protocols, interviews, and daily journal entries. In addition, field work observations, reading and writing strategy checklists, participants’ written work, and the comparison of the pretest and posttest results were also instrumental to the analyses. The interpretive approach of content analysis was employed for these four case studies. Findings were initially derived from the single-case analyses, and then from cross-case analyses.

Major findings revealed that strategic knowledge enhanced these English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners’ proficiency in English reading and writing. However, applying elaborative strategies for higher-level reading was challenging for most of the participants. Two crucial factors that impeded their development were the learners’ uncertain procedural and conditional knowledge of strategy uses and their limited English language proficiency due to limited exposure to the second language (L2). The teacher’s explanations and modeling of strategies, the participants’ opportunities to discuss strategy use with peers, and extensive practice positively enhanced their development. Additionally, the learners’ schema and
knowledge of text structures played significant roles in their development of the two skills. These English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners also developed metacognitive awareness and strategy applications, but not to the level that always enhanced effective regulation and control of their reading and writing behaviors. Combining reading and writing in English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) instruction promoted the learners’ awareness of the relationships of certain strategies for the two skills, and developed their literacy skills holistically.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

English is a major international language. To be able to take part in both regional and
global academic and professional communities, one needs to be proficient in English. People all
over the world in non-English speaking countries take English as a foreign language (EFL) to
develop their proficiency in English. The higher the level of education being pursued, the greater
the command of English is required, especially in reading and writing in order to access
academic resources and keep up with world standards in all disciplines.

Learning to read and write in English is a great challenge for EFL students, especially
when it is mostly for academic purposes. One way to envision the steps an EFL learner must take
is to consider the nature of their language learning on a continuum. According to Cummins’
(2000), attaining advanced levels of performance in academic second language learning requires
highly cognitively demanding skills. First, students are not required only to have general
communicative language proficiency, but they also need to be able to understand the instruction
of contents being learned through the language. Second, academic language proficiency involves
knowing language registers and conventions of schooling (e.g., scholastic language usage and
styles are more formal than casual, every day life conversations). Third, generally language
learning requires a great deal of context, but unlike basic interpersonal communicative skills
(BICS), cognitive academic language learning is supported mainly by “linguistic cues that are
largely independent of the immediate communicative context” (Cummins, 2000, p. 59). In other
words, it is by its nature undertaken in a context-reduced communicative environment. All of
these factors cause the academic language learning process to be highly cognitively demanding.
To be successful in acquiring cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), students need to
have both good language proficiency and strong cognitive skills in strategic thinking and learning. This is especially true for the EFL learners, who unlike ESL learners, have English only in the classroom and nowhere else. To develop cognitive academic language proficiency is even more challenging for the EFL learners (compared to ESL learners) because there is even less contextual support. Thus, not only must they be competent in the foreign language, but they also need to be strategic in their learning process.

Regarding the issue of learning to read and write, the research has shown that knowledge of and expertise with learning strategies in reading and writing help readers and writers become more proficient. This knowledge and expertise are very crucial in literacy development, and they can be introduced to learners explicitly (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Brown, Palincsar, & Armbruster, 1994; Carrell, Gadjuse, and Wise, 2001; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Dole, Duffy, Rohler, & Pearson, 1991; Hartman, 2001; Harris & Graham, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980 b, 1994; Irwin, 1991; Paris, Lipson, & Dixon, 1994; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990; Schraw, 2001).

Similar to the English native language learners, English as a second/ foreign language learners need to be strategic in their English reading and writing development. In relation to this issue, the instruction of English reading during the past few decades have shifted from approaches that teach students to mainly deal with reading texts at the textual level to those that focus on higher-level cognitive reading skills (Carrell, 1993). English writing instructional approaches have also developed in a similar direction; in short, the prior focus of instruction has shifted from teaching students to concentrate on their writing product to their process of writing (Silva, 1990). It has been recognized that these instructional approaches enable learners to become more strategic than did the traditional approaches. To understand how those instructional
approaches have included the knowledge of cognition and metacognition regarding reading and writing strategies, a brief overview of those approaches is needed:

Following Goodman’s psycholinguistic model of reading (1967, 1971) which insisted on the concept that reading is an active process with an essential role played by the reader’s background knowledge, during the late 1970s, the top-down process instruction model was first applied in English as a first language reading education. From the 1980s, this concept has also influenced English as a second language instruction. Based on Goodman’s views, activating a reader’s prior knowledge of how to make meaning of text, the process of meaning construction mainly involves predicting, testing, and confirming reader predictions. Therefore, top-down reading instruction focuses on preparing students to develop their higher-level conceptual processing skills to make sense of the text rather tapping only their perceptual processing skills at the textual level. To illustrate, to enable students to interact with the text effectively, top-down instruction emphasizes building on various aspects of background knowledge by the students and teaching them how to use their strategic knowledge and other related strategies (e.g., making predictions, identifying text structure) beyond the level of text-decoding strategies (Carrell, 1993; Carrell & Eisterhold, 1993). Through these higher-level cognitive skills, students will be able to interpret content to effectively interpret the messages intended by the authors.

During the 1980s, a more interactive reading model proposed by Rumelheart (1980, 1994) was also introduced into ESL reading instruction. This argues that meaningful reading requires the reader’s use of various aspects of prior knowledge (e.g., linguistic, content, rhetorical structure). That is, it stresses that “efficient and effective reading -- be it in a first or second language-- requires both top-down and bottom-up strategies operating interactively” (Carrell, 1993, p. 4). Eskey (1993) explains that we cannot deny that problems in ESL reading,
especially for EFL readers, basically derived from a bottom-up process of constructing meaning. Because EFL students have primary problems in decoding at word and syntactic levels, instructional approaches based on the interactive model can thus address this issue. This model holds that skilled readers work on the perceptual dimension of the linguistic decoding process with a greater degree of automaticity, therefore, they can concentrate more on the conceptual dimensions at a higher level. In contrast, prior to becoming fluent in their reading, less skilled readers still need to accurately decoding language at the discourse level language in the text (Samuels, 1994). Thus, instruction of second language reading needs to support students in learning strategies for both accurate and fluent reading.

In writing education, since the 1980s, following the developments in composition instruction of English as a first language, ESL composition instruction has shifted from the controlled composition and current traditional rhetoric approaches that focus on the ultimate products of student writing to the process approach that emphasizes the essence of promoting the writer’s thinking skills while writing. In this process approach, students are trained to pay attention on the purpose and content of the messages they want to convey to the readers, not just primarily on the forms of the language. The strategic knowledge involved in planning, drafting (composing), and revising is the central focus in second language writing practice. With this approach, the writing classroom environment transforms into a writing workshop context (Silva, 1990).

In addition to introducing the knowledge of cognitive strategies in reading and writing, experts point out that literacy instruction also involves introducing the knowledge of metacognition. Hartman (2001) suggests that it is important for students to have self-regulation skill. Schraw (2001) also notes that metacognitive knowledge enable students to improve their
performance in various ways, including making better use of existing strategies and additional resources, and being able to identify problems that need to be solved. Therefore, in order for students to become expert readers and writers, they need to be trained to know how they can regulate their knowledge of cognitive strategies to perform effective reading and writing. Teaching students to know how, when, and why they can use strategies will enhance their learning to read and write metacognitively (Carell, 2001; Sternberg, 2001). Various studies also propose that teaching students to read and write metacognitively promotes their potential of becoming expert readers and writers (e.g., Block, 1992; Brown, Palincsar, & Armbuster, 1994; El-Hindi, 1997; Pintrich, 2002; Stolarek, 1994; Williams & Colomb, 1993).

However, research has also revealed that many ESL/ EFL students are not highly proficient in English reading and writing. They fail to achieve the necessary skills in reading and writing in English because they do not know how to apply strategies effectively (e.g., Abersold & Field, 1997; Adunyarittikun, 2005; Arndt, 1987; Brown, 2000, Carrell, 2001; Cumming, 1989; Raimes, 1985; Rorschach, 1986; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Sasaki, 2000; Victori, 1999; Wongpaisaj & Chaikittimongkol, 1995). Regarding this failure, particularly for EFL students, I posit, based on my knowledge of the EFL learning context in Thailand, that they still have limited learning opportunities to develop strategic reading and writing skills metacognitively.

In the case of Thai EFL students, they learn to read and write in English mainly through an instructional approach which is teacher-directed, with an emphasis placed on the products of students’ performances. The bottom-up reading instructional approach is still common. In Thailand, the teaching of reading in English generally involves a great deal of introducing and improving knowledge of vocabulary and sentence structures. Students read passages to find answers to comprehension questions after they have been taught about vocabulary, grammar,
paragraph organization, and how to identify context clues based on word and sentence attack skills. As Clarke (1993) notes, instead of teaching reading, it is rather teaching language through reading. Although some strategies such as skimming, identifying main ideas, and using context clues are taught, other higher-level strategies are not extensively introduced. In other words, students are not explicitly trained to develop their strategic skills of how to make sense of text or to make reflections on how strategic knowledge can enhance their comprehension.

In English writing instruction in Thailand, the approaches of controlled composition and current traditional rhetoric still prevail. Also, it should be noted that prior to entering the tertiary level of education, the majority of Thai students have a few opportunities to practice English writing beyond the paragraph level. Generally, in writing classrooms, students are taught useful vocabulary, sentence patterns, and how to use conjunctive devices to connect sentences to form a paragraph and connect discourses between paragraphs. Then, they apply such linguistic knowledge for the assigned writing task. The knowledge of rhetorical patterns is generally introduced through modeled essays/compositions. On the other hand, students are not trained to think about how they can develop their cognitive strategies to enhance different writing processes (i.e., planning, drafting, revising). The real senses of goal-setting and rhetorical problems are not seriously promoted. Besides, students are not provided with enough time to develop multiple drafts or reflect on how they could revise their drafts. Generally, they produce a single draft, perhaps with some minor revision of content but with most editing focused on grammatical elements.

Unfortunately, this traditional model of English reading and writing instruction typically found in Thailand has not proven to be successful in producing proficient readers and writers, as noted in some studies (Adunyarittigun, 1998; Naranunn, 1998; Rorschach, 1986; Tontong,
Thai students generally have difficulty in reading and writing in English. According to Adunyarittigun (1998), generally, Thai college students’ reading proficiency, when measured in terms of grade equivalent scores on the Nelson- Denny Reading Test, ranged from 2.1 to 6.8, well below expectations for college level English learners. Naranunn argues that the traditional product-oriented instruction prevents students from getting to the effective process of constructing meanings and does not help them to solve problems when they experience difficulties in reading.

For writing, speaking from my personal experience as both an EFL student writer and an EFL writing teacher, I perceive that learning and teaching writing by a product-oriented approach helps students to develop mainly their linguistic skills rather than writing expertise. Clearly, its major limitation is that it does not prepare students to become proficient, independent writers because they do not learn to be explicitly aware of the writing processes they are working on and do not gain the strategic knowledge necessary to enhance their performances during these processes. In one study, a Thai EFL college student was described at the beginning of the study as a non-fluent writer since she could not produce “complete and meaningful texts” (Rorschach, 1986, p. 58). The researcher noted that the student’s concern about her teacher’s expectations of the final quality of her written work focused her attention away from how she should deal with writing processes. However, more recent research that examined the effect of the instruction of the process-oriented writing practice to Thai college students reported that using a communicative writing task (i.e., dialogue journal writing) helped build students’ awareness of what writing means and entails (Tonthong, 1999).

In conclusion, I consider that the traditionally low performance of Thai EFL students in English reading and writing is attributable to the fact that they lack the knowledge regarding
cognitive and metacognitive strategy use in reading and writing in English. This lack logically stems from an instructional technique that does not lead students to such learning. In addition, only limited information about how Thai EFL students carry out their learning in English reading and writing is available, especially regarding their awareness of and expertise with strategy use. In general, little research has been conducted to reveal about EFL students’ learning behaviors during their reading and writing processes. Thus, this study attempts to fill this gap in the body of EFL reading and writing research literature.

Statement of Problem

To improve English literacy instruction to enable EFL students to become proficient, a clearer understanding of their learning behaviors while reading and writing in English is needed. As mentioned earlier, research has revealed that when strategies are taught explicitly, this knowledge helps both native English speakers and ESL/EFL students become more strategic and proficient in reading and writing (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Block, 1992; Brown et al., 1994; Carrell, 2001; Casanave, 1988; El-Hindi, 1997; Krapels, 1990; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Paris et al., 1994; Stolarek, 1994; Williams & Colomb, 1993). How EFL students may employ strategic learning behaviors when they are introduced to the knowledge of cognition and metacognition regarding strategy use in English reading and writing is also of great interest. Therefore, this study explores Thai EFL university students’ awareness/knowledge, use, and control of learning strategies to enhance reading comprehension and writing performance when they had the opportunities to be in a learning context in which strategic knowledge use in reading and writing was introduced through explicit instruction.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct case studies to explore and describe Thai EFL university students’ awareness/knowledge and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in English reading and writing during a five-week course of explicit instruction in strategy use.

Significance of the Study

EFL students’ knowledge/awareness of strategy use and their abilities in applying such strategies in reading and writing has not been discussed extensively in the literature. The study of learning behaviors that take place during the reading and writing processes should provide more insight into this issue. This better understanding may help inform classroom teachers and educators about what pedagogical considerations needs to be taken when developing or implementing instruction to promote students’ strategic knowledge and expertise in English reading and writing. Eventually, this could help EFL students become strategic and proficient readers and writers in English. Also, the findings and discussions of the theoretical and practical implications from this study should contribute to the body of research knowledge in the field of English literacy development for EFL learners.

Research Questions

The questions guiding this study are:

1. What cognitive and metacognitive reading and writing strategies do Thai EFL university students report understanding and using?
2. How do they use strategies during the reading and writing processes?
3. Having been exposed to explicit strategy instruction in a process-oriented reading and writing classroom context, how do they perceive the connections between reading and
writing strategies, and how do they use that knowledge in their reading and writing processes?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined.

English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners -- Students who learn English as a subject at school in countries whose native and official language is not English. They are exposed to English mainly in the form of formal education in classrooms. They do not use English as a medium in learning other subjects nor for communication outside school.

High-proficiency learners -- Participants whose grades in their previous English courses were higher than the average level, and whose scores earned from the pretests in this study were higher than most students enrolling in the course.

Low-proficiency learners -- Participants whose grades in the previous English courses were about the average level and lower, and the scores earned from the pretests in this study were lower than most students enrolling in the course.

Strategies -- Cognitive and metacognitive learning behaviors or actions that learners consciously choose or spontaneously employ during reading and writing processes:

Cognitive reading strategies include previewing, skimming, locating main ideas and supporting details (identifying importance vs. non-importance), making predictions, using knowledge of text structure, using background knowledge, generating questions, using context clues and other repair devices, synthesizing and summarizing, drawing inferences, analyzing, and note-taking (Anderson, 1999; Dole et al., 1991; Irwin, 1991; Palincsar & Brown, 1984).

Cognitive writing strategies include planning (goal-setting and thinking about rhetorical
problems, generating ideas, drawing information, and organizing ideas); drafting, composing the written text; and reviewing including revising ideas, editing, and evaluating (Hayes & Flower, 1979, 1980 a & b; Harris & Graham, 1996; Hillocks, 1986)

Metacognitive strategies “involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring of comprehension and production while it is taking place, and self-evaluation of learning after the language activity is completed” (Carrell, 2001, p. 232).

Explicit instruction of strategies -- The instruction that includes explanations, teacher-student discussions, and modeling (verbalizing thinking) of strategies. Students are also explicitly taught to know how to employ, monitor and evaluate strategies, as well as to solve problems regarding strategy use (Garner, 1994; Sternberg, 2001).

Reading process -- The process of meaning construction that readers perform when they deal with written texts (Pearson & Stephen, 1994).

Writing process -- “A series of operations leading to the solution of a problem. The process begins when a writer consciously or unconsciously starts a topic and is finished when the written piece is published” (Graves, 1981, p. 4).

Limitations of the Study

1. The four major sources of data in this study included the transcripts of the students’ peer discussions, interviews, think-aloud protocols, and their daily written journal entries. It was very likely that not all of the students’ thoughts about their strategic behaviors and perceptions of their behaviors were mentioned during the peer discussions or reported in the interviews. In addition, it appeared that some participants made verbal recalls in some parts of their think-alouds instead of actually verbalizing thoughts while performing a strategic action. For example, while they were skimming a passage or composing a draft, they did not make a thorough
verbalization, but right after they had finished it, they described their thinking behaviors. (This appeared only in a few portions of certain protocols.) All of these factors might affect the completeness of information and thus its interpretation.

However, most of the think-alouds were being performed while the actual cognitive behaviors were taking place. This information together with data from the other sources such as their daily journal entries (about their own perceptions of their learning behaviors), evidence of their performances from their written work, their records on the checklists of the strategies used, and my notes and analytic memos helped decrease the degree of this limitation and ensure the credibility of the findings.

2. Because I was taking the roles of a participant observer as well as the teacher throughout the five-week period of the course, it was hard to avoid the situation of being totally unbiased towards the participants’ behaviors. For example, because I first had an impression that one participant was very active in making reflections on her strategy use, I then tended to perceive that she would be the most strategic and proficient learner. However, being aware that this kind of feeling could lead to an inaccurate interpretation of data, I was very careful to cross-check evidence from multiple sources of data to confirm my analyses. I examined the actual behaviors in contexts. This cross-checking strategy keeps me from interpreting from my personal impressions. Therefore, I tried to rely on this strategy throughout the process of analysis. In other words, this recursive and spiral process of analysis helped ensure its credibility.

3. The four participants in this research project had similar socio-cultural and educational backgrounds in relation to learning English. The generalizability of findings about their behaviors in literacy development from this study thus may not always be applicable to students in other EFL countries where socio-cultural and educational backgrounds are different.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature in this chapter covers the discussions of major lines of theory and views, and findings from studies that are relevant to the inquiry of this study including:
(a) knowledge of cognition and metacognition, (b) reading comprehension processes and strategy use in reading, (c) writing processes and strategy use in writing, (d) reading and writing connections, (e) the explicit instruction of strategies, and (f) research studies in ESL/ EFL reading and writing.

Prior to the understanding of cognitive theory in the 1970s, reading and writing were rarely considered in terms of the cognitive actions involved in the process of constructing meaning. With the rise and greater emphasis on exploring the cognitive processes executed during learning, the interactions between reader and text or writer and text became primary foci in literacy research. Two major factors identified that play important roles in effective reading and writing are the knowledge and strategies that readers and writers bring to their tasks as well as their use and control of their thinking processes during meaning construction (Brown et al., 1994; Carrell, 2001; Carrel & Eisterhols, 1993; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Dole et al., 1991; Hartman, 2001; Harris & Graham, 1996; Hayes & Flowers, 1979; Hillocks, 1986; Irwin, 1991; Paris et al., 1994; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990; Schraw, 2001; Sternberg, 2001). Research has also brought a greater understanding of the inextricable link between reading and writing and the parallel nature of those two processes on meaning construction (e.g., Goodman, 1994; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Rumelhart, 1994; Shanahan, 1990; Smith, 1994; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991).
The next section presents some theoretical views about learning knowledge that includes the knowledge of cognition and the regulation of cognition.

**Knowledge of Cognition and Metacognition**

Cognition and metacognition are viewed as being integral, or at least closely related and connected (Flavell, 1978).

**Knowledge of Cognition**

The knowledge of cognition has been classified into three components: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge (Paris et al., 1994). Carrell et al. (2001) summed up the concepts of these three components:

- **Declarative knowledge** is propositional knowledge, referring to “knowing what”. A learner may know what a given reading strategy is, for example, s/he may know what summarization is and what summaries are. 
- **Procedural knowledge** is “knowing how” to perform various actions, for example how to study, how to deal with analogies, or how to write summaries. 
- **Conditional knowledge** refers to “knowing why”, and includes the learner’s understanding of the value or rationale for acquiring and using a strategy, and when to use it. (p. 233)

**Metacognition or Regulation of Cognition**

Metacognition is the knowledge about one’s own thinking. Hartman (2001) explains that “[t]wo fundamental aspects of metacognition are awareness and control over one’s thinking” (p. 34). Three important metacognitive strategies are planning, monitoring, evaluating (including revising). Some experts also include the aspects of checking/ hypothesis-testing and problem-solving (e.g. Baker & Brown, 1984; Mayer, 2001; Sternberg, 2001). In sum, metacognition is the regulation of cognition. That is, learners need to link these metacognitive awareness with their strategic knowledge about what they know (declarative), how they will use the knowledge (procedural), and when and why they can use the knowledge (conditional). It is this awareness and control over learner’s thinking during the performance of a task that will enable him or her
to regulate cognitive activities. (Hartman, 2001; Schraw, 2001; Sternberg, 2001). O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Mazanares, Russo and Kupper (1985) also discuss the connection of these two aspects of knowledge:

Metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring of comprehension or production while it is taking place, and self-evaluation of learning after language activity is completed. Cognitive strategies are more directly related to individual learning tasks and entail direct manipulation or transformation of learning materials (pp. 560-561).

In sum, this knowledge of cognition and metacognition is essential in learning. Cognitive strategies are useful to perform a task, and metacognitive strategies are useful to allow a task to be performed effectively as the learners understand how to manage the available strategies. Metacognition strengthens the procedural knowledge of strategies as it enables the learners to know how to use different strategies in proper sequence for a task and use them more automatically. It also enhances the conditional knowledge of strategies as it enables the learners to adjust their strategic behaviors to properly meet the demands in different contexts (Schraw, 2001).

When the learners know what strategies are available and how they can be used, and know which are needed to perform a particular task (including what problems need to be solved), they will be able to meet the demand of the task more efficiently (Carell et al., 2001). Chamot & O’Malley (1994) also explain that learners who are trained to utilize these learning strategies will make reflections on their learning, see the relationship between the strategies they have learned and evaluate the effectiveness of their strategic learning behaviors. This will enable them to become more self-regulated and independent learners. With their metacognitive skills, their knowledge of strategies can also be transferred to other tasks.
Reading Comprehension Processes and Strategy Use in Reading

Part of this study was to understand any phenomena that EFL learners might exhibit in relation to their cognitive and metacognitive strategies during reading. In order to gain insight into how learning strategies that take place during reading can contribute to comprehension, it was important to recognize a basic theoretical concept about processes of reading comprehension. The following section covers literature related to this perspective.

Reading Comprehension Processes

Based on the cognitive psychological views, Irwin (1991) proposed a model that explains what takes place cognitively while a person is reading. She suggested that five major processes of meaning construction occur simultaneously: microprocessing, integrative processing, macroprocessing, elaborative processing, and metacognitive processing.

Microprocessing takes place when a reader retrieves individual idea units from sentences. To understand a sentence, a reader needs to chunk words into phrases using his or her syntactic knowledge. During microprocessing, a reader may not remember all idea units but select only some important idea units in a sentence to remember. Selecting only important ideas is a skill needed when reading a long text.

Integrative processing involves understanding the meaning derived from connecting clauses and sentences. This process requires the knowledge of references and sentence patterns (e.g., causation, sequence), and the ability to identify the coherence of sentences that form larger units of the text.

Macroprocessing involves the ability to organize the general ideas of the topic of a text into a summary. In order to derive these main points, unimportant details are deleted and main ideas that cover those details are identified and connected. It is important that a reader be able to
organize and summarize ideas in accordance with the general organizational pattern intended by the author. This skill will enhance the ability to understand and recall ideas effectively.

Elaborative processing involves making extensions and inferences of ideas, even those not always necessarily presented or intended by the author. When readers have a good understanding of the text, they should make elaborations or inferences that have some relationships to the text. However, good readers can make elaborations beyond the literal level. This ability helps promote higher-level comprehension. In addition, reading also entails metacognitive processing. This higher-level mental operation involves having both the awareness and the ability to monitor and control (e.g., select, evaluate, regulate) the operations of those cognitive processes. Since these five comprehension processes occur simultaneously, one process can contribute to the effectiveness of another (Irwin, 1991).

Strategy Use in Reading

Reading researchers have identified many useful reading strategies that assist a reader to effectively establish comprehension. These strategies generally include previewing, skimming, locating main ideas and supporting details (identifying importance vs. non-importance), using knowledge of text structure, synthesizing and summarizing, note-taking, making predictions, using background knowledge, generating questions, drawing inferences, and analyzing. To enhance the regulation or orchestration of those strategies, goal-setting, comprehension monitoring and evaluation, and problem-solving strategies (e.g., using context clues) are useful. (Anderson, 1999; Brown & Palincsar, 1985, Brown et al., 1994; Dole et al., 1991; Duffy, 2003; Irwin, 1991).

The following section covers the literature that describes important cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading and presents perspectives that reading experts have discussed.
regarding the roles of the strategies and related learning and instructional implications of those strategies.

Using Background Knowledge

According to schema theory, readers interpret text based on whatever prior knowledge they bring to their reading task. This prior knowledge includes experience they have in their lives, their social values, their attitudes and beliefs, formal schemata (knowledge about structures and conventions of a language), their content-area knowledge, and their linguistic knowledge at all levels. It is this knowledge that influences their interpretations in reading. Some aspects of knowledge may enhance encoding and meaning construction abilities at the textual level; some aspects may enhance higher-level interpretations (Anderson, 1994; Carrell & Eisterhold, 1993).

Therefore, in learning to read (including in a second language reading), it is crucial for readers to know what prior knowledge they have such as about the topic, the organization of ideas, or language used in the text. They also need to know how and when they can connect such knowledge to enhance their reading (Carrell, 1993). A reader’s ability to employ prior knowledge in reading is considered an important reading strategic behavior. Of the six functions of reader schema (Anderson, 1994), besides facilitating the filling of any gaps of missing information by connecting the reader’s old information with the new information presented in the text (making predictions and interferences), it also facilitates other strategic behaviors such as identifying the organization of the text, and paying attention to important information, which will also lead to making summarizations.

Afflerbach’s study (1990), on the influence of the prior knowledge and text genre on readers’ prediction strategies, concluded that the students made more predictions on the essays and stories with the more familiar contents and structures of the texts. In addition, through
making predictions, they also used cues available from their background knowledge to monitor and determine the effectiveness of their suppositions and comprehension.

Because using background knowledge is an important reading strategy, it is important that readers have adequate and appropriate background knowledge as a reading tool. In an early study, Row and Rayford (1987) observed that in order to help students activate their schema, besides providing pre-rereading activities such as using purpose questions as ‘prepassage content-cues’ (p. 174), other factors that affected the activation of this strategy including students’ familiarity of topics, amount of information provided and cues to genre of the passage must be considered. Especially for second language readers, Anderson (1999) and Carrell and Eisterhold (1993) pointed out that although readers persistently bring their background knowledge to their reading tasks, if their existing schema is not appropriate to the particular text they are reading, their meaning making can fail. Therefore, it is important to prepare second language readers to have enough of the relevant background knowledge required by the text so that they can use it as a strategic device to enhance their comprehension.

Using Knowledge of Text Structure

Reading experts and researchers have revealed that knowledge of text structure (as one aspect of the reader’ schema) is important for reading comprehension. In order to comprehend a reading passage effectively, readers need to be able to identify the overall organizational pattern of ideas presented by the author. This knowledge will assist them to perceive the overall connections with the content (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Irwin, 1991).

Five major patterns of top-level structures of expository texts that describe the rhetorical relations of content that organize the text as a whole were proposed. These patterns include description, collection, causation, comparison, and problem-solution (Meyer & Rice, 1984).
Goldman and Rakestraw (1984) explained that the text’s structural cues help readers to identify main ideas more effectively; when the readers’ perception of text structure at the surface level connects with their understanding of conceptual structure, and when this understanding interacts with their prior content knowledge, it enhances overall comprehension.

Research continued to explore the relationship between readers’ use of knowledge of text structures and their success in reading. Students who use this knowledge as a strategy to guide their reading in expository texts can identify main ideas from the passage, comprehend, and recall more messages than those who do not use the strategy. Generally, students use this strategy to help interpret meanings at all levels of reading. Sometimes they connect structures of ideas within the smaller parts of the text (e.g., between words, clauses, sentences within a paragraph). Some try to connect ideas to identify the structure of a larger cohesive picture (Anderson, 1999; Meyer & Rice, 1984; Kletzien, 1992; Richards, D. J., McGee, L. M., Lomax, R. G. & Sheard, C. 1987). And, as mentioned earlier, readers’ knowledge of text structure also enhances their abilities to apply other strategies such as making predictions (Afflerbach, 1990).

Also, research has revealed that readers’ applications of text structure knowledge to enhance other strategies vary with different types of passages. Kletzien (1992) focused on the interaction of text type and learner proficiency levels. This study, which compared three text types (i.e., causation, comparison, and collection) found that a causation passage activated greater use of the knowledge of text structure among highly proficient high school student readers than the other passage types. Kletzien further predicted a positive trend that less proficient students would apply strategies to a greater extent in this passage type. Both groups of students tended to use knowledge of text structure less in the collection passage. The researcher also noted that knowledge of text structures seemed to play a very significant role when the
content of a passage was not familiar to the students. However, when the passage was difficult, the students’ ability to identify structure from overall text reading diminished; they focused instead on smaller units of text (i.e., words, phrases). Therefore, it is important that students learn about text structures. To aid that, Richgels, McGee, and Slaton (1989) proposed an instructional activity that focuses on using the knowledge of text structures as a strategy to combine reading and writing together. They argued that this serves to establish comprehension and guide well-organized essay writing, an argument which is still held by the field.

**Determining Importance**

Determining importance is considered a key strategy for reading comprehension. This strategy includes identifying the gist, main idea, thesis, theme, and/or topic sentence. In determining importance, readers generally find either the ‘author-determined importance’ or the ‘reader-determined importance’. Skilled readers are better at identifying the author-determined importance. In doing this, they use three aspects of knowledge, namely the general and domain-specific knowledge, the knowledge about the author’s goal and intention, and knowledge of text structure (Dole et al., 1991).

However, Duffy (2003) pointed out that this strategic behavior can also be difficult for many readers, for various reasons. First, not all of main ideas in expository text are presented in topic sentences, and not all narrative stories have clear themes. Readers need to derive the implied main ideas using information provided in a given context. This process requires other related strategies such as questioning and inferring from background knowledge. Moreover, a main idea that the reader has already predicted at one point during reading may have to be altered as he or she encounters new information. In sum, this strategy entails the reader’s
interaction with the author’s intentions and the reasoning skills to determine how the provided clues help confirm the main ideas he or she has identified.

Because of its essential role to enhance an understanding of the general ideas of the text, and the fact that it demands cognitive skills of multiple strategic behaviors, Dole and her colleagues (1991) reiterated the generally agreed-upon view that this strategy needs to be taught to students. Indeed, studies also have shown that students who were taught explicitly how to determine important (or unimportant) ideas comprehended better (Bauman, 1984; Wade & Trathen 1989).

**Summarizing Information**

Irwin (1991) explained that summarizing is one the core strategies of macroprocessing in reading. Comprehension occurs when a reader can identify main ideas and then connect them in an organized text to form a summary. Dole and her colleagues (1991) determined that summarizing is a broader and more synthetic strategy than is identifying importance. Readers should be able to see the global structure of the text, identify what is important or not important, and then synthesize and reorganize those important ideas coherently to accurately represent the original text. Researchers note that writer-based summaries differ from reader-based summaries (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). The former helps readers improve their comprehension and recall; the latter is for conveying information to the audience. “A reader-based perspective changes summarization from a comprehension to a composition task” (Dole et al., p. 245). In producing this type of summary, students need to think about issues regarding the length and cohesion of text as well as the grammatical accuracy of the language. Therefore, it requires writing ability in addition to reading comprehension ability.
Irwin (1991) also identified four strategic behaviors that readers generally employ to create a written (reader-based) summary. These include deleting unimportant information, substituting general terms for specific details, selecting topic statements and/or inventing them when they are not provided in the text. She argued that teaching summarizing skills can be effectively performed in explicit instruction. However, she cautioned that some research regarding summarizing instruction revealed that the skill of inventing topic statements was found difficult for poor readers (e.g., disabled college students). Generally, with explicit instruction, students could improve summarizing skills of paragraphs when they could find stated main ideas. The instruction on inventing of topic statements did not appear effective when students did not have adequate reading and writing abilities required for learning to achieve this skill. Thus, teachers need to be aware of this necessary element when teaching students to write a summary. Also, she suggested that summarizing strategy should be introduced together with other related strategies such as text structure strategy.

Making Predictions

Duffy (2003) explained that when readers make predictions of what ideas they will encounter in the text, they increase the potential for effective reading comprehension to take place. Predicting often occurs in tandem with other strategies such as using background knowledge, generating questions, and comprehension monitoring. As readers move on to later parts of the text in a passage, they may also change what they have predicted.

Irwin (1991) noted that predictions also depend upon the readers’ characteristics. Their background knowledge, goals in reading a given text, and attitudes towards the ideas they learn from the passage influenced their predictions. She also noted that good readers also made predictions of text content using their knowledge about text structure. Predictions stimulate the
reader’s sense of monitoring and lead the readers to pay close attention to identifying important information. Irwin concluded that these strategic behaviors make the reading process active and constructive.

As Duffy (2003) noted, this strategy of making prediction is fundamental to reading comprehension in both narrative and expository texts. Also, it can be taught to learners at all levels. He suggested that when students experience a situation where they are uncertain about what they are reading but still try to read without being able to make much sense, they should be guided to use predictions. It should be explained how this strategy is important in enhancing probing for meaning. Basically, students can be taught to use the topic, textual cues, and pictures to elicit predicting. He asserted that an effective prediction is “a thoughtful hypothesis based on cues” (p.82). According to Duffy, when students can determine what they have predicted and how they make predictions (e.g., what cues or background knowledge they use), it indicates that the instruction of this strategy is successful.

Generating Questions

Generating questions during reading helps students move themselves to a higher level of thinking. Duffy (2003) found that good readers generate questions while reading without having to put much effort on it, but poor readers do not have this skill and tend to believe that they will understand the meanings of the text only when they can decode words. He explained that by nature, since generating questions, together with predictions and monitoring, are cognitive activities that normally take place instantaneously and quite unconsciously and invisibly, it is therefore hard to teach these thinking processes only by giving explanations or by modeling. It is hard for students to mimic the teacher’s modeling because the strategy itself requires background knowledge, and normally each individual reader has different prior knowledge. Students cannot
achieve this skill just by passively seeing the teacher performing it. He insisted that students have
to actively practice it.

Over a decade, Brown and her colleagues’ studies regarding reciprocal teaching provided
evidence that training students to actively generate questions (together with the other three
strategies of summarizing, predicting, and clarifying introduced in this technique) helped
improve students’ comprehension. They noted that generating questions is a prominent strategy
among the four strategies, but generating questions alone will not be as effective as all strategies
are employed together (Brown & Palincsar, 1985; Brown, et al., 1994). Similarly, a review of
various reading research studies concluded that students who were trained to use this strategy
(with well-structured guidance) outperformed those who did not receive training. In fact, it was
observed that students’ success in this strategy application seemed to have a connection with the
type of instruction provided to them: “the nature and intensity of the instruction may be critically
important” (Dole et al., 1991, p. 246). In relation to this issue, from the instructional perspective,
Duffy (2003) suggested that using guided and intensive practice, when students become
comfortable with this cognitive behavior, teachers can ask them to report how they have used it
and how they related it with other strategies in their reading.

**Drawing Inferences**

Drawing inferences is “the ability to read between lines or to get the meaning an author
implies but does not state directly” (Duffy, 2003, p. 102). It is considered a central on-going
reading comprehension strategy as readers constantly elaborate ideas and create implied meaning
for the text they read to fill in information for the overall meaning construction process. Readers
normally connect their background knowledge with the text to draw inferences throughout the
whole process of reading (Dole et al., 1991).
As Duffy (2003) explained, this strategy dominates the overall process of meaning construction because it involves readers’ attempts to “get inside the author’s head” (p. 102) to figure out what ideas the author wants them to take from the text from both stated and implied information. During this operation, readers need to be aware that when they make attempts to interpret meanings using their prior knowledge, it may be different from that of the author. Thus, they need to develop ability to make logical guesses of what the author wants to convey.

However, despite the notion of inferring being continual process, not all readers automatically apply this strategy. Therefore, to enhance reading comprehension, students need to be taught to improve their inferential skills. Practitioners agree that the teaching of drawing inferences should be introduced from the beginning of reading practice. Experts further caution that teachers also need to be aware that inferential activities may need to be introduced only when it is certain that students’ understanding at the literal level of the text has been achieved (Dole et al., 1991; Duffy, 2003).

Earlier researchers had previously determined that instruction of this strategy improved students’ abilities in making inferences and thus improved their overall reading comprehension (Raphael & Pearson, 1985; Raphael & Wonacott, 1985). In these studies, students were guided to become aware of how to answer referential questions such as whether they needed to use background knowledge alone or both background knowledge and clues from the text to draw inferences. The teachers also used prompts to help stimulate students to think about possible inferences. Duffy (2003) later emphasized that teachers need to make clear to students that drawing inferences is more than just guessing. Instead, they need to apply this strategic behavior in a thoughtful and systematic fashion to derive logical implied meanings.
Comprehension Monitoring

Comprehension monitoring has been identified as an essential metacognitive strategy for reading comprehension. It involves the readers’ awareness of their own understanding during the reading process as well as of knowing what and how to take appropriate action when they fail to comprehend the text. Pressley and Ghatala (1990) concluded

Monitoring is at the heart of self-regulated thinking. It is an important ‘executive’ process, activating or deactivating other processes as a function of the on-line evaluation of thought processes as they occur and products of thought as they are generated (e.g., the understanding of a text (p. 120).

They also noted that how actively and effectively readers can actually apply the procedural knowledge of strategies they have learned also depends on both their own monitoring of their performance and their awareness of the benefits those strategies yield in establishing comprehension.

Researchers have come to hold that in addition to knowing cognitive reading strategies, readers need to be aware that comprehension monitoring can help them control the effectiveness of their reading. They need to monitor their choices of strategies employed, to check comprehension, and to evaluate whether and how the strategies enhance their understanding of the text. Through this monitoring process, normally readers should be able to detect problems when experience difficulty, to plan how to tackle those problems, and to perform self-correction (when misunderstanding occurs) to regain their understanding. In short, comprehension monitoring also provides readers “a rationale for using fix-up strategies” to restore their comprehension (Paris et al., 1994, p 796). However, comprehension monitoring may not always be consciously or explicitly performed when the readers do not encounter problems during reading. It is more consciously applied when comprehending problems arise and the meaning construction process is blocked (Baker & Brown, 1984; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990).
Brown and her colleagues also suggested a list of activities that if used properly while reading, can be both “comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring”:

1. Clarifying the purpose of reading, i.e., understanding the task demands both explicit and implicit.
2. Activating background knowledge.
3. Allocating attention so that concentration can be focused on the major content at the expense of trivia.
4. Critical evaluation of content for internal consistency and compatibility with prior knowledge and common sense.
5. Monitoring ongoing activities to see if comprehension is occurring.
6. Drawing and testing inferences of many kinds, including interpretations, predictions and conclusions. (Brown et al., 1994, pp. 764-765)

Baker and Brown (1984) explained that effective comprehension monitoring is indicated when the readers’ evaluation of their performance matches the degree of comprehension that is actually established. On the other hand, poor comprehension monitoring or lack of monitoring normally leads to a mismatch between the readers’ confidence in their performance and the real comprehension. They found that generally skilled and matured readers (e.g., college students) are competent in their first language reading and take action to resolve problems they experience during reading. Good readers have greater declarative and procedural knowledge of monitoring, controlling, and adapting their strategic processes while reading. They normally carry out this metacognitive strategy automatically without much conscious attention. But when they experience difficulties in understanding the text, skilled readers direct their attention to selecting appropriate repair strategies to solve the problems. However, they noted that unskilled readers do
not have consistently effective monitoring of their understanding, and therefore, they cannot detect their problems or solve them effectively. Paris and his colleagues (Paris et al., 1994) noted that even if low proficiency readers do find problems, they might not be able to employ the proper repair strategies. They pointed out that one difficulty in employing repair strategies is the fact that they are not “uniform tools” (p. 796), which are applied identically or universally to all the potential problems readers may encounter. Readers need to know how to adjust their strategic behaviors to suit a particular reading context.

A study by Ehrlich, Kurtz- Costes, and Loridant (1993) added support to Baker and Brown’s conclusions about the different comprehension monitoring abilities between skilled and unskilled readers. This study examined the interplay of cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational factors as predictors of reading comprehension among young adolescent readers, and whether the good readers’ performance differed in relation to these factors from that of the poor readers’. The reading performance of Sixty percent of 220 students in a Paris middle school was investigated. The students’ metacognitive knowledge, word recognition, and reading comprehension were measured by selected standardized tests. In addition, the information about their academic self-concept and beliefs were obtained from questionnaires and scales eliciting their perceptions. The results suggested that good readers had better cognitive (word recognition) and metacognitive abilities, and they have positive views about their academic skills.

In contrast, from their observations of differential evidence regarding adult students’ comprehension monitoring, Pressley and Ghatala (1990) offered a perspective contradictory to that of Baker and Brown regarding age and ability. They cautioned that in their research, adult readers did not always demonstrate effective monitoring skills during text processing. They noted that from the point of view of academic demands, their abilities were often “far from
optimal” (p. 21). They also concluded that while “[a]dequate monitoring, when it occurs, can be observed across a range of abilities -- so can inadequate monitoring” (p. 30).

Block (1992) studied the comprehension monitoring process of first and second language college freshmen in relation to two reading difficulties -- a search for a referent and a vocabulary problem. Students were trained to express their thoughts while reading a passage from an introductory psychological textbook using a think-aloud technique. Consistent with theoretical assumptions, three monitoring processes were evidenced: recognizing problems and sources of problems (evaluation phase), planning and working on solutions (action phase), and checking and revising understanding (checking phase). More interestingly, the results showed that ability in comprehension monitoring was not different between first and second language proficient readers, or between first and second language less proficient readers. Block noted “[c]ontrol of the various stages of this process seemed to depend more on reading ability than on whether the reader was a first or second language reader of English” (1992, p. 325).

Since comprehension monitoring is essential for learning success, researchers seem to agree that it should be taught to students. Despite their views that adults generally possess strong monitoring ability, Baker and Brown (1984) explained that this metacognitive ability is a “late-developing skill” (p.353). Like young children, unskilled adult learners may not be aware of which strategic behaviors need to be performed effectively to accomplish reading comprehension. If they are not aware of the demands of the tasks in a given situation and do not recognize the limitations of their own capacity, it is unlikely that they can take efficient actions to resolve problems. Therefore, Baker and Brown insisted that instruction in evaluating and regulating their comprehension should provide students with greater improvement in this metacognitive skill. And, as Pressley and Ghatala (1990) pointed out, in teaching metacognitive
skills, teachers also need to consider the weaknesses in cognitive abilities and low motivation among poor learners. The integration of cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational factors is important for effective instruction in reading comprehension.

Casanave (1988) believed that effective instruction in comprehension monitoring can result in students’ efficient metacognitive skills. However, the difficulties teachers have in perceiving their students’ metacognitive performance are partly due to the fact that students’ problems, judgments, and decision making during reading are normally invisible. According to Casanave, at least the information gained from a think-aloud technique suggested that strategy training techniques introduced to improve L1 readers’ metacognitive skills should also be suitable or adaptable to instruction for L2 students. She explained that having students discuss their understanding of the text and how such understanding arises is one effective way to raise their own awareness of their performance. In addition, she reiterate that reciprocal teaching and having students think aloud about their strategic learning behaviors should be useful in promoting their expertise in applying metacognitive strategies in L2 reading classrooms.

Writing Processes and Strategy use in Writing

Since the framework of investigation regarding the students’ writing strategy use was based on the cognitive process model of writing proposed by Hayes and Flower (1980 a), the review of literature in this section mainly focused on perspectives about writing processes and strategies consistent with this theory.

Writing Processes

To answer the question What are writing processes? or What does writing involve?, a definition from a cognitive theoretical view given by Graves (1981) seems to provide a useful concept of the comprehensive aspects of writing. He defined the writing process as “a series of
operations leading to the solution of a problem. The process begins when a writer consciously or
unconsciously starts a topic and is finished when the written piece is published” (p. 4). It is a
process whereby writers’ meanings are conveyed to their readers by translating them into written
texts. Hayes and Flower (1980 a) proposed a cognitive process model that explained that writing
consists of three major processes namely planning, translating, and reviewing. These three
processes operate simultaneously, not in linear stages of pre-writing, writing, and rewriting as
discussed in the more traditional views (e.g., Emig, 1971; Perl, 1979; Pianko, 1979; Rohman,
1965).

Planning

Planning consists of sub processes: goal-setting, generating, and organizing.

Goal-setting involves taking information from the task environment and from long-term memory
to set goals for a selected topic, considering the intended audience, and making judgments for the
directions to guide the production of a text that will meet those purposes. Generating involves
thinking about and selecting the topics, retrieving information from the writers’ background
knowledge (long-term memory), and generating ideas, and searching for relevant ideas and
information from available materials. Organizing involves selecting the retrieved ideas and
information, ordering and classifying ideas and information for selected topics, and connecting
them into some kinds of rhetorical structures to be elaborated during the composing process
(Hayes and Flower (1980 a).

Translating

Translating is the act of composing the writer’s thoughts into written speech. Generally,
writers use the ideas and information they have planned to convey their intending meaning
(Hayes and Flower (1980 a).
Reviewing

Reviewing consists of revising (reading the composed text, making changes, and editing) and evaluating (Hayes & Flower, 1980 a; Flower & Hayes, 1994). Revising is undertaken to change ideas or coherence of information to improve the comprehensibility of text. This process of making changes also involves evaluating the plan and the composed text and can lead to recursive planning and translating processes. Through revising and evaluating, editing is performed to meet “standard language conventions, accuracy of meaning, reader understanding, or reader acceptance” (Hayes and Flower (1980 a, p.18).

Hayes and Flower (1979) also presented the nature of writing as problem-solving processes with five important aspects. First, “writing is goal-directed” (p. 97). Goal-setting behaviors, as described above, come in to play at different points in the writing process. Also, while writers are monitoring their writing processes and the product, goals are checked and adjusted. Second, “writing processes are hierarchically organized” (p. 97). Writers have major goals and sub-goals. Each sub-goal may in turn have its own sub-goal. For example, writers will begin their process by having a plan, then turning the plan into organized guidelines, and use those guidelines to lead to their actual writing. Third, “some writing processes may interrupt other processes” (p. 97). That is, while composing, revising or editing can appear at any point, and interrupt other on-going processes. Generating that may recur during composing (e.g., because of the revised ideas) can also interrupt other processes. Next, “writing processes may be organized recursively” (p. 97). When some processes are interrupted, for example, in a situation when the writer can identify a part of the text they have composed that requires revising and editing (e.g., due to context lack or poor organization.), the whole writing process will be employed again. Lastly, “writing goals may be modified as writing proceeds” (p. 97). When
writers have difficulties with their goals, they will find some ways to modify the goals or even decide to abandon the problematic ones. In some cases, writers may connect some sub-goals to form a single major goal.

**Constraints in Writing Processes**

During writing, Hayes and Flower (1980 b) explained that writers have to deal with three major constraints: the demand for integrated knowledge, the linguistic conventions of writing texts, and rhetorical problems.

**The demand for integrated knowledge.** This is considered as one of the major constraints in the writing process. Writing tasks require the writers’ ability to incorporate well-organized knowledge in their work. Writers may have to transform any incoherent ideas that come to mind into a more organized knowledge network. Also, in presenting their knowledge to the readers, the writers need to be aware that it is important to make it suit the readers’ expectations. As Hayes and Flower (1980 b) cautioned, “Retrieving knowledge and creating an adequate conceptual structure of what you think can be a demanding task” (p. 36).

**Linguistic convention of written texts.** To be able to express the organized knowledge into the form of written texts, writers need to recognize linguistic and discourse conventions of written messages. To compose a written text, writers need to establish a discourse with fully contextualized meanings clear in itself. The constraint of ‘text-making’ affects the whole composing process in two important ways: 1) writers have to learn the conventions of a particular type of text, and 2) they must learn how to handle the overall complicated process of writing itself. For instance, they need to know how to generate ideas effectively, how to make sentences grammatically reflect intended meanings, and how to keep a proper tone to fit with the goal of the task and to suit the expectation of the audience (Hayes & Flower, 1980 b).
Rhetorical constraint. This is concerned with the ability to make the writing task to conform to the writing purpose. Writers must decide the topic of their writing piece (e.g., essays, compositions, dialogical journals), think about the audience and about their own “imagined roles” (Hayes & Flower, 1980 b, p. 40) in that particular writing task. A rhetorical problem should theoretically direct the process of generating knowledge and language.

The three writing processes and their related constraints require a great deal of writers’ abilities in controlling various operations during a writing task. In order to translate oral thoughts into written language successfully, it is essential that writers have effective strategies to enhance the processes of planning, drafting (composing) and reviewing. In addition, similar to the reading processes, during writing, writers need to be aware of their own performance. Therefore, self-monitoring and evaluating are also considered important components of the reviewing strategies.

Strategy Use in Writing

When researchers explore what writers do during writing, one major attention is focused on which cognitive strategies writers apply to enhance the effectiveness of their writing, and how they perform those strategic behaviors. The following section covers literature that has determined which writing strategies students should learn. The major categories of strategies were classified in accordance with the cognitive process model of writing as discussed thus far.

Planning Strategies

Planning strategies are behaviors that enhance effective processes of goal setting (including thinking about rhetorical problems), generating, and organizing of ideas. Harris and Graham (1996) suggested that student writers be made aware of employing goal-setting strategies and know how to relate their background knowledge and different sources of information to create the topic and generate ideas for the topic. In classroom instruction,
brainstorming and discussions can help raise students’ awareness of the purpose of a particular writing task, their potential audience, and how they can put ideas into a plan. In addition, they need to learn strategies for organizing ideas. The uses of organizers and outlines to order and connect ideas, topics, topic sentences, and supporting details should be introduced. Also, the ability to organize ideas presented in the text requires the knowledge of text structures (e.g., story grammar, genres, types of expository passages, and rhetorical patterns of essays or compositions). This knowledge of text structures will enable student writers to maintain the coherence of ideas and cohesion of text, and to conform to the standard conventions (Harris & Graham, 1996).

**Drafting Strategy**

Students should learn the concept that writing a good piece of work involves the process of developing the composed text in multiple drafts. This concept will help strengthen their awareness that the goals, generated ideas, and the composed text in the first draft can be refined until they feel that their text satisfactorily represents the ideas that want to communicate to the readers. Through the process of developing ideas and refining the language in multiple drafts, students will become more aware of the essential elements of fluency and accuracy in writing (Kane, 1988).

**Reviewing Strategies**

Reviewing involves revising, editing, and evaluating strategies (Hayes & Flower, 1980 a; Flower & Hayes, 1994). Students need to be aware that these behaviors will enable their writing to yield a satisfactory product. They should learn that good writers reread, examine, and make changes in the composed text. Writers should also be able to evaluate whether the content presented in their text is clear, logical, well organized, useful, and complete. Learning to improve
their text to meet the standard of convention and being aware that a good piece of written text should be finally error-free is also important. Students should understand that during the revising process, all planning strategies can be recursively applied (Harris & Graham, 1996; Hayes and Flower, 1980 b). In addition to revising ideas of the text, students need to learn various aspects of editing the text (e.g., knowing how to write a topic sentence, checking grammar, using proper connectors, choices of words, spelling).

Peer revising/editing is also an effective strategy for the reviewing process since it provides students with opportunities to access opinions and feedback from their immediate audience. Writers can learn about the evaluation criteria and suggestions from their peers. A peer conference not only promotes a sense of audience, but it also promotes co-operative learning in writing (Harris & Graham, 1996).

Writers need to be aware of various strategies and learn to use one to enhance another to help them control the processes of planning, translating and reviewing effectively. Students should also be aware that these strategies can be applied recursively during the process of writing.

As previously mentioned, reviewing also involves monitoring and evaluating. These metacognitive abilities will help writers regulate and control their writing behaviors during different processes. To illustrate, an awareness of using monitoring and evaluating strategies helps students to pay attention to their writing to, focus on their thinking, to be able to select ideas, set criteria, and control their writing behaviors and, as a result, to be able to perform their task efficiently. Harris and Graham (1996) concluded that students need to understand the writing task, to learn the strategies, to use the knowledge of the learned strategies to direct themselves along the process of their writing.
Reading and Writing Connections

Although reading and writing can be practiced separately, combining the practice of these two skills together helps students to better perceive the relationships in various aspects including their roles for communicative functions, the common processes of meaning-construction, and their roles in promoting cognitive and linguistic skills and learning in other academic disciplines. Arguments for combining reading and writing to benefit students as readers and writers have been discussed in literature (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Shanahan, 1990; Smith, 1994; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). The relevant aspects of his part of the framework of this study can be summarized as follows.

Common Characteristics of Reading and Writing

First, a common concept about reading and writing is that they are social activities and that their ultimate functions are for communication. The underlying implication is that reading and writing entail negotiations of meanings and related senses of authorship and audience. When reading, readers not only interact with the texts but also think about what the authors want them to think or to do. When writing, writers not only translate their ideas into the written texts but also try to anticipate different aspects of their audience to make their work communicate with them effectively (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Shanahan, 1990; Smith, 1994; Tierney, 1990). Tierney described the process of meaning construction in reading as one involving negotiations between the readers and the authors. A study he conducted with his colleagues indicated that although readers wanted to know their authors’ intentions and suggestions, they did not entirely rely on the authors’ ideas. Instead, they also developed meaning based on their own knowledge. Similarly, writers want to be cooperative with their audience, but during this meaning making process, negotiations also take place (Tierney, LaZansky, Raphael, & Cohen, 1987).
Second, reading and writing share similar cognitive and metacognitive knowledge, strategies, and thinking processes. Readers and writers need to be aware of the purposes of their tasks, how they will perform and control their reading or writing, and how they evaluate their success. Bringing reading and writing together provides students with opportunities to explore their own ideas and techniques from the texts they read and transfer them to their written tasks. This combination should promote the awareness of reciprocal connections between reading and writing and engage learners in literacy learning with the more active and constructive ways. In addition, both reading and writing require background knowledge of content and the world, linguistic knowledge, and knowledge of text structure. Therefore, the reader’s and writer’s schemata, their knowledge in any content area, linguistic knowledge, and text structure knowledge can be developed through concurrent reading and writing activities (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Shanahan, 1990; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991).

Third, reading and writing promote learning, and when they are combined, they foster better critical thinking and understanding. Good reading involves critical thinking of the authors’ intentions and good writing involves anticipatory thinking of possible ways to produce text to suit their audience (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). Tierney (1990), referring an earlier study he conducted with his colleagues (Tierney, Soter, O’ Flahavan, & McGinley, 1989) which examined the effects of combining reading and writing on thinking, revealed that “students who read and wrote [together] were engaged in a great deal more evaluative thinking and perspective shifting than those who just wrote or those who just read” (p. 137). McGee & Richgels (1990) elaborated on this view stating that good learning involves critical understanding, engaging
readers and writers as learners in revising, assessing and using their background knowledge, and getting involved personally in and expressing their feelings about the topics.

**Instructional Activities in Connecting Reading and Writing**

Because of the common characteristics that reading and writing share and the theoretical view that combining the learning of the two skills can yield optimum benefits in literacy development, many experts have introduced instructional activities for bringing the practice of the two skills together. In this section, I discuss only those activities that were incorporated in the course taught as part of this study. A rationale for their choices is also provided.

With my belief that strategic knowledge enhances learning to read and write, especially when combining the teaching of the two skills together, I selected activities that I considered appropriate for a multiplicity of use. They were aimed at promoting students’ awareness that various strategies could be applied in both reading and writing, and that in this way reading reinforces writing and vice versa. It should be noted that the focus of practice in this course was limited only to expository texts. The details of the instructional procedures employed for the course offered to the participants in this study are presented in chapter 3, but it is important to mention here that the lessons provided during the five weeks in this study were designed on the basis of a weekly reading and writing combined unit.

Based on the reading activities (e.g., shared activities during a mini-lesson, silent reading, pair discussion on a reading passage, class discussion), students were taught to write an extended essay or a composition related to ideas they had derived from a reading passage. In general, extended writing was chosen as a bridging activity to combine reading and writing to promote the sense that both literacy skills entail common aspects of planning (e.g., having a purpose to find or create messages, collecting and generating ideas, anticipating), of the processes of
retrieving or delivering meanings to communicate such messages (e.g., organizing, synthesizing, summarizing, illustrating, interpreting, relating, negotiating, hypothesis-testing), of the process of reviewing (including monitoring and evaluation, and regulating), and of the related senses of authorship and audience.

Furthermore, when students read to write something, and when they write from what they have read, they should come to recognize classroom reading and writing as being meaningful beyond school assignments; students should perceive that reading and writing (even in a second language) serve to connect the sources of information (i.e., the reading or writing text), a person (the student as reader or writer) and his or her world. To promote this real sense of communication and ownership, students were guided (by task requirements) to take their own positions in expressing the views, attitudes, and feelings they had arrived at from reading and to expand them in writing so that they could become critical and independent learners. Lastly, especially for EFL students whose exposure to English linguistic resources is normally limited, having opportunities to learn ways of composing different types of expository texts from relevant reading materials before they have to compose one of their own should be of great assistance.

Therefore, these combined reading and writing activities were designed to strengthen the students’ knowledge and expertise in strategy use they had learned and applied for the two skills and to allow them to perceive the connections of those strategies. To fulfill these teaching/learning purposes, I selected relevant instructional exercises presented by various experts to use in the writing lessons that I conducted in this course. Activities such as response to content area-related texts (Brozo, 1988), dialogical reading and writing (Salvatori, 1985), and writing using text structure strategy (Richgels, McGee, & Slaton, 1989) were also incorporated. I introduced the extended writing practices that promoted students’ skills in different types of expository
essays and compositions (persuasive, descriptive, argumentative, journal, summary). Thus, students were taught to write extended essays in different rhetorical patterns in response to content from the materials they had read, to write summaries from the reading passages, to write dialogical journals, and to apply their knowledge of text structures from the readings to their writing.

In an extended writing activity, the teacher can require students to take a position so that they have an opportunity to become personally involved in their reading and writing tasks. When students are given an expository reading passage and asked to write an extended essay, they have to use their background knowledge and the knowledge derived from the text or other related sources of information to support their position. Also, they need to review their understanding of the reading materials and revise their own text to make it clear to the readers. In an extended writing task, students can learn to synthesize ideas from what they understand from reading to support their ideas in their writing (McGee & Richgels, 1990; Newell, 1984).

Brozo (1988) suggested that students read content-area related text and respond to any ideas they perceive as interesting. They can draw from their own experiences or use their knowledge from other resources in related areas to connect with their views. They can also express their personal attitudes, beliefs, and feelings about any ideas they discuss in addition to the factual information they present. Moreover, Salvatori (1985) noted that the on-going processes of back and forth reading, writing, and rereading of the old text (from the reading materials) and the new text (they produce) will promote opportunities for students to have reflective thinking in both skills and enhance continuous revision skills. In light of this, I chose texts from social science sources that should pique the students’ interest and keep them engaged.
In every combined reading and writing task in this course, the importance of applying knowledge of text structure to enhance both reading comprehension and the ability to write a well-organized essay was also emphasized. Richgels et al. (1989) proposed an activity that encourages students to become familiar with the different types of text structures of expository passages. The use of graphic organizers was introduced to help students connect important ideas in a reading passage. They can also compare the organization of their writing with that of the reading passage of the same type. In this type of activity, students can be trained to be aware that feedback from readers (during peer revision) can help them perceive how they should reorganize their ideas when the text fails to convey clear messages.

Explicit Instruction of Learning Strategies in Reading and Writing

Why should Learning Strategies be Taught Explicitly?

Cognitive theory holds that the knowledge of strategy use (in relation to the knowledge of task and the knowledge about one’s own capacity) plays an important role in assisting learners to control their learning behaviors. One important reason that skilled readers and writers become successful in their reading and writing is because they know how to employ strategies efficiently. Therefore, it is necessary that students know useful strategies and learn how and when they can use such strategies appropriately to enhance their reading comprehension and writing performance. This is a cyclical process that helps learners to move themselves along their learning continuum. However, this cognitive and metacognitive expertise is not always naturally provided. Cognitive experts (Hartman, 2001; Paris et al., 1994; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990; Schraw, 2001; Schunk, 1991) pointed out that not all students can develop strategic skills independently, without training. Students need motivation in performing strategic learning, and
these skills need to be taught and practiced so that students will be able to eventually “polish and internalize” them (Hartman, 2001, p. 40).

When students are taught to self-monitor and regulate learning behaviors, they will have a rationale for applying the learned strategies and are aware that strategy applications are ongoing skills useful for their learning tasks. Then, when they perceive the value of learning about declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of strategies and how to regulate them, they will become motivated in their strategic learning behaviors. This motivation will in turn enhance more effective learning since students will expend their time and efforts in developing these skills (Paris et al., 1994). More importantly, achieving in control of learning environments, they will feel that their strategic knowledge is not limited (Hartman, 2001). This positive sense of self-regulated skills will eventually lead them to a greater sense of self-efficacy and to understand the value of strategic learning (Schunk, 1991). In all, students will become more reflective and successful in learning activities. Chamot & O’Malley (1994) concluded:

We emphasize repeatedly that students who are mentally active and who analyze and reflect their learning activities will learn, retain, and be able to use new information more effectively. Furthermore, students will be able to learn and apply strategies more effectively if they verbalize and describe their efforts to apply strategies with learning activities (p.11).

How should Learning Strategies be Taught Explicitly?

Reading and writing processes require the expertise of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Schraw (2001) noted that students need to know the difference between these two aspects of strategic behaviors. Researchers agreed that in addition to introducing existing reading and writing strategies that good readers and writers employ (i.e., declarative knowledge), procedural and conditional knowledge should be taught explicitly along with metacognitive strategies (Anderson, 1999; Brown et al., 1994; Carrell, 2001; Casanave, 1988; El-Hindi, 1997;
Harris & Graham, 1996; Hartman, 2001; Flower & Hayes, 1994; Paris et al., 1994; Pressley, 2000; Schraw, 2001; Schunk, 1991; Stenrb erg, 2001; Storalek, 1994; Williams & Colomb, 1993).

For reading instruction, several experts (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Carrell, 2001) referred to Winograd and Hare’s suggestion (1988) that five aspects of strategy use should be taught: (a) what strategy use is, (b) why strategy use should be learned, (c) how to use the strategy, (d) when and where the strategy is to be learned, and (e) how to evaluate the use of strategy (pp. 123-124). With strategic knowing in these five aspects, students should be able to determine whether they are successful in applying those strategies.

Schraw (2001) suggested three conditions that help promote the effectiveness of strategic learning. First, students should be given enough opportunities to observe how experts use strategic skills. Second, they should also learn how experts make reflections or evaluations on their own strategic behaviors. Third, students should be provided with an adequate amount of time to practice their strategic skills in meaningful contexts. In explicit instruction, when teachers explain and model the thought processes of applying cognitive strategies, they should also reflect on the metacognitive thinking of how to regulate those strategies. The more often explicit strategies are modeled, the more likely it will help develop the students’ awareness of such strategic skills. Also, students themselves need to be provided with opportunities to identify their strategies, talk about them, and analyze their own learning behaviors. Besides, students’ opportunities to share knowledge with teacher and peers will help them better understand the procedural and conditional aspects of strategy applications and how to regulate those strategies. The more opportunities they have to practice their skills, the more reflections they can make on
their own development of their strategic learning behaviors (Carrell, 2001; Chamot & O’ Malley, 1994; Schraw, 2001).

However, Sternberg (2001) also cautioned that while strategic knowledge leads students to perform their learning in a mindful or thoughtful way, teachers also need to be aware that these habits take time to develop, especially for students who have been in passive learning environments for years. So, it is challenging for teachers to make students become interested in metacognitive strategic procedures so that they will be motivated to develop such strategic skills as on-going learning habits of their own. Also, despite the fact that strategic learning activities are useful, in the situations where students appear to be able to automatize those skills, conscious metacognitive activities may not have to be emphasized. Paris and his colleagues (1994) explain that when students become proficient, they will be able to make choices of certain strategies for their tasks automatically.

Research in Explicit Instruction in Reading and Writing

Research studies in both reading and writing that employed explicit instruction in strategy training have confirmed its effectiveness in promoting students’ knowledge of cognition and metacognition, and consequently their strategic learning skills development.

Pressley (1984) noted that self-regulated use of comprehension strategies is a prominent characteristic of skilled adult readers, and he recommended that students be taught explicitly to use and articulate reading strategies. According to Pressley, previous research studies had found that students became successful when they were trained to apply various individual or multiple strategies in reading such as background knowledge, making predictions, generating questions, constructing mental images, summarizing, and analyzing stories. One of the most well known explicit instructional technique of multiple reading strategies that yields effective comprehension
is reciprocal teaching, first introduced by Palincsar and Brown (1984). In reciprocal teaching, students are trained to use the strategies of making predictions, generating questions, summarizing, and seeking clarification. Teachers provide students with opportunities to practice strategies in the context of real reading. Also, teachers explain and model their thinking processes. More importantly, making students understand when and where certain strategies can be applied helps promote abilities to transfer strategic knowledge into a new reading context. Through this learning method, students become more independent in reading and can apply strategic behaviors more autonomously. Pressley (1984) explains that when students become more proficient, teacher’s feedback and instruction can be reduced.

Casanave (1988) also recommended that reciprocal teaching should also be suitable for L2 reading instruction since it enhances students’ skills in comprehension monitoring and repairing. These abstract skills can be overtly demonstrated to students. However, she pointed out that comprehension monitoring alone cannot directly yield effective reading comprehension. It needs to be orchestrated with other strategic behaviors. Therefore, it is crucial for teachers to arrange learning activities to promote comprehension for a particular purpose of reading in a given context. In addition, having students discuss questions to reflect their understanding of the text in class is another effective way to raise this awareness. Discussions and questions can include issues about the content, point of view, genres of text, and help relate the text to the students’ world. Students can be asked to retell and summarize what they have read or to predict the parts they have not covered yet. When students have opportunities for interactive dialogues, it will also allow teachers to monitor their students’ progress and to be able to provide them scaffolding at appropriate points.
Casanave (1988) also suggested that the think-aloud technique is suitable for reflective learning activities in a normal classroom setting. For instance, teachers can exemplify common comprehension problems, demonstrate useful repair strategies, and model think aloud problem-solving procedures to students. Students can be asked to identify the strategies they observe from the teacher. Then, they can practice these strategic procedures for problem-solving in their own reading.

Shih (1992) also urged English for academic purposes (EAP) programs for ESL students to integrate strategy instruction into the teaching of reading comprehension. She proposed three main steps for teaching comprehension strategies explicitly and explained how each step facilitates comprehension. First, the teacher should explain the strategies to students (i.e., introducing declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge) and model strategic thinking processes. Second, guided practice should follow. At this stage, students would begin to control the strategy applications by themselves. Together with guided practice, having discussions about the learned strategies, and sharing products resulting from strategy applications (e.g., notes, paraphrases, written summaries, or even underlined texts) all will help strengthen the students’ understanding about and the effectiveness of strategy use. At this stage, the teacher could decrease his/ her leading role in the classroom as the learning activity moves from being teacher-centered to being student-centered. Last, students should be provided with opportunities for independent application. When students can apply the learned strategies to a whole text of their own, they are considered to be successful in transferring their strategic knowledge.

For writing, experts have suggested that knowledge about strategies for writing processes (e.g., planning, drafting, revising, editing, evaluating) need to be introduced to students (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Flower & Hayes, 1994; Harris and Graham, 1996; Storalek, 1994; Williams
and Colomb, 1993). Also, research studies have indicated that explicit instruction of writing strategies can effectively enhance students’ strategic writing skills development. Williams and Colomb (1993), based on the results of their meta-analyses, pointed out the benefit of explicit instruction in writing. They explained that writing includes skills for social communication, meaning that students need to understand how to communicate in their written language through an appropriate genre for a particular purpose. In order that students are able to learn the suitable form of language for use in a given situation, they need to be taught about the features or the rhetorical components required for each genre. It is important that they learn about the rhetorical structures at the discourse level in addition to basic syntactic knowledge at sentence level. Williams and Colomb (1993) asserted that the explicit teaching of writing skills by modeling strategies can help students convert their tacit knowledge into practice. Also, they noted that various university writing programs that had employed an explicit instructional approach in writing (e.g., University of Chicago, University of Illinois) had brought about their students’ successful writing performance. In these programs, students also revealed their perceptions of the value in learning through explicit instruction. However, Williams and Colomb also stressed the importance of considering the issue of “what” and “when” strategies should be taught explicitly. This judgment can be based on what teachers know about their students.

Stolarek (1994) proposed using prose modeling as a technique of explicit instruction in writing. She explored the effect prose modeling in a writing classroom could have to help promote students’ metacognitive awareness in writing. Her study was conducted based on her beliefs in the effectiveness of modeling and in Vygotsky’s concept (1962) that perceiving words and signs can aid one’s cognitive learning processes. She also referred to Flower’s explanation (1989) about learning and teaching in writing when she said
“Writing process needs to be taught not just as a procedure or a set of ‘natural’ activities but as purposeful cognition. Students need to be actively aware of the rhetorical goals behind a writing strategy and learn not only how to use a thinking procedure but when and why it might be worth trying” (p. 206).

In her study, she divided 15 college students and 15 faculty members into 5 groups. Each group was assigned to write an essay of an unfamiliar form with different conditions (e.g., a task with descriptions, explanation, and modeling vs. a task with only descriptions and explanation). The major findings revealed the group that was provided with a description of the genre, modeling, and explanation showed the most conscious awareness of their writing processes. Stolarek noted “[students’] self-conscious, self-criteria, and introspective manner of attacking the task …may have contributed to their success” (p. 168). This suggested that prose modeling facilitated the students’ metacognitive response to the task. The researcher also argued that “the use of modeling… did not detract from [a student] writer’s abilities to write in a creative manner ….The essay which was most the result of modeling was one of the most original” (p. 169).

Explicit instruction has also been proven effective in the learning/teaching context where the practice of reading and writing are combined. El-Hindi (1997) conducted a study in which explicit metacognitive instruction was provided to students during a 6-week residential academic program. The training aimed to improve their reading, writing, and study skills prior to enrolling in their first year in college. The researcher (and two other teachers) conducted the lessons in 3 main phases: 1) teaching strategies corresponding to planning for both reading and writing, 2) self-monitoring and questioning for both reading and writing, and 3) evaluating, reacting, and relating. The teachers explained, modeled, and allowed students to apply the learned strategies in their reading and writing assignments from the course. When they worked on their reading and writing tasks, the students were asked to use reading logs to make written reflections of their learning behaviors and performance. Each week, they wrote comments on the texts they had read.
and how the content related to their personal experience. The teachers also gave feedback on the
students’ reading logs. El-Hindi explained that the use of reading logs promoted the students’
active engagement and thought about their learning behaviors. This helped them to become
critical in their reading as well as to be able to express their thoughts articulately in writing.
Some students even reflected how they changed as readers. In all, the researcher asserted that
through explicit instruction, the students’ “metacognitive awareness for reading and writing
increased over time and that learners developed a greater sense of the relationship of reading and
writing” (1997, p.1).

In conclusion, the theoretical views and research studies I have reviewed above support
the similar view that explicit instruction is as an effective means to introduce strategic
knowledge to students. Although there has been limited research regarding strategy training
specifically in EFL reading and writing classrooms, I was convinced that adapting various
aspects of explicit instruction to introduce learning strategies in reading and writing to EFL
learners would help promote their literacy learning proficiency and performance.

Research Studies in ESL/EFL Reading and Writing

This portion of the literature review was aimed at identifying and summarizing successful
strategy use in reading and writing among ESL/EFL learners explored in the previous studies.

Research in ESL/EFL Reading

Wongbaisaj and Chaikittimongkol (1995) conducted a study to investigate the strategies
used by proficient and less proficient EFL university students in Thailand in terms of their
choices and effectiveness. Twelve proficient and twelve less proficient students were asked to
identify strategies they normally used in reading. Then, they were asked to read four passages.
To monitor the students’ reading behaviors, the researchers used the checklists the students had
completed as a reference. After the reading activity, the students were interviewed. They were asked to describe what they had done while reading, including what problems they had experienced and how they solved those problems.

The researchers concluded that the students in both groups used the strategies at both cognitive and metacognitive levels. They did not differ greatly in terms of their awareness of strategies and the range of strategies they employed. All students used mechanical strategies (e.g., skimming, scanning, using abbreviations and symbols, assigning headings in notes) effectively. However, the proficient students performed much better with the more abstract and high-level strategies such as critical questioning, reasoning, and thinking through. In addition, proficient students perceived the connections of the strategies they had employed, while the less proficient students perceived individual strategies as separate entities. Proficient students were more flexible in their use of strategies and more sensitive to the effectiveness of the used strategies than were the less proficient students. When they reflected on their strategy applications, the proficient students showed clearer goals and descriptions of their strategic behaviors than did the less proficient students.

Adunyaritikun (2005) investigated the reading strategies of non-proficient Thai EFL college students. Thirty-seven students participated in the study. Three main sources of data revealed the students’ perceptions and knowledge of reading strategies and the strategies they employed in their English reading. First, the students were asked to complete the questionnaire about the “metacognitive conceptualizations of their silent reading strategies in English” (p. 21). In the questionnaire, the students had to rate 36 statements with a 1-5 point Likert scale to reflect their perceptions regarding reading strategy use in English. These statements included inquiries about the students’ confidence in their reading ability, in their problem-solving strategies, in their
perception of effective reading strategies, and in their perception of what makes texts difficult to read (p.21). Second, the students were individually asked to read a passage of about 400-475 words considered appropriate to the level of their English proficiency and to perform the think-alouds while reading. Finally, the students were interviewed about their views of reading and reading strategies.

From the interviews and questionnaires, these non-proficient EFL students reported that they knew the strategies of identifying main ideas and supporting details, understanding the author’s writing purposes, making use of context clues, using background knowledge, making use of grammatical structures and text graphical cues, summarizing, skipping, keeping on reading for further clarification when encountering difficulties, rereading, and using a dictionary (pp. 35-38).

From the think-aloud data analysis, the researcher classified the strategies employed by these non-proficient students into three categories: First, text based-strategies included translating texts from English into Thai, using visual information, rereading, using lexical meaning and grammatical structure, solving vocabulary problems and sounding out words (p. 41). Second, knowledge-based strategies included use of background knowledge, predicting, and comprehension monitoring (p. 47). Third, interactive strategies included summarizing, interpreting text, integrating previous information, questioning the constructed meaning (of a word, clause, or sentence), reacting to text, self-correcting, and skipping problematic parts (p. 48). Among these three categories, the students employed the text-based strategies at 71.02%, the knowledge-based strategies at 6.41 %, and the interactive-based strategies at 22.55%. Despite the use of these strategies, the learners were not successful readers. The study revealed four major factors that contributed to the students’ failure in English reading. These included first, a
large proportion of unknown words in the text, and second, the complex syntactic structures. Third, the ineffective regulation of strategies resulted in the students’ reading performance not reflecting the knowledge they reported, and an unbalanced implementation of strategies was identified as learners employed the text-based strategies more than they other types and over-relied on translation. Finally, the students had misconception of reading: they conceptualized reading as “a decoding process rather than a meaning making process” (2005, p. 68).

Sukirin (1999) investigated the reading strategies employed by 15 Indonesian EFL student teachers enrolled at a state university in Indonesia. These students were above-average readers among their peers. Multiple data gathering methods were employed. They were asked to perform a think-aloud task while reading an assigned passage. After the think-aloud task, they were asked to review the reading passage again and then retell what they could remember about the text. Then, the students were given a multiple-choice comprehension test. Additionally, all of them were interviewed. The researcher also made observations throughout the research project. In the article, Sukirin presented only two strategy profiles: those of the student who earned the highest score in the comprehension test and those of the student who earned the lowest score.

Sukirin found that these two above-average readers employed a number of similar strategies including skimming, referring, inferring, making association with knowledge/experience, paraphrasing, questioning text content, evaluating content, predicting, monitoring, giving illustration, summarizing, and guessing meaning from context. Both similarities and differences were evidenced regarding their applications of the strategies; for example, both students used skimming and context clues in similar fashions. They also used paraphrasing and inferring at high frequency. Monitoring was evidenced during reading, leading to applications of paraphrasing and referring. Nevertheless, they differed in their abilities to apply some strategies
and in making interpretations of the text. The higher-proficiency student evaluated the text by questioning the content or sharing agreeing with the author’s perspective; the lower-proficiency student did not demonstrate these behaviors. Instead, the lower-proficiency student used questioning of text content when she encountered a problem. The researcher concluded that the questioning produced by the higher-proficiency student was for evaluation, while the latter did it as part of monitoring. Also, the former demonstrated more occurrences of giving illustrations and connecting background knowledge with the text than did the less proficient learner. The lower-proficiency student also misinterpreted due to difficult sentence structures. However, she was able to correct her misunderstanding later on.

Chi (1995) investigated not only how ten proficient Taiwanese EFL university students used their background knowledge from previous textual experiences to interpret reading texts in English, but also how this background knowledge enhanced their comprehension. ‘Previous textual experiences’ referred to old information related to the topics/stories that the students had previously gained from any sources including prior reading materials, movies, and story telling. The students were assigned to read two short stories of similar themes. During the reading process, the students stopped at the end of each paragraph to report their thoughts. After the initial reading, they were asked to read the whole story again and make additional comments. Then, they were interviewed about whether they had thought of any other stories or information from previous sources while reading the two stories.

Chi revealed four patterns in which the students employed background knowledge as a strategy to comprehend the text namely storying, integrating, evaluating and associating. For storying, Chi explained “the readers are stimulated by the current text to create or describe another story.” For integrating, Chi said “readers apply the background knowledge of their native
culture to interpret the target or current text, and vice versa.” Evaluating, the researcher described, was when “readers generate their own views, values, or conclusions by comparing the current text with previous texts.” For associating, “readers simply link the current text with their previous textual experiences without any further explanation” (Chi, 1995, p. 640). The researcher concluded that the students’ uses of background knowledge gained from their previous textual experiences appeared effective in the comprehending assigned reading tasks. Connecting background knowledge and the current texts helped lead the students through their dynamic thinking process while reading. Also, it allowed them to make “meaningful and personal sense of a text” With the background knowledge they had, these students became more involved in “private, idiosyncratic, and hypothesis-generating responses.” This let them reconstruct their own meanings of the text (1995, p. 643).

Lin (2002) investigated EFL learners’ perceptions about their prior knowledge in English reading comprehension. A survey was conducted among 400 EFL students at the secondary and tertiary levels in China. The questions consisted of lists of factors that the students might perceive to cause difficulties in English reading, including those that related to their prior linguistic, conceptual, and socio-cultural backgrounds. The survey results revealed that the students in the lower grades believed that background knowledge of vocabulary was very important in reading comprehension. However, the students in the higher grades perceived that conceptual and socio-cultural background knowledge was more important than the linguistic knowledge. The researcher noted that when the students’ linguistic competence increased, their perception of its limiting role decreased. At the same time, they tended to give more importance to the socio-cultural knowledge.
Another interesting aspect of strategy use in reading concerns the readers’ awareness of rhetorical knowledge of text and their abilities to apply it. Cristina and Martinez (2002) conducted an experimental study to investigate the relation between the EFL learners’ uses of the knowledge of structure and their comprehension and reproduction of information. Sixty Spanish EFL college students enrolled in a course for English for science and technology at a university in Spain participated. In this course, introducing the knowledge of text structures was one aspect of the instruction. The students were randomly divided into 5 groups of 12; the researchers had a text written in five different rhetorical organizational patterns: a collection of descriptions, causation, problem-solution, comparison, or no rhetorical signals. Each student in four of the groups read a text with a clear organizational pattern, with the last group read the text with no rhetorical signals. The students were allowed to read the texts individually at their own pace. After reading, they were asked to produce a written recall, writing everything they remembered from the text. They were encouraged to write in complete sentences so that they could show how ideas were related. The students were asked to identify the organizational pattern of the text if they recognized it.

The result of Cristina and Martinez’s study showed a significant relationship between knowledge of text structure and comprehension. That is, the organized texts with clear signals had a positive impact on comprehension; however, different levels on comprehension of influence between different types of organization were not evidenced. In addition, the students’ recognition of the organizational pattern of the text influenced their ability to reproduce information from the text. All types of organizational patterns presented in the study were recognized; the most familiar type was the collection of descriptions, while the less familiar type was the comparison. Thus, the students who read the collection of descriptions were able to
reproduce more information using their knowledge of that text structure. The researchers also concluded that “when reproduction and conscious recognition coincide in the reader, the use of structure has a positive effect on reading comprehension and reproduction of the information presented in a text” (Cristina and Martinez, 2002, p. 93). Thus, they proposed that in teaching reading, it is important to raise students’ awareness of text structure since this conscious awareness has positively enhanced their abilities to predict and interpret the texts.

Another study regarding the use of text structures was conducted by Sengupta (1999). The researcher conducted tutorials (at a university in Hong Kong) using discussions to raise 15 ESL Chinese students’ rhetorical awareness of English texts. During these sessions, the researcher investigated how the students developed their rhetorical consciousness of English passages, especially regarding the feature of texts that students perceived as “reader-friendly” (p. 291). He also explored how such consciousness influenced the students’ reading and writing performance.

The results suggested that the students were aware of four major textual elements as reader-friendly, namely, a good introduction, the clear structure of the text, a conclusion, and the use of signaling devices (p. 291). The students reported that a good introduction includes signals of purpose and background. Clear links between subheadings that are mentioned in the introduction or conclusion should be seen in the text. A conclusion should recapture the ideas mentioned in the introduction. Signaling devices included “advance label, recapitulation and authorial stance” (p. 303). The students also felt that these elements would help them to comprehend better. However, they reported that despite this awareness, they did not apply these features in their texts when they had to write for the class assignments since they viewed academic writing as a different genre. The researcher concluded that raising consciousness
helped develop the students’ abilities in reading. However, Sengupta noted that in addition to the students’ perception about school writing, they might not have sufficient practice to transfer their knowledge from the declarative level to procedural level in writing. (They did not do substantial writing in this tutorial class.)

In summary, findings from the studies reviewed above provided useful information about reading strategies employed by ESL/EFL learners. However, none of them investigated nor described how ESL/ EFL learners developed their awareness/ knowledge of those strategies into the strategic behaviors that they might apply during reading. Also, none explored the holistic strategic reading behaviors of EFL learners that developed over time. Because of this lack of research which address those important aspects, there is a clear need for studies that examine these issues. Therefore, it is reasonable for this study to explore these aspects of reading behaviors among adult learners in an EFL context.

Research in ESL/ EFL Writing

In her seminal qualitative research, Zamel (1983) employed a case study approach to examine six advanced level ESL college students’ writing behaviors. These students were considered advanced English language learners since they had adequate experience in composition and essay writing at the university level. The students were asked to perform course-related expository writing; they were allowed to take as much time to complete the task as they needed. They were assigned to write research-oriented papers and essays related to reading materials and in-class discussions, and they were observed while composing the texts. The students were not asked to think aloud about their thoughts. Instead, the researcher observed and recorded both the students’ writing behaviors and their written work, and at the end of the study, all the students were interviewed.
The research revealed that none of the six (both skilled and unskilled) advanced students performed writing in a linear fashion. Planning took place recursively as they found more appropriate ideas and directions in expressing those ideas during composing. Similarly, revising was performed throughout the writing process. Zamel concluded that “ESL advanced writers understand that composing involves the constant interplay of thinking, writing, and rewriting” (p. 172). She also noted that whether ideas during planning were written down or not had little relation to learners’ writing skills. As the writing process moved on, the generating of ideas became consistent and recursive. Some of these students discussed their sense of audience; they considered it important to write to suit the readers’ expectation. All of them also reread their texts to see whether they accurately represented the ideas they wanted to convey.

Zamel’s students all performed multiple drafts. Generally, they spent more time on the first draft. The later drafts showed more changes of language forms than of ideas. However, the researcher found some differences between behaviors performed by the skilled students and by the least skilled student in the group: the skilled students tended to have better awareness of the recursive nature of writing. They believed that they did not have to have a complete plan at the beginning, and that they could complete their ideas later on. They were also aware of the importance of the process of making changes to meaning. They began to pay attention to revising surface level features of text only when approaching the end of the composing process.

Zamel noted that on the other hand, the less skilled students tended to pay more attention to language editing before they had completely conveyed all ideas they wanted to. The least skilled student in the group reflected that she had difficulties in planning because she felt that she definitely needed to follow her plan. The researcher noted that this student also tended to copy her first draft rather than having it revised.
In addition to exploring how these advanced ESL writers wrote, one important inquiry addressed the issue regarding “the extent to which writing in a second language affected the composing process of advanced-level students” (Zamel, 1983, p. 175). The researcher perceived that language problems did not generally affect the composing process of these students. Her perception coincided with the students’ reflections during the interviews.

Raimes (1985) focused on how unskilled ESL college students wrote essays. Eight students in a developmental writing course at Hunter College, City University of New York participated in the study, which explored their composing processes and how the specification of audience and purpose affected their composing behaviors.

The students were asked to write a narrative essay in class and think aloud while composing. To investigate aspects regarding the writers’ sense of audience and goal-setting, the students were randomly divided into two groups. The first group was assigned to write an essay with instructions that did not specify the purpose or audience, while the other group was given the instructions that specified purpose and audience.

The researcher found that these unskilled ESL students seldom made use of the topic to help generate ideas. They decided what ideas they would include in their essays at the beginning, but they did not make a list of ideas or use an outline to organize them. While composing, they generally read their text but at the levels of phrases or sentences rather than the level of larger discourse. Also, they appeared to rehearse their ideas by verbalizing them or trying them out in writing. Raimes noted that some students used this strategy to “search grammatically acceptable forms” (p.243) and to evaluate whether their ideas would suit the audience’s expectation. Some of them cast themselves as a listener of their own story. However, in general the writing of these students did not reflect really that they were conscious of the notion of readers. The specified
audience and purpose that was included in the assignment instructions did not have much impact on the students’ sense of rhetorical problem.

Among these eight students, those who had the higher scores in the pretests showed fluency in their writing while those with the lower scores had difficulties in completing sentences and moving from one sentence to another. However, the researcher concluded that language ability was independent of their “creativity” of ideas (Raimes, 1985, p. 245). Nevertheless, she noted it was hard for those who had language difficulties to express ideas as they had planned, but none gave up their writing. Also noticeable was that these students rarely produced multiple drafts for their essays. Even when they did, the content of the later drafts was not much different from the original. Raimes noted “For most part, editing and revising took place during the working out of ideas and not as a clean-up operation” (p. 246).

From the findings in the study, Raimes concluded that unskilled writers worked in ways similar to those of the skilled writers when generating ideas and language. However, she suggested that unskilled ESL writers should be provided with training on both process writing and attention to language accuracy. She recommended that they need to develop their writing expertise, which includes skills in generating, organizing, and revising of ideas as well as knowledge of the rhetorical problem. Also, they need to learn how to focus more attention on editing language forms and styles. In addition, they should be provided with adequate time for practice to develop their skills.

Cumming (1989) investigated writing performance in relation to writing expertise and L2 proficiency of young adult ESL learners. Twenty-three Francophone students enrolled in a bilingual English-French program at a Canadian University participated. These students included learners at all levels of their L1 writing expertise -- professional writers, average
student writers, or basic writers (p. 88), and were either intermediate or advanced English language learners.

The participants met individually with Cumming three times every two weeks. Each student was asked to perform three writing tasks including an informal letter, an expository argument, and a summary of a booklet. During writing, they were asked to think aloud. The researcher noted that the students’ think-alouds switched between French and English.

From the multivariate analyses of the study, findings revealed that both writing expertise and L2 proficiency were important factors affecting quality of the students’ compositions and their strategy uses in writing. However, they were separate factors. The researcher concluded that writing abilities appeared to relate to strategic behaviors in decision making, organizing, and problem-solving. The L2 proficiency was considered as an “additive factor” (p. 81) that allowed the writers to better express ideas into texts, and this affected the quality of their work. The researcher noted that it did not visibly affect the processes of composing. The task requirements also appeared to be important factors of their writing behaviors as some tasks (e.g., argumentative writing, summary writing) were more cognitively demanding.

Sasaki and Hirose (1996) investigated factors that might influence the performance of expository writing in English of 70 Japanese EFL college freshmen majoring in the British and American Studies. The factors under investigation included L2 proficiency, L1 writing ability, writing strategies in L1 and L2, metaknowledge of L2 expository writing, past writing experiences, and instructional background (p. 137).

In addition to writing the assigned essays as part of the study, other information was obtained from questionnaires, the scores from the Comprehensive English Language Test for Learners of English (CELT) (p. 143), and the scores from the test of metaknowledge on English
expository writing (p. 145). For the writing tasks, the students were given a prompt and were asked to compose one essay in English to express their opinions about the given topic, and another version in the native language. These two tasks were performed one week apart.

Major findings from the quantitative analysis revealed that L2 proficiency, L1 writing expertise, and metaknowledge were all significant factors in L2 writing. L2 proficiency especially had the most influence on the students’ writing performances. The researchers also noted that L1 writing expertise appeared to enhance L2 writing after the students’ L2 proficiency “has surpassed a certain level” (p. 156). Their metaknowledge (e.g., knowledge about organization, style, sense of audience) was not adequate to enhance their writing performance.

The findings from the qualitative analysis revealed that skilled EFL writers were more concerned with the overall organization before and while writing in both L1 and L2 than were unskilled writers, and skilled writers wrote more fluently in both languages. The researchers noted that a lack of L2 proficiency among unskilled writers resulted in less concern with the overall organization of their texts. However, students generally demonstrated little difference in their applications of revising strategies. Skilled writers also tended to have higher confidence and better metacognitive strategy of self-assessment. Also, generally they had more prior experience than their peers in writing beyond a paragraph level from high school.

Bosher (1998) explored the writing processes of Southeast Asian ESL post-secondary students. The study focused on aspects writers attended to and the strategies employed during writing. The results of three from the total of eight participants were reported. These three students were in an academic language bridge program for refugee/ immigrant students in the open-admissions college of the University of Minnesota (p. 209). The course these students were taking was a content-based course of reading and writing for academic purposes. At the same
time, they were taking other reading and writing courses equivalent to those required for the freshman level.

For the main task of the study, the students were asked to read an article and write their opinions about the topic. While the students were writing, they were videotaped. After completing the writing task, they were asked to recall of their thinking processes from selected parts of the video. Also, they were interviewed about their writing processes.

The first student, earning the highest score of the writing task in the study, appeared to write as she had planned and referred to the overall plan during writing. Also, she integrated her personal experience appropriately in her essays. She was well aware of the element of coherence in writing and was concerned about the issue of fluency of expression. She paid close attention to the content and elements of the rhetorical organization (discourse) while composing. The researcher noted that this strategy enhanced the quality of her work. Also, she used many useful strategies for problem-solving and was able to solve most problems that occurred during writing.

The second student, who earned the lowest score of the writing task, neither applied the planning strategy before beginning to write nor while composing. Her essay was very much influenced by her personal experience. Instead of paying attention to global organization, her primary attention was focused at the local level (e.g., connection of sentences). This student did not pay attention to goal-setting. And, although she was more concerned about the language aspect rather than other strategic aspects of writing, her attention was only at the levels of words or clauses. She was able to use few strategies and could not solve many problems she encountered during composing.

The third student, who earned a score in between those of his peers, paid great attention to the task requirements and the teacher’s expectations. He used his notes from reading to help
generate ideas and he referred back to the article while writing. Like the first, proficient student, he was concerned about the content of the text he produced, and he consistently attended to goal-setting during composing. However, he focused less on organizing ideas and also tended to pay more attention to the language issues. Overall, he was able to use strategies successfully in his writing.

The researcher concluded that writers with higher performances had more metacognitive awareness and demonstrated their metacognitive strategies to enhance their writing to greater extents than the writer with lower performance. However, the researcher observed that although these three students were considered to have similar level of language proficiency, they demonstrated different weaknesses and strengths in their writing expertise.

Sasaki (2000) investigated EFL learners’ writing processes. In particular, the writing behaviors of expert writers compared to novice (both skilled and less skilled) were examined. The investigation focused on their strategy use, writing fluency, and the quality of their written texts.

The expert writers were four Japanese professors of applied linguistics. The novice writers were eight Japanese college freshmen. None of the novice writers (the students) had much L2 writing instruction. The novice writers were further classified as skilled or less skilled writers based on their composition scores from a task they had been required to take prior to the study. These students were given English writing instruction for one semester, as part of the study. The instruction included meta-knowledge about writing and writing strategies (e.g., goal-setting, planning, revising, rhetorical problems, sense of audience, monitoring). Their performances before and six months after the instruction were also compared.
All expert and novice writers were asked to write two argumentative compositions, one before and another six months after the instruction (provided to the students). The results revealed that the expert writers spent more time on global planning while the novice writers spent less time on it at the beginning but stopped to think about it more frequently during composing. The researcher speculated that expertise in global planning was a skill that might not be developed effectively over a short period of time. After six months of learning how to write, the students began to use some of the expert writers’ strategies. Regarding the issue of their English language proficiency, the researcher concluded that “L2 proficiency appeared to explain part of the difference in strategy use between the experts and novices” (p. 259).

Thus far, various aspects of commonalities and differences regarding the ESL/EFL writer’s strategic knowledge and behaviors have been revealed. Therefore, it is of interest to me to explore whether the EFL students in this present study would share any of strategic behaviors as evidenced among learners in the above studies.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes how this research was conducted. The discussion covers the (a) research design, (b) entry and site description, (c) participants, (d) roles of the researcher, (e) data collection/ data sources), (f) instructional procedures, and (g) data analysis.

Research Design

The main purpose of this study was to explore and describe Thai EFL university students’ awareness/ knowledge and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in English reading and writing during a five-week period of explicit instruction in strategy use. As learner behaviors can be observed to a certain degree and their thoughts about learning can be accessed only through their verbalizations, a qualitative approach to research of this nature is warranted (Berg, 2004; Creswell, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). In particular, the case study design involves the process of gathering information that allows the researcher to concentrate on a particular subject or group of subjects to understand their behaviors caused by the interaction of various factors. This process eventually enables the researcher to produce a holistic description of his or her understanding of the behaviors being studied (Berg, 2004). I therefore considered this approach most suitable for this study as its purpose is to understand the participants’ learning behaviors intensively and extensively. This research method has been employed in various previous research studies that focused on inquiries into the learners’ cognitive behaviors including self-perceptions of their own learning process and performance (e.g., Ferrara, 2005; Hosenfeld, 1979, 1984; Raimes, 1985; Rorschach, 1986; Ruiz-Funes, 1999; Zamel, 1983).

This study included four case studies of Thai college students. I decided to choose two participants who were students with high proficiency and two participants with low proficiency
so that the general trends of their strategic behaviors in English reading and writing could be identified. The four cases were selected from students who enrolled in the five-week course I conducted to fulfill this research project. To allow myself to have opportunities for constant observation and interaction with the participants in order to gain insight into what the data would reveal about their learning behaviors, I decided to take on the role of participant observer through my role as the teacher of this course. (More details are provided in the “roles of the researcher” section.)

The data collection and subsequent analysis were mainly based on the information gathered as that the students verbalized their thoughts about their own behaviors after reading or writing activities (i.e., oral reports in pair discussions and interviews, and written reports in daily journal entries) and during reading or writing activities (i.e., think-aloud tasks during reading and writing homework assignments). Through the triangulation and analysis of data from these major sources, I derived various themes regarding these students’ learning behaviors in relation to their strategy use in their English reading and writing. From these emerging themes, I further developed related conceptual constructs.

Entry and Site Description

Before this study began in 2005, I had contacted the Department of Foreign Languages at Kasetsart University in Bangkok, Thailand where I had taught English classes for approximately eight years. I had their permission to offer a course for English reading and writing instruction (to fulfill this research study) during the five-week summer semester of the university between March and May in 2005. Therefore, this study took place in the EFL classroom setting of the course called English for Social Sciences.
Participants

Through the regular class registration system of the university, fourteen students enrolled in the course English for Social Sciences. On the first day of the class, I informed the students that the course would be conducted for the research study, and they could drop the course if they chose not to participate in the study. After they were informed about the nature of the course, the purpose of the research study, and the benefits I expected them to gain from the course, all the students agreed to participate in the study. This was a mixed group including four male and ten female students; most of them came from the Department of Social Sciences. Prior to joining this class, these students had taken two required Foundation English courses that taught grammar and language use, reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. Some of them had also taken one or several elective English courses after having completed their foundation courses.

In the first class session, the fourteen students were given an Information Letter in lieu of the informed consent for human subjects (Appendix A). After that, I asked them to complete the Background Information Form. I designed it to gain general information for student profile and it included an inquiry about any previous English courses they had taken and the final grades they had earned from those courses. They also completed a portion of the reading comprehension section of the TOEFL® Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and a researcher-created Test of Reading Strategies as pretest measures for this research project. The purpose of these pretests was to establish criteria for selecting four students to be the case study participants. Based on their grades from previous English courses and the result of the pretests, two students of high proficiency and two of low proficiency were selected.
Roles of the Researcher

For qualitative research, participant observation is important in order that the researcher can have opportunities for constant observation and interaction with the participants in their environment (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Specifically for this study, firsthand observation provided me as a participant observer with a good understanding about the contexts in which the students’ learning behaviors occurred. This helped ensure more comprehensive interpretations of those behaviors.

Nevertheless, when the researcher (as a participant observer) also has to perform another role (i.e., in this study the role of teacher), there is a concern that the credibility of observation and analysis can be affected. Regarding this issue, Isakson and Boody (1993) pointed out both the advantages and disadvantages for the study when the researcher also has to take on the role of the teacher. They noted some positive aspects from their experience. Being in the classroom allows the researcher to be very aware of what is taking place. While leading the students to engage in learning activities, the researcher can get to know the students’ feelings and attitudes more easily. In addition, researchers and teachers normally have similar kinds of questions and reflections. However, being involved in “a sustained and intensive experience with participants” (Creswell, 2003, p. 184) can also lead the researcher to have biases that may affect his or her analysis. To avoid this shortcoming, Isakson and Boody (1993) suggest that the researcher should explicitly articulate his or her rationale in making decisions about different procedures of the study and be clear about his or her interests, values and beliefs. Asking questions such as What did I do? and Why did I do it? and trying to rely on multiple sources of data and methods of analyses can help decrease any biases.
Bearing these pros and cons in mind, I decided to take on the roles of researcher as participant observer and the teacher in this study. However, except when giving students the instructions and training about the procedures of activities for the data collection, I did not emphasize my role as a researcher in the classroom, so the students generally recognized me as a “normal” teacher. My observations of their learning behaviors were performed in a naturalistic manner. Also, because they were informed from the very beginning that different abilities in expressing their thoughts during discussions, think-aloud tasks, and reflections in daily journals about how they performed their reading and writing would not affect their grades, the students did not appear to have any concern about this issue later on. With these positive circumstances, I considered that my role as a researcher should have a minimal effect on the students’ learning behaviors. At the same time, my role as a teacher should also have minimal influence on the reports they made about their learning. And, as the focus of the study was on the participants’ cognitive behaviors of which most information could be obtained from their verbalized thoughts collected from multiple sources of data (which will be described later), the information obtained from my own classroom observations served only as additional, supplemental data to those major sources.

As the teacher, I gave mini-lessons in English reading and writing focused on raising students’ awareness of how to use strategies to enhance their reading comprehension and writing performance. I introduced cognitive and metacognitive strategies, discussed and modeled how to apply them in reading and writing. After the mini-lessons, I provided the students with opportunities to work on reading or writing tasks so that they could practice using the presented strategies. At the end of each teaching session, I facilitated the class discussion about what they had learned from their reading or writing practice. On class days that were designated for
students to have practice activities only (in which students mostly worked in pairs), I took on the role of a facilitator monitoring, participating in their discussions (when necessary), encouraging them to use the taught strategies, and giving them feedback. (More details about activities are in the section of Instructional Procedures.)

Having an opportunity to stay close to the students in the classroom during the five weeks of this research project, I found the various advantages I had expected for the procedures of data collection and analysis; my experience supports the positive view of taking on the two roles in this kind of study as suggested by Isakson and Boody (1993). First, my continuing observations in the classroom helped me gain a good perception about individual students’ personalities as learners, their attitudes about learning English literacy, and the perceived development of their learning performance during this course. This observable information served as valuable contextual clues for my analysis. Second, as the teacher and facilitator, I had an important role in introducing knowledge to the students, giving them motivation for learning English, and providing scaffolding for their learning development. This role was very important to establish a good rapport and trust with the students. This positive relationship allowed the students to behave naturally in the classroom and to reveal their perceptions and attitudes about their learning behaviors without having to worry about any negative consequences. I consider this circumstance to have made a contribution to the trustworthiness of data for the analysis.

Nevertheless, regarding the issue of data collection, some minor disadvantages should be acknowledged. Due to the fact that I had to teach, facilitate the students’ learning activities, and build up a positive classroom environment, I certainly had limitations in making detailed field notes during class time. However, I was able to make analytical memos about the students’
behaviors and developing learning abilities that I perceived when I responded to their daily journals.

After the five-week period of the class, I continued in my role as a researcher/investigator to perform all the procedures of data arrangements (e.g., classification, transcription, reduction), analysis, and reporting on findings of the study.

Data Collection/Data Sources

Based on the research questions and the design of the case study, various methods of data collection were chosen to explore the participants’ awareness and application of learning strategies in reading and writing.

Data Sources Collected Before Instruction

As mentioned above, in the first session of the course, I asked all fourteen students to fill out the Background Information Form. Then, they completed the reading comprehension section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and the Test of Reading Strategies.

Background Information Form

This form solicited basic demographic information such as name, age, year of study, major field of study as well as previous English courses the students had taken prior to joining this class and the grades they earned from those courses (Appendix B).

TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Test One)

Test One of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) was used as a pretest measure of the students’ English reading proficiency. The test consists of 50 multiple-choice questions mainly for assessing reading abilities in identifying topics, main ideas and details, using context clues, and making inferences.
Due to the fact that these students had never taken the TOEFL test before, in order to ensure that they were able to complete a large portion of the test, they were given 90 minutes to take the test instead of 50 minutes as normally allotted (See Appendix C for materials for the pretests and posttests).

**Test of Reading Strategies (Form A: Pretest)**

The purpose of this test was to obtain an overview of how well the students could use strategies during the reading process. In this test, the students were required to read an English passage of approximately 500 words. They were instructed that while reading they had to work on the tasks of making predictions, previewing and skimming, identifying main ideas, identifying the organization of the text, generating questions, note-taking, summarizing, using context clues, and analyzing and making inferences. I designed this test and piloted it with a group of Thai college students prior to this study. In this study, in order to gain information about whether the students had previous knowledge of reading strategies, the students were allowed to complete the test with no time limit. Students were also allowed to answer in Thai on some sections in order to remove any barriers to their expression of ideas. A rubric was used for scoring this test (See Appendix C for materials for the pretests and posttests).

**Data Sources Collected During Instruction**

Following the introductory day (described above) the instruction began. Most of the data sources were an integral part of the daily instructional events. The descriptions of these data sources and how they were collected are as follows:

**Audiotapes of Student-Student Pair Discussions**

In addition to the fact that pair discussion is a kind of classroom activity that promotes constructive and cooperative learning behaviors, it was chosen as one main type of classroom
learning activity in this study due to two reasons. First, as it was designed to follow shortly after the students’ silent reading, I considered that the verbal reports the students would make about their learning behaviors, perceptions, and attitudes would consist of “memory for sequences of heeded thoughts” that should allow me (as the researcher) to have reliable information about the participants’ “cognitive process on a par with other type of data” (Ericsson & Simon, 1987, p. 46). Although pair discussions in the revision sessions for writing tasks did not take place directly after the writing process was completed, the participants were still able to concentrate on reporting ideas regarding their tasks because they did not have too many peers to interrupt their discourse. Also, their discourse would be mostly complete and understandable chunks of utterances. This would allow me to follow their ideas without much difficulty. Second, in terms of a physical arrangement for data collection, it was convenient to arrange the recording.

In the Reading Practice Session (Day 2 of each weekly unit), a pair discussion took place following the silent reading of a given selection. Students were given approximately 30 minutes to discuss with their partner about the content of the passage, what strategies they used during the reading process, and how they used them.

In the Writing Revision Session (Day 4), the students had a pair discussion at the beginning of the session for approximately 30 minutes. They did peer revising and editing: sharing their first draft of the first essay they wrote on Day 3 and having a discussion about what and how they wrote it (e.g., ideas they wanted to convey, strategies they used during the different processes of writing, problems they had encountered, and feelings about their work). This discussion was taped. After the discussion, students wrote their second draft. During this time, they took turns having conferences with the teacher, but this conference was not taped due to time constraints.
The Reading and Writing Connection Session (Day 5) was originally designed for the students to have opportunities to discuss what relationships they perceived about strategy use in reading and writing and how they used that knowledge. However, the discussions on this topic did not take place every week as planned, due to two reasons. First, the students showed signs that they tended to repeat the same ideas as they had discussed in the previous week and felt they could not generate many ideas on this topic. Thus, I decided to include this topic in interviews 2 and 3 instead of having it as part of classroom activities. (However, I still encouraged them to include it in their discussions whenever they had ideas about it.) Second, they preferred to have this portion of the class time for peer editing and revising the first draft and completing the second draft of their weekly homework assignment (from Day 4). Nonetheless, the discussion during pair activities on Day 5 of each week was taped. While the students were writing their second draft, each took a turn at having a conference with the teacher but there was no audiotape recording.

It should be noted that to help students overcome difficulties in talking about their thoughts regarding their performance with their reading and writing (since I had noticed that students in the two pilot studies experienced this kind of problem), I provided the students with some guidelines for the discussions on strategy use. However, most students in this study used them only in the early weeks. After they had learned the general concepts of what should be included in their discussions, they were able to perform spontaneously.

To gain the most accurate information possible about the students’ thoughts, I allowed them to have all discussions in Thai. Then, those of the four cases were transcribed. The information expressed in their native language helped ensure the credibility of the analysis.
Audiotapes of Think-Aloud Protocols

Ericsson and Simon (1987) have noted that the data from the think-aloud protocols can be a major source that allows a researcher to gain the most accurate understanding of their participant’s thinking process because the cognitive information is released while he or she is performing the actual task. Thus, it yields information available in short-term memory. Besides, the think-aloud protocol elicits the most comprehensive report of thinking behaviors (as compared to other techniques).

A number of previous studies about learners’ cognitive behaviors in reading (e.g., Afflerbach, 1990; Block, 1992; Hosenfeld, 1979; Steven, 2002; Sugirin, 1999) have employed the think-aloud technique. In writing, Arndt (1987), Cumming (1989), and Raimes (1985) among others used the think-aloud protocol analysis. In response to the debate of whether a think-aloud performed while composing will obstruct the writer’s normal thinking process, Raimes’ study supports Ericsson and Simon’s view that it does not appear to interfere with the composing process. These researchers conclude that it is a useful tool for accessing the writer’s thinking behaviors.

Due to the advantages of the think-aloud technique, I chose to include it in this study to gain more complete information regarding the students’ thoughts about their awareness and applications of the strategies during their reading and writing processes. Thus, a greater credibility of the analysis should be ensured.

After the Day 4 class of each weekly unit, the students had reading and writing homework assignments. The four students who were selected as the case studies were required to perform think-alouds in Thai while working on these assignment tasks. These think-aloud protocols were audio-taped and transcribed. The framework for the think-aloud task was adapted
from that suggested by Ericsson and Simon (1984, 1987) and the pause protocols designed by Cavalcanti (1987) as illustrated below.

Prior to having the four cases perform their think-aloud tasks, I provided them training. The students had an opportunity to listen to the tapes I had recorded of my own think-alouds while reading short paragraphs of a passage and while writing a short essay. Then, we discussed them and I modeled the procedure once again. After that, the students were given a short passage to practice their own think-alouds with until they felt that they could do it on their own.

The instructions for the think-aloud task during reading were:

   a) Read each paragraph aloud. (This task was aimed to familiarize the students with the content of the text. The second purpose for the read aloud was so that the researcher would be able to locate the student’s place in the text when the audiotapes were transcribed.)

   b) Read the same paragraph silently and pause whenever you feel that any kind of thoughts about your reading come to your mind.

   c) Think-aloud (verbalize) your thoughts in Thai (e.g., thoughts about what you think about your reading, what you will do with your reading, and why and how you will do it.) You can even “I don’t understand it, but I don’t know what to do.”

   d) Continue your reading and pauses for the think-alouds until you finish the paragraph. Repeat all of these steps with every paragraph throughout the passage.

Similarly, the students were also instructed to perform the think-alouds while writing the first draft of their essays (similar to the instruction in step C of the think-aloud task for reading).
Checklists of Reading and Writing Strategies

I had designed the reading and writing strategy checklists and used them in the two pilot studies, and then I modified them for this study. In each practice session, the students were required to complete these checklists identifying the strategies they had applied during reading and writing. These checklists were aimed at being an instructional instrument for raising the students’ awareness of strategy use as well as supplementary data sources (Appendix D).

Daily Journals

Each day the students were required to write a short journal entry about what they thought they had learned from their reading and writing practices, the peer discussion, and the conference with the teacher. Also, the students expressed their attitudes and feelings about their achievements and problems in the development of the two skills, this learning approach, and the daily learning environment. They could choose to write in Thai or in English.

Students’ Written Work

Both classroom and homework written assignments were collected to be part of the evaluation of the students’ reading and writing performance throughout the project. These assignments included note-taking, written summaries, and drafts of essays.

Field Notes

During the twenty-five sessions of classroom activities, I made observations of the students’ learning behaviors and wrote field notes and analytic memos as situations permitted. Analytic memos were also made when I responded to the students’ daily journals.

Audiotapes of Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviewing has been recognized as a powerful method that helps researchers access information about how participants come to their actual learning behaviors and perceive their
own behaviors (Burg, 2004). With this rationale, for this study, I chose to include the interview technique as one main method to obtain information from the participants.

I had designed the interview framework and questions following Burg’s guideline of the semi-structured interview (2004), and these questions were tried out in two pilot studies and refined for this study (See Appendix E for interview questions). Each interview consisted of predetermined questions and topics related to the research questions. The questions were generally asked in consistent order. In some situations, I probed with further questions based on the participants’ answers to draw more complete information. It should be also noted that I had translated the interview questions from English into Thai in order to maintain consistency of their content because the interviews were conducted in Thai.

Three interviews were conducted with each student at different points of the study: the first interview in the first week, the second interview in the third week, and the third interview in the fifth week. All interviews were held outside of class time. Each interview took approximately twenty minutes. The first interview consisted of questions about the background information of the students’ experiences in reading and writing both in Thai and in English, their attitudes about reading and writing in both languages, and their awareness of strategy use in previous reading and writing. The second and third interviews consisted of similar sets of questions about the students’ strategy uses in reading and writing, self-evaluation of their own reading and writing performance during the period of this study, and their attitudes toward the teaching/learning approach employed in this course.
Data Sources Collected after Instruction

TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Test Two)

Test Two of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) was a parallel form to Test One (used as the pretest). Test Two was used as a posttest measure of the students’ English reading proficiency after the last class was completed and the scores compared with the pretest scores (See Appendix C for materials for the pretests and posttests).

Test of Reading Strategies (Form B)

The Test of Reading Strategies (Form B) was a parallel form to the Form A used as the pretest. Form B was used as a posttest measure of how well the students used reading strategies after they had practiced applying them during this five-week research project. The students took this test after the last class was completed. The same rubric employed with Form A was also used for scoring this test, and the scores were then compared (See Appendix C for materials for the pretests and posttests).

Instructional Procedures

Prior to this study I had conducted two pilot studies to gain experience in conducting a research study using a case study approach, especially with the context that in addition to being the researcher, I also performed the role of teacher. Also, as part of these pilot studies, I developed the instruments (i.e., interview questions, the checklists of reading and writing strategies) and ensured their reliability prior to employing them in this study (Appendix F).

Reading Strategies Taught during Teaching Sessions

In the sessions that focused on teaching reading (Day 1 of the weekly unit), for the mini-lessons I selected one or two reading passages to read with the students. The lessons normally
began with a conversation about their background knowledge of the topics. Then I introduced various strategies they could apply during reading, including how to identify the organizational pattern of the passage and how to apply this knowledge of text structure during reading. I explained and discussed why and when to use each strategy and how to use it effectively. Also, I demonstrated my thinking process during the reading of the first few paragraphs to the students. After modeling and having the discussion, the students continued to read the rest of the passage silently making attempts to use the taught strategies in their reading. At the end of these sessions, the whole class discussed how they comprehended the passage and how they used those strategies. In the following session (Day 2), the students were provided with another passage to read individually. Then, in pairs, they had a discussion on both content and strategies they had employed. Similar to Day 1, the whole class discussed at the end of the session.

The reading strategies presented included previewing, skimming, locating main ideas and supporting details (identifying importance vs. non-importance), making predictions, using knowledge of text structure, using background knowledge, using context clues, generating questions, note-taking, summarizing, drawing inferences, and analyzing (Anderson, 1999; Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991; Irwin, 1986; Palincsar & Brown, 1984).

**Writing Strategies Taught during Teaching Sessions**

In the sessions that focused on teaching writing (Day 3 of the weekly unit), I introduced the concepts that good writing consists of planning, of writing multiple drafts, and of reviewing. Various strategies for planning (goal-setting, thinking about rhetorical problems including the prospective audience, generating ideas, drawing information, and organizing ideas), composing a draft, and reviewing (revising ideas, editing the language, and evaluating the overall task) were presented (e.g., Harris & Graham, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1979, 1980 a & b; Hillocks, 1986).
With teaching procedures similar to those employed in the reading sessions, my explanations and our discussions focused on why and when to use each strategy and how to use it effectively. I modeled my thinking process of applying planning strategies for an essay. The students also joined in the planning process of the modeled task. Then, they each wrote an extended essay of their own topic. In the following session (Day 4), in pairs, the students performed peer revisions and editing on their first draft, and then they individually wrote their second draft. While writing the second draft, each student had a conference with me.

**The Instruction of Metacognitive Strategies**

I introduced concepts of metacognitive strategies as an integral part of the discussions and modeling of how to regulate the strategic behaviors in reading and writing. I encouraged and guided the students to think about their goals and interests. The concepts of problem-solving, and self-monitoring and evaluating their comprehension and writing performance were also introduced and discussed.

**Class Meetings**

Daily class meetings were designated primarily as a Teaching Day or a Practice Day. The teaching and practice activities were performed in five weekly units. The learning activities in each session lasted for two hours. There were five sessions during a week.

For the purpose of clarity, the activities of the five days in the first unit are outlined below (It should be noted that audiotape recording for data collection was conducted on the days that pair discussions took place and homework assignments were given: Day 2*, 4*, 5*).

**Day 1 (Teaching Day)**

**Instructional Focus:** Strategic reading

**Strategies Taught:** Previewing, making predictions, finding main ideas, skimming,
using text structure strategy, using background knowledge

Materials: Expository passage (compare and contrast -- Reading Passage 1)

Activities: 1. Teacher introduced the strategies, discussed with students and

   provided modeling. (The teacher and students worked on some
   paragraphs together.)

   2. Individual silent reading: The students continued working on the rest
   of the passage.

   3. Class discussion: The students discussed the content of the passage and
   the reading strategies they had applied in the passage.

Day 2 (Practice Day)

Practice Focus: Strategic reading

Materials: Expository passage (compare and contrast -- Reading Passage 2)

Activities: 1. Individual silent reading: Students applied the strategies learned in
   Day 1 in the new reading passage and worked on the assigned task.

   2. Pair Discussion*: The students discussed the content of the passage
   and the strategies they had applied in the passage. They compared
   tasks with their partner.

Day 3 (Teaching Day)

Instructional Focus: Strategic writing (An extended essay)

Strategies Taught: Planning (goal-setting and thinking about rhetorical problems,

generating and organizing ideas, collecting data) and composing a

draft

Materials: The reading passage on Day 2 was chosen as the source of information for the
teaching and practice of the writing task.

Activities: 1. Teacher introduced strategies for planning and composing a draft of a persuasive essay. (A handout of a guideline for writing a persuasive essay was provided.)
2. Teacher and students experimented with the planning process for a modeled task.
3. Students derived ideas from the reading passage and set a topic for their essay.
4. Each student planned and wrote the first draft of the essay.

Day 4 (Practice Day)

Practice Focus: Revising the first draft (Writing)

Materials: The first draft (of each student) from Day 3

Activities: 1. Teacher introduced ideas about reviewing strategies (e.g., revising, editing, evaluating).
2. ST- ST pair discussion*: peer revising and editing of the first draft.
3. Students wrote the second draft.
4. ST- T conference: While students were writing their second draft, each took a turn to have a conference with the teacher.

Homework Assignments*: Students worked on one reading and one writing task.

Only the four students who were selected as the case studies performed the think-aloud tasks*.

Day 5 (Practice Day)

Practice Focus: Raising awareness of the connections between reading and writing
strategies

Materials: The reading passages and the two extended essays the students had completed as classroom and homework assignments during the week.

Activities: 1. Pair discussion*: Students discussed about
   a) Their homework (e.g., the reading passage and the draft of their essay).
   b) What connections they perceived between reading and writing strategies, and how they used that knowledge in their reading and writing during practice in this unit.

2. ST- T conference: While the students wrote the second draft of their homework essays, they took turn to have a conference with the teacher.

(See Appendix G for the Course Syllabus)

Materials

Reading Selection and Supplementary Materials

The grade records showed that the majority of students who had been enrolled into the “Foundation English” courses at Kasetsart University were at the intermediate level. Therefore, reading materials at the intermediate level were chosen for the instructional and practice activities. Since this course was offered to students from the field of social sciences, the reading selections generally covered the topics in this content area. The lengths of the reading passages ranged from approximately one to two pages.

Seventeen reading selections were used during this five-week course (See Appendix H for a list of titles of the reading selections). Generally, three reading selections were used each week, one passage for the Teaching Day (Day 1), one passage for the Practice Day (Day 2), and a third passage for the homework assignment (Day 4). These three passages shared the weekly
pattern of text organization (e.g., compare and contrast, description, cause and effect, problem-solution, and collection). The students also used these reading passages as sources of information for their extended writing tasks (e.g., summaries, essays, dialogical journals on the topics related to the ideas they had learned from the reading passages). In addition to these reading selections, handouts and worksheets for reading and writing tasks were provided.

Checklists of Reading and Writing Strategies

As mentioned, the initial purpose of providing the Checklists of Reading and Writing Strategies was to raise the students’ awareness of strategy use. In each session, the students used the checklists to identify the strategies they had applied in their reading and writing tasks. Also, the information gained from their records was used as supplementary data for the analysis.

Guidelines for Discussions on Strategy Use

As previously mentioned, to help the students overcome the difficulties of the discussions on strategy use, guidelines for the discussions were provided (Appendix I).

Data Analysis Procedures

The interpretive approach of content analysis was employed for the four case studies (Berg, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994) in this study to explore and investigate the verbal reports about their thoughts, and to interpret and describe the case study participants’ learning behaviors regarding their awareness/knowledge and application of strategies in English reading and writing.

The framework of this study was based on the existing theoretical concepts of knowledge of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use for reading and writing processes (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Brown et al., 1994; Carrell et al., 2001; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Dole et al., 1991; Garner, 1994; Harris & Graham, 1996; Hartman, 2001; Hayes & Flower, 1979, 1980 a and b;
Flower & Hayes, 1994; Hillocks, 1986; Irwin, 1991; McGee & Richgels, 1990; Paris et al., 1994; Pressley et al., 1987; Schraw, 2001; Stolarek, 1994; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991; Williams & Colomb, 1993). To explore and investigate what Thai EFL university students know about strategy use and how they use their strategies during reading and writing processes, I applied procedures of top-down data analysis by using the existing theoretical concepts as the framework for the processes of coding and deriving themes (Berg, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). To illustrate, based on the two main theoretical themes or “deductive categories” (Berg, 2004, p. 273) of knowledge of strategy use for reading and knowledge of strategy use for writing, I asked the four major questions: a) What did the participant report about understanding and using each individual strategy?, b) In what circumstances (contexts or conditions) was the strategy applied during the reading/ writing process?, c) How effectively did the participant perceive he/ she had used the strategy, and how effectively did he or she appear to use the strategy? , and d) How frequently was the strategy applied? In addition, I set a list of the preliminary deductive categories and subcategories of reading and writing strategies. Codes were assigned to these categories (See Appendix J for the framework of investigation and preliminary categories of strategies).

From this broad framework, I began to perform a single case analysis. In each case, I examined the data from multiple sources focusing on the participant’s behaviors regarding his/ her awareness and application of strategies in reading and writing. I undertook the coding process, classified the coded data, derived “inductive themes” (Berg, 2004, p. 273), and made connections of data in order to identify the phenomena of the learner’s behaviors under each theme. Through these procedures, interpretations were made and meaningful theoretical constructs were derived (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin,
From the findings of each single case study, I further developed the cross-case analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) to investigate the broader phenomena of these four EFL learners’ behaviors in regard to their common knowledge, use, and control of strategies in English reading and writing. I also identified the general commonalities among the four participants and the differing natures of learning behaviors between the high-proficiency and low-proficiency learners. From the connections of constructs I had derived through the cross-case analysis, I identified major findings in response to the three research questions of this study. In relation to these findings, I made attempts to suggest both their theoretical implications and implications for practice.

Single Case Analysis

In the following sections, I describe the details of the procedures of data reduction and analysis.

Segmenting the Data from Each Source into Units of Analysis

The major data sources yielding the derived themes regarding the participants’ learning behaviors included the transcripts of their discussions with peers, of think-aloud protocols, of interviews, and their written daily journal entries. Other documents (e.g., field notes and analytic memos, students’ records from the checklists of strategies, their written work, results from posttests) were used as the supplementary sources. After reading and rereading the major documents, I began to segment the text into units of analysis. As the framework of the think-aloud task was designed (as described), a unit of analysis of a transcript of each reading task was segmented by a paragraph in the reading passage. For other documents (i.e., a transcript of a writing think-aloud task, a discussion (with peer), an interview, or an entry of a daily journal), a unit of analysis was on an idea unit basis. For example, when a conversation or a reflection in the
think-aloud task or the journal changed from one topic to another, I separated them into different units.

The Process of Coding

Within each unit of analysis, when the student’s awareness and/or application of a strategy (or strategies) in reading or writing was evidenced, I assigned a code for the preliminary category of an existing strategy that I had set for guiding the investigation. In addition, some new categories of strategies were derived from the data. While assigning the codes to the data, wherever I perceived any kind of connections or conditions of the learner’s strategic behaviors, I made an analytic memo. This open coding process was undertaken in all transcripts and documents of the major sources.

To ensure the credibility of the coded data after I had completed my open coding, I had approximately 30% of my data from these major sources coded by two intercoders. That is, the transcripts of the discussions, think-aloud protocols, and interviews of two participants from the four cases (one of high-proficiency learner and one of low-proficiency learner) that had been recorded from Weeks 1 and 3 learning activities were given to them. One intercoder (who was an expert in English reading education) performed coding for the data on reading behaviors, and another (who was an expert in English writing education) performed coding for the data on writing behaviors. I provided them with a list of definitions of the strategies I had set as preliminary categories and also invited them to suggest any emerging categories. When they had completed their coding, we had discussions to clarify categories we had assigned to the data. Using the formula suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), the numerical percentage of agreement indicating intercoder reliability was 80%. Miles and Huberman also suggest that it is beneficial for the coded data to have internal consistency of reliability. Therefore, I had also
performed this intra-coding checking during my own coding process until I was certain that my coding system was reliable.

**Drawing Connections and Deriving Themes**

After all the data had been coded, I began to investigate the occurrences of identified learning behaviors, to classify, and to connect the related categories together. In addition to classifying the coded data, I also displayed the frequency of occurrences of each strategy across five weeks and made notes of the contexts in which a given strategy was identified. This process of classifying and connecting coded data identifying the strategies within the context of application enabled me to derive the themes in relation to *purpose* of strategy use. In other words, with this thorough investigation, I derived overall levels of categories or themes of purposes of reading or writing strategy use. (Please refer to these categories of *purposes* in the introductory part of the detailed reports on findings in chapter 4.) Under each thematic category of purpose for reading and writing strategy application, my investigation in relation to the four major questions at the beginning of the analysis enabled me to explain the phenomena of evidenced behaviors in three dimensions: a) the dimension regarding the participant’s awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application, b) the participant’s ability in converting knowledge into effective application, and c) the regularity and substantiality of strategy application.

**Looking for the General Meanings**

Within the above procedures of classifying, making connections, and deriving themes and dimensions from the phenomena of behaviors, I conducted further analysis of looking for the general meanings of related phenomena of behaviors to derive more conceptual interpretations.
As a result of my analyses, I was able to describe and present conceptual interpretations on each participant’s knowledge, use, and control of strategies during reading and writing in English.

Cross-Case Analysis

I performed a cross-case analysis in order to gain more insight into the larger phenomena of Thai EFL university students’ behaviors in regard to their understanding, use and control of strategies in reading and writing. To derive the broader constructs at the level of cross cases, I employed two cross-case analysis methods suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994): a) the partially ordered displays using the partially ordered meta-matrix, and b) the conceptually ordered displays using a content analytic summary table or construct table. These methods enabled me to develop more powerful descriptions and explanations of the phenomena of these four EFL students’ behaviors.

Partially Ordered Displays

Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that this method helps assemble the descriptive data from different individual cases into one common standard format. This process assists the researcher to see the picture of all relevant data conclusively. With this methodological concept, I drew all major descriptions of phenomena of strategy use illustrated by the four individual participants and assembled these descriptions using this partially ordered meta-matrix.

Conceptually Ordered Displays

Miles and Huberman (1994) explain that this method helps the researcher view and determine how the different cases share similar characteristics. At this level of display, the researcher can focus on the content of the data regardless of the reference to which case it comes from.
Based on the major descriptions of phenomena I had displayed under the partially ordered meta-matrix, I identified similar characteristics of the four participants’ reading and writing strategy applications (regardless of cases) and interpreted them into the more conceptual summaries and displayed these derived concepts using the content-analytic summary or construct table. I also identified the characteristics that were common only between the high-proficiency participants or low-proficiency participants.

From the derived conceptual summaries, I present findings from the cross-case analysis. In addition, I make connections of findings in this study with the findings and derived constructs from previous research studies. The connections of the constructs I present in this study and existing related constructs, principles, and theories should ensure a greater degree of credibility of the interpretations of the analysis of this study.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research is to conduct case studies to explore and describe Thai EFL university students' awareness and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies when reading and writing in English. The data for the study were collected from four students, selected from a larger group of fourteen, participating in this project over the five-week summer semester, 2005 at a public University in Bangkok, Thailand. These four students (three females and one male with pseudonyms – Uma, Orawan, Pailin, and Tongchai) were chosen as the case study participants according to the records of their prior English language and reading proficiency and from their academic profiles and the pretests of reading proficiency. Therefore, two students of high proficiency (Uma and Orawan) and two of low proficiency (Pailin and Tongchai) were selected. It should be noted that the students’ writing ability was not used as criteria because most of them had only minimal practice of writing in English before joining the course.

The three questions guiding this study were:

1. What cognitive and metacognitive reading and writing strategies do Thai EFL university students report understanding and using?

2. How do they use strategies during the reading and writing processes?

3. Having been exposed to explicit strategy instruction in a process-oriented reading and writing context, how do the learners perceive the connections between reading and writing strategies and how do they use that knowledge in their reading and writing?

The findings are based on analyses of the triangulation of data from multiple sources (as described in chapter 3) both verbal and written. Overall, learners reported and verbalized about their own behaviors regarding strategy use in reading and writing in the classroom context (pair
discussions and interviews), during their self-study hours for weekly homework assignments, (think-aloud tasks), and in their daily journals. In addition, data from other sources including the participants’ daily records of reading and writing strategy checklists, written work, and posttest results were also instrumental to the analyses.

To investigate the data in order to answer the first two questions, I set the framework for examining their strategy use in relation to the perspectives of declarative, conditional, and procedural knowledge of reading and writing strategies. I had four fundamental probe questions to guide my processes of individual case analysis: (a) What did the student report about understanding and using each individual strategy?, (b) How frequently was the strategy applied?, (c) How effectively did the student perceive s/he had used the strategy, and how effectively did s/he appear to use the strategy?, and (d) In what circumstance (contexts or conditions) was the strategy applied during the reading and/or writing process?

With the applications of various related qualitative methods and procedures (as described in chapter 3), the preliminary analyses of each individual strategy led to further analyses of the larger categories of related strategies. Analyses of the participants’ behaviors regarding their strategy use allowed me to perceive various facets of their progress. I will describe their reading/writing behaviors from a larger framework of ‘purpose of strategy use’. Within this big framework, I will describe three major aspects of the strategy use under the following headings

1. Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application (What strategies were employed, and how, when, and why they were applied for a particular purpose?).
2. Converting knowledge into effective application.
3. Regularity and substantiality of application (How frequently during this five-week course and to what degree were the strategies applied within a single reading task?).
In the following sections, I will first begin with descriptions of the four individual case studies regarding their reading strategy use. Second, I will present the overall phenomena across the four cases and the derived concepts. Next, descriptions of their writing strategy use (following the same format as reading behavior descriptions) will follow. Lastly, the composite findings from the four participants in response to the third research question regarding the participants’ awareness of relationships between reading and writing strategy uses will be presented.

Prior to revealing the participants’ thoughts during reading and writing processes, it is of interest to know their background as readers and as writers (both in their first language and in English) before enrollment in this course. Furthermore, my ongoing observations of their characters as learners (as revealed in my classroom observation field notes and interviews, and as reflected during think-aloud tasks and daily journals) will also add to the sense of how and why they appeared to develop their awareness, their use and control of literacy (reading and writing) and their learning (metacognitive) strategies in their own unique ways.

Case Study 1: Uma

Uma’s Background

I chose Uma as one of the case studies because her academic profile identified her as one of the high English language learners among the fourteen students in the class. Prior to joining this course, she had completed several English courses for her minor field of study. These included a Foundation English Course, English Writing I, Communicative English for Career, and English Listening and Speaking I. She earned grades of B and C in these courses. At the beginning of this research project, she took two pretests: Test One of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and The
Test of Reading Strategies (Form A) that I developed for this project (See Appendices C & D). She scored 56% on the reading section of the TOEFL test (28 of the 50 items correct) and 84.62% on the Test of Reading Strategies (with 22 out of 26 correct). After she had completed the course, she took the parallel forms of the two tests (Test Two of the former and Form A of the latter), and she scored 60% (30 of the 50 items correct) on the TOEFL reading test but 100% on the Test of Reading Strategies.

**Uma as a Reader before the Course**

In the first week of the semester, using a set of semi-structured questions aimed at getting to know her, I interviewed Uma before starting the five-week observation process. Uma said that she did not like to read books much; she preferred to look at the illustrations. However, she preferred to read more from electronic texts (Websites) than traditional printed texts. In Thai, she preferred to read expository texts such as documentary articles in which the authors also expressed their views so that she could react to their opinions.

She read much less in English, and she considered vocabulary (rather than grammatical structures) problematic—a major obstacle to her ability to master comprehension. She always needed to rely on a dictionary, and this caused difficulties in comprehending the text and improving her reading fluency.

Uma could not report much about what knowledge of reading strategies she had acquired. However, she noted that she perhaps used some strategies in her previous reading habits (e.g., skimming, previewing, and making predictions) without much awareness; she had never deliberately thought about using them systematically.
Uma as a Writer before the Course

In Thai, Uma enjoyed writing more than reading. She loved writing in diaries to express her feelings and ideas. When working on academic writing assignments, she often made plans for her essays but not always in the forms of outlines or graphic organizers as she learned in this course. Usually, when she wrote her essays, she did not do multiple drafts, but she added and changed ideas and contents of her work recursively within a single draft. Thus, when she came to the end of the work, she considered it finished without any thought or need of a second draft. However, she did not considered herself as having any problems in writing in her first language.

For English writing, she had taken an English writing composition course before, but she felt that she did not have many opportunities to express her views in her composition work. Most of the time she needed to pay attention to following the models of sentence and paragraph patterns taught by the teacher. Thus, she was not very well aware of how to process her writing or how to generate ideas for her essays. In addition, owing to her constraint of vocabulary knowledge, it was hard to compose efficiently to elaborate her ideas and express her feelings.

Uma as a Learner

During the five-week summer semester that Uma was in my class, I saw her as a highly motivated, ambitious, and strategic learner. It appeared to me that she came to class with a strong intention that she would be able to improve her skills in reading and writing in English. Although she appeared quiet during the first week, she seemed to keep thinking what she should do with her reading and writing tasks. With this goal, she was very attentive to practicing how to use reading and writing strategies during the mini-lesson sessions and the practice sessions in the class. She was also active and had clear purposes in her discussions with peers. When she had conferences with me (as the teacher), she knew what she wanted from my feedback. I saw her
become more and more confident in sharing her views about the readings and her essays with her peers.

Uma had an analytical mind. When she was introduced to some new reading and writing strategies, she always made a decision about whether she would make use of any of them, and when she decided not to use a certain strategy, she would always have a reason for it. With her critical mind, she always read and wrote following her opinions.

In addition, with her good sense of self-monitoring and evaluation and her ambition to become a proficient reader and writer, Uma always looked for her weaknesses in the two skills and had a positive view of improving them. At the same time, she could also identify what she could do well. With her good self-monitoring skill and with the knowledge of strategy use she learned in the class, I sensed that she was able to regulate her learning style effectively since I could see her improve her reading and writing performance at a satisfactory level. In the last interview, at the end of the course, she revealed her positive attitude when stating that by knowing more strategies in reading and writing, she believed she should be able to even better her reading and writing in English with more on-going practice. I viewed Uma as an independent learner of great potential.

**Uma: Awareness and Application of Reading Strategies**

Similar to the investigation in the other cases, the framework of the display and discussion on Uma’s reading behaviors is based on the four major purposes of cognitive reading strategy use derived from findings: (a) probing strategies, (b) elaborative strategies, (c) consequential strategies, and (d) problem-solving strategies. In addition, the metacognitive strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation will be included. Based on the four fundamental probing questions for analysis (as stated in the beginning of this chapter), Uma’s reading
behaviors will be described in three major aspects in relation to each purpose of strategy use. These include (a) awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application, (b) converting knowledge into effective application, and (c) regularity and substantiality of application.

**Probing Strategies**

Probing strategies included the strategies that Uma used to build her comprehension of the main ideas of the paragraphs and to identify the overall important information of the passage in both the first and second read-throughs of her single reading task.

**Awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Uma learned that in order to understand a reading passage, she could begin her reading by making an initial survey to gain the big picture of the passage. In addition to her previous knowledge about skimming for the general ideas, she also became aware of looking for the organizational pattern (e.g., compare and contrast; description, cause and effect, collection) and the rhetorical structure of the passage (e.g., persuasive, descriptive, argumentative, journal). She reported that several strategies could lead her to gaining this big picture before she would look for more details of the passage. These strategies were previewing, skimming, making predictions, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, using background knowledge, and note-taking.

Before moving on to actually deal with the passage, making predictions and previewing helped her to form tentative ideas about what she was going to read. She predicted and previewed from the topic, title, and introductory paragraph. She also previewed the beginning of each paragraph, headings and subheadings, and textual clues (e.g., highlighted words/phrases, connectors). In addition, she perceived that the two strategies were interrelated in that one enhanced the other. For example, when she could not make predictions from the topic, she tried previewing first and then tried making predictions again. She felt that although she had not
applied previewing actively in the early weeks, her skill of this strategy became more active and spontaneous in the later weeks. In her previous reading habits, she neither made many predictions nor systematically previewed, but in this class she felt her applications of these strategies were more purposeful. They helped her gain an initial picture of the passage better than before. In the second interview she reflected:

In the past, I had not previewed like this before I began to read. I just read every sentence and I felt like everything was important or sometimes I got lost easily. Knowing how to preview helped me see the overall picture more quickly, so I could tentatively anticipate the contents of what I was going to read….I knew what I should focus on….Making predictions made me read the passage more purposefully….At the beginning, I didn’t use it much, then I tried it and I felt happy that it was really useful. Since then I always use it. [Int 2- W3]

Similarly, Uma noted that her applications of previewing and skimming were not totally separated. Skimming was one of the strategies she had learned before, but she had not known exactly how to use it effectively, and she had not used it regularly. Previously, she normally read every single word, and when she encountered a vocabulary problem, it discouraged her from and unmotivated her to continue her reading. In this class, knowing how to preview and skim, she learned to process her initial reading more efficiently. She realized that she did not have to know all the words. Additionally, she knew how to use other supporting strategies to help make her skimming more effective. In the third interview, she reported:

Now I feel I can see the big picture of a passage more efficiently. This helps me understand what I read better than before…and when I can tell what the main ideas are, it’s easier to understand the details…. Having opportunities to read often helps a lot. In the past, I didn’t read much and didn’t think about how to read….Now, when I see the topic, I automatically make predictions and anticipate the contents….If I can also tell what type of passage it is, I will know what I should anticipate and in what direction I can predict. I try not just to read every sentence, word by word. In the past, sometimes when I got stuck at one point, I began to worry, and then I lost very easily….Since I have learned how to read, my reading skills have changed a lot. [Int 3- W5]
During her first reading, she normally paid attention to finding main ideas and learned to skip or did not focus on the details of a paragraph. Moving along the passage, she looked back and forth to connect main ideas between paragraphs; on some occasions, this led her to the overview of the organizational pattern and rhetorical structure of the passage, and vice versa. Uma noted that when she had limited time to read a passage, she would focus on previewing and skimming, and if the text structure was clear to her, she used her knowledge of it to help find main ideas.

Uma also used her background knowledge to enhance the identification of the main idea during and after skimming. In fact, she seemed to employ this strategy more spontaneously (less consciously) in connection with previewing and making predictions. Evidence in the think-aloud protocols indicated that she regularly connected the ideas she learned from the text to her knowledge from other subjects and her personal experience, but she rarely commented on the strategy during the peer discussions. In the second interview with me, she noted that in the mini-lessons, she learned that using background knowledge to connect with the text would enhance her comprehension process; however, she cautioned that this was true for her only when her schema corresponded with the ideas presented in the text. Otherwise, her different schema could make her misinterpret the text. Her reflection upon this attitude was as follows:

Teacher: While reading, how much did you link the text with your background knowledge?

Uma: I did. But sometimes I had different background knowledge from what the author said in the passage. Then, I had a conflict…and I was not sure about what I understood. I thought sometimes my background knowledge might make me misinterpret the text….So, I used it more in my writing.

[Int2- W3]

After identifying main ideas, Uma also took notes, and note-taking in turn helped strengthen or confirm her understanding of the overall ideas. In the early weeks her notes were quite long, and
it showed that she still included copying parts of the original texts (as she had practiced before). She felt it was hard to make good notes when the passages had too many details. However, from the second week Uma had practiced making an outline or creating a graphic organizer. With the teacher’s modeling of how to make good notes, she gradually developed this skill using the two techniques most of the time. She felt that using outlines and graphic organizers helped her see the big picture of the passage better than just writing her underlined sentences or phrases down. Moreover, it enabled her to take notes during reading. From week three, she was able to take notes mostly in her own words. In the excerpt below, she described how she made progress in this skill:

Teacher: Can you describe how you took notes?
Uma: In the first two sessions, I wrote very long notes. Then, after I had learned how to use a graphic organizer and make an outline for important ideas, I felt better. I liked to use a graphic organizer to help take notes.
T: Did you do it during or after reading?
U: During reading. You showed us how to do it, so I tried. While I was reading, I tried to connect my concept map….I tried to have my own key word for each paragraph and then connect them. Sometimes I could not do it well. I have to practice more. But I can do it much better than at the beginning [of the course]. [Int 2- W3]

In sum, knowing how to use various strategies for probing not only helped her perceive the big picture of the passage, it also enabled her to move on more easily to reading the passage in detail.

Converting knowledge into effective application. In examining the nature of how the participants converted their knowledge into application, I had established three categories to classify the possible trends of their progress: (a) Good awareness/knowledge developed into effective application; (b) Knowledge applied but with less consciousness; and (c) attempts made to develop knowledge into application, but hindered by difficulties along the continuum of
progress. (These categories were used to describe this aspect of strategy use of the four case studies.)

It was evident that after Uma had learned useful probing strategies, she made attempts to employ them in her reading. As various phenomena from her actual applications of strategies and her reflections of her strategy use were observed, I perceived that her comprehension during probing reading was dependent on her overall ability to orchestrate related strategies to tackle the text in a given context. For instance, as she had mentioned, when she read a passage with difficult vocabulary, she struggled with her skimming (although she tried to skip details). However, in the contexts where she was able to use previewing more effectively and to employ context clues or background knowledge to help identifying main ideas, not only did her skimming become less problematic, her concern about unknown vocabulary lessened. Also, she found that it was quite hard to determine the general ideas when the organization of the passage was not very clear to her. In such situations, if she tried to use note taking to help make connections between ideas, she could gain a better overview of the contents and the passage structure. An example of her reflection about this kind of situation is clear in the excerpt of her pair discussion with her peer below:

When I skimmed the passage, I just had rough ideas about Einstein… more or less as I had predicted…but I still had problems because there were so many words that I didn’t know. However, I already knew about the history of his life, which helped a little. …I also tried to use context clues to help figure out some words. I just looked for the main ideas first and tried to take notes. Then, I reviewed my notes and the main ideas in those paragraphs to see what I could add. [Dis- W2D2]

It was also obvious that in addition to her declarative knowledge, her procedural and conditional knowledge greatly influenced her decisions of strategy application. For instance, because she perceived the benefits of predicting (from topics), previewing, identifying main ideas, and note-taking which eventually led to her effective skimming, she made attempts to use
them more often, and such attempts in turn promoted the effectiveness of their applications over time. On the other hand, because Uma had the perception that background knowledge helped her only in the contexts where it corresponded with the ideas in the text, she generally seemed to use it less often. Similarly, she did not apply the text structure strategy substantially during this surveying phase (despite the fact that she knew it was a useful strategy) because she felt some passages did not have a clear organizational pattern.

In sum, when Uma had a positive perception of the roles of the introduced strategies, she did seem to effectively develop her knowledge into application. In contrast, when she was uncertain about their benefits, her knowledge of those strategies was not converted into applications to any great extent. However, at the end of the course, she asserted that knowledge of various new strategies enhanced her understanding of the big picture of the passage, and this eventually made her become confident and have a positive attitude towards reading in English.

**Elaborative Strategies**

Elaborative strategies refer to strategic behaviors that Uma used to expand her understanding beyond the main ideas of the passage. These included for example, the understanding of details and clarification of meanings related to the main ideas of the text.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** After Uma had gained initial comprehension of the important information, she moved on to do her second reading to attain understanding of the details of those main ideas she had identified. There appeared several strategies that she employed for this elaborative purpose. The strategy of identifying details was applied in connection with analyzing text structure, making predictions, generating question, and using background knowledge.
She reported that when reading details of paragraphs in the early weeks she did not often use prediction as a strategy. However, she developed her awareness of it and made more attempts to apply it when approaching week three since she had already begun to perceive its usefulness when applying it during the skimming stage. In addition, she found that when a passage had a clear organizational pattern, she could use her knowledge of text structure to guide her predictions throughout this (second) reading process. Also interestingly, her predictions occurred more frequently with the compare and contrast and cause and effect passages than with the other types of text.

On the other hand, her strategy of using background knowledge was employed less frequently since she felt that it might mislead her in her understanding of what the author presented in the text (as her reflections illustrated above). Because of this concern, she tended to rely more on what was literally stated. Similarly, Uma seemed to have a conflicting/ambivalent attitude about using the strategy of generating questions. She revealed that at the beginning of this course, she did not apply this strategy much since she was afraid that the questions she had generated might lead her to ideas irrelevant to the text. But with the teacher’s encouragement, she began to practice using it and agreed that it helped her to interact with the text and to understand it better. However, instead of generating the WH-questions to lead her to search for further specific information (as she had learned from the mini-lessons), she still tended to raise only general questions of “What is next?” or “What does this really mean?” She also felt that generating too many questions still might lead her to confusion. The following excerpts illustrate both her positive and negative attitudes about this strategy use:

Teacher: When you skimmed or read in detail, did you generate any questions?
Uma: Yes, I made some while skimming; when I read in detail I made more questions. In the past, I hadn’t made questions and I had not thought before that it was
important. I just followed the story as the text said…. At the beginning [of this course] I didn’t get why we needed to generate questions because it might lead us to something else not related to the ideas in the article. So, I just read as the text said. But when I’ve tried it, I feel it helps me understand the passage more easily, and I can have some new ideas clearer comprehension?. [Int 2- W3]

In her daily journal in Week 5, she wrote:

I didn’t understand the passage I read today very well….I couldn’t identify the main ideas, so it was hard to guess what the article was about. I tried to ask questions ‘What is it?,’ ‘Who,?’ and ‘How,?’ but I couldn’t arrive at t the answers, so I couldn’t take notes. Perhaps, asking too many questions, I made myself confused. [DJ- W5D1]

It is interesting to note that since Uma had to deal with more text while reading for details, language difficulty appeared to be a significant issue for her strategy use and comprehension. Uma revealed that new vocabulary, unfamiliar styles of writing, and (less often) the complexity of sentence structures lead to her ineffective comprehension of details. When encountering such language difficulties, Uma used strategies such as context clues and rereading to help regain her understanding, and she seemed to be more intent on using these supporting strategies. (See the detailed discussion in the section on “problem-solving strategy”. ) However, because she could now generally differentiate between important and non-important information, she was no longer so concerned when she failed to comprehend minor details as long as she could understand the general ideas of the passage. This was a change from her previous attitude. In the second interview, she commented:

I think my reading has improved though it’s still not the best….Now I know that when I have a problem, I can skip that part first and then come back to read it later. I can still understand the passage doing it this way. Some words are also not very important, so it doesn’t matter if I don’t know their meanings. If I can understand the passage, it’s OK. [Int 2- W3]

In short, while some strategies (e.g., making predictions, text structure strategy) played positive roles in enhancing her elaborative reading, her applications of other strategies for
making clarification and elaboration (e.g. generating questions, using background knowledge) occurred more sporadically with more hesitation and less consistency. As a result, she was not very confident in her comprehension of the details of some passages that she considered difficult.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** I examined Uma’s progress in this aspect of strategy use from the same categories I have classified in the preceding section. It appeared that her preconceptions about strategies influenced her practice of strategy application in elaborative reading.

When Uma did not have a negative preconception of a certain strategy, she tended to apply it actively. She reported that she was satisfied with her application of making predictions because it enhanced her interaction with the text; this resulted in a positive impact on her overall understanding of the passage in detail, over time. For other strategies (e.g. using background knowledge, and generating questions), two phenomena emerged. First, despite her uncertain beliefs of their values, Uma still wanted to try them to a certain extent; however, she experienced difficulties in mastering them. She noted that the effectiveness of the applications of background knowledge and of generating questions were dependent on the context of the text. On some occasions, the two strategies helped her to create better understanding while they caused problems on others. Second, at some points during reading, the applications of these strategies just emerged with seemingly little consciousness or without deliberate intent.

My hypothesis about these trends of behaviors is that her procedural and conditional knowledge of the strategies and her awareness of their values were still not at the optimal level. As a consequence, they did not foster extensive and effective applications. Additionally, Uma also perceived that her ability to comprehend the passage in detail depended on the level of language difficulty of the text. Overall, she was less confident in her comprehension of the
details as compared to the satisfaction of her comprehension of the general ideas. However, it should be noted that when she understood the passage in detail well, she appeared to be more analytical in her reading. In short, despite her positive potential in reading skill development, the difficulties she experienced in applying certain elaborative strategies on some occasions seemed to prevent her from generating higher-level thinking during this reading process.

Consequential Strategies

Some strategic reading behaviors occurred only after Uma was able to construct meanings within the text at a given point during her reading process. These strategies were beneficial because they helped confirm her comprehension and enhance her elaboration and expansion of ideas. I classified those behaviors as consequential strategies as they were only possible after she had constructed enough meaning. These include summarizing, making inferences, and analyzing.

Awareness/ knowledge of the strategies and context of application. In the mini-lessons in the course, Uma learned that the three strategies, namely summarizing, analyzing, and making inferences could enhance the process of effectively constructing meaning. Evidence of her oral summarizing could be regularly observed when she discussed, with peers, the reading passages she had read. Generally, she began her discussion with her recall and a brief summary of what she understood from the passage. However, the think-aloud protocols did not reveal frequent occurrences of this strategy during reading. In some tasks where this strategy was applied, it took place after she had finished reading a paragraph or at some point after she had read a few paragraphs before moving on to the next part. Analyzing ideas from the text and expressing opinions (e.g., agreements and disagreements) also generally took place in such contexts. Occasionally, these strategies seemed to take place more spontaneously. However, where she
appeared to make attempts to generate questions or connect the text with her previous knowledge and experience in order to analyze some of the ideas she had comprehended, she seemed to be more conscious of her applications of the strategy. The two excerpts of the think-aloud protocols below illustrate the contexts in which the two strategies were applied more spontaneously vs. more consciously respectively:

Protocol 1: [TA- W1D4]

After Uma had read three paragraphs in a reading passage, she appeared to spontaneously summarize ideas by making connections between those paragraphs. Also, she tried to analyze the text to see if she could find ideas she had predicted and to see what the following paragraph would include.

After finished reading paragraph 1, she said:
I really want to know what this story is about….But it says that men and women have different brain structures….It’s hard to tell more from the introduction. I think it’s about their brains…brain and gender.

After paragraph 2:
From paragraphs 1 and 2 together, I’m still not sure, but it seems to tell about different skills that they are good at, for example…

After paragraph 3:
Coming to this paragraph, ideas seem to be clearer. He tells about men’s and women’s different ways in learning things…OK, it’s about their brains…but how does it deals with sex, he doesn’t say much here, perhaps in the next paragraph….Let me take notes first.

Protocol 2: [TA- W2D4]

After reading the second paragraph of a passage, she made a reflection indicating more consciousness of her strategy use:

From the second paragraph, I can summarize that the ideas are about the character of our king regarding his duties for his people. Because of his character, he is a hero of the Thai people….I think many points here are true….I don’t know the exact meanings of the words “fellow” and “dedicate”, but I can understand the ideas…. I think it’s not very important [to get the exact meanings of the words].
Although Uma did not seem to be attentive to her oral summarizing performance, because the tasks in the course focused more on written summaries, she reflected more on her performance of writing a summary. She commented that although she learned how to make a written summary and had a concept of the proper format of a good summary, she had difficulty in paraphrasing and developing skill in writing a summary (due to the limitation of her language proficiency). In addition, with a long reading passage, she was uncertain about how many supporting details should be included to support the main ideas she had summarized.

For making inferences, Uma learned that constructing meanings between lines would help a reader develop greater degree of comprehension, but she found it hard to apply this strategy. She noted that without relevant background knowledge, it was hard to think about the implications of the text or to make further interpretations. Although the teacher’s modeling helped her to have a better concept of how to make inferences, she was still too uncertain to apply it for fear that she would make a wrong interpretation. This led to less frequent application of the strategy as evidenced in the think-aloud protocols. However, in the second and third interviews, she revealed some aspects of attitudes about this strategy use:

Teacher: During reading, have you thought about the author’s intention?
Uma: Not much…. But I sometimes agreed or disagreed with the ideas the author said in the passage; sometimes I thought about why he thought that way…
T: When we practiced making inferences, did you find it difficult and how much have you used it?
U: (When we did it in class), it was not very difficult. But I had never tried making inferences before, so when I began to try it, I was afraid that I would make wrong interpretations…Sometimes if my experience was not like what was said in the passage, then I misunderstood it. [Int 2- W3]

Uma: I haven’t done much inference making…. Normally I agreed or disagreed after I had finished the passage. I didn’t often make further interpretations unless it was clear to lead me to do that…. But I think I could tell better why the authors thought the way they did, and I also had my own views when I read….I felt it was fun. [Int 3- W5]
Converting knowledge into effective application. In the second interview, to my question of how she perceived the role of summarizing on promoting reading comprehension, she revealed that when she realized that she could make an oral summary of the passage to her peers, it seemed to confirm her understanding of the text. However, because she was not confident in her written summaries (despite her good understanding of a reading passage), overall she did not perceive that it helped foster her comprehension much. In the think-aloud task of writing a summary in week five, she still indicated her concern about the quality of her work. In short, Uma’s procedural knowledge (of how to produce a good written summary) and conditional knowledge (whether and/or when her written summary would enhance her overall comprehension) was uncertain. In the second interview, she reflected:

Teacher: Did you think writing a summary helped you have a better comprehension in reading?
Uma: It should help, but for me it doesn’t help much…Sometimes, what I wrote led to an incorrect summary. Note-taking is better and easier. [Int 2- W3]

In the revision session of the first draft of her summary writing in week 5, she demonstrated a situation in which she was uncertain about how to make a good written summary:

In my notes, I got eight meanings of kissing. Kissing in different countries and examples. When I wrote the summary, I was not sure whether it was too detailed. … I’m a bit confused now…. Should I combine these points? If so, I’ll get six or seven main ideas. Or should I separate them?  [Dis W5D5]

Regarding her abilities in analyzing and making inferences, she felt that in the early weeks, she did not really practice interpreting the author’s views. Instead, she tended to express her opinions and agreements or disagreements with ideas literally stated in the text. Nevertheless, since she had a positive attitude about this strategy, she maintained her practice of making inferences and analyzing the author’s purposes and views. She felt she could perceive the author’s views better in the later weeks. However, it was evidenced that in some reading
passages, the difficulties in understanding the text in detail prevented her from being capable of making further interpretations from the text. In other words, her language constraints appeared to impede her potential to develop further higher-level reading strategies in a consistent manner.

In sum, despite her perception that these higher-level reading strategies indicated her comprehension at any given point during reading, Uma still had some constraints in developing such skills. The negative influence from her previous reading experience and her language ability were the major causes of this limitation.

**Problem-Solving Strategies**

Problem-solving strategies refer to the strategic behaviors Uma appeared to employ when experiencing difficulties during her reading process.

**Awareness/knowledge of the strategies and context of application.** As an EFL student, Uma certainly experienced various problems during her reading process, and as she reported, her major problem was rooted in the limitation of her English language proficiency (although her language competence was higher than some other students in the class). In previous experience, her vocabulary problem occasionally led her to discontinue her reading of a text. In this course, more frequently in the early weeks, difficult vocabulary sometimes prevented her from mastering enough text to acquire higher-level comprehension.

Other factors that Uma also claimed hindered her successful comprehension were lack of discernment of the organizational pattern of the passage, unfamiliarity with the writing style, complicated sentence structures (less often), and her lack of concentration (in rare cases). Evidence indicated that she learned to make choices of strategies to help repair her understanding of the problematic text within a particular context. Her major problem-solving strategies
included rereading, using context clues, and skipping. In addition, she underlined the problematic parts and used a dictionary.

Uma used a fix-up strategy in connection with other supporting strategies. For example, when she decided to reread parts of the passage while skimming, she would preview and review the text structure again; or when she reread some problematic parts of text for specific information, she used context clues and background knowledge to regain her comprehension. It is interesting to note that although she did not seem to have a strong intention to use background knowledge as a strategy to lead probing or elaborative reading (as I have discussed in the preceding sections), she used it when it could facilitate her process of problem-solving. The excerpt of the think-aloud protocol below exemplifies this kind of situation; in this particular context, she used her linguistic background knowledge to help tackle the meanings of the unknown words and understand the paragraph:

Protocols:
What does masculine mean? I don’t know…. I guess feminine means female…. I’ve come across the word feminist, I think it means something like female. If feminine means female, masculine should mean male…. So, this sentence says “How this might influence masculine and feminine modes of thinking science doesn’t yet know…” I’m still not quite sure. Let me underline it first. And then it says “We do know, though, the brain development in the fetus is affected by hormones as well as genetics. And most of us grow up at least a little like the opposite sex.” So, the fetus’s brain develops by hormones and genes. And this makes male and female thinking different. [TA-W1D4]

Using context clues was applied as the word-attack strategy. Her clues included linguistic clues (e.g., knowledge of synonyms, derivatives, connectors) and textual clues (e.g., paragraph structures, connection of key words). She reported her change of reading habit from relying more on a dictionary to applying more of this strategy.

While rereading and using context clues were employed in order to increase the understanding of the problematic text, skipping seemed to play a role for keeping the flow of the
process for meaning construction. As she noted, the language problems had often obstructed her reading process. In this course, she used skipping some problematic text to solve this problem. However, most of the skipped parts were revisited except when she perceived that it did not yield negative consequences to her overall comprehension of the passage.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** From her comments and recalls, it is clear that Uma could both identify her problems in English reading and make decisions about how to handle her problems well in most situations. As a result of her good skills in problem-solving (together with her progress in applying other strategies), she no longer gave up her reading when encountering language problems. At the end of the course, Uma concluded that she had became more confident in her ability to solve her reading problems, and this feeling helped lessen her concern about language difficulty issue in her reading in English.

Approaching weeks 2 and 3, Uma felt her application of using context clues improved. In week 5 she asserted that the effective use of this word-attacking strategy contributed greatly to her understanding of main ideas and details. However, she noted that when the text was too difficult, even though she used context clues, she could not attain good comprehension.

In her daily journal in Week 3, she reflected:

```
Today I read The Morals of Chess. I tried to find the causes and effects. I previewed all of the passage and got some idea that there were many good effects when you played at chess. But I couldn’t understand the details because there’re a lot of difficult words. I used context clues, but I couldn’t guess the meanings. It was really hard to guess. [DJ- W3D2]
```

Also, Uma considered her application of rereading effective since it helped her regain understanding of the passage and correct the misunderstanding she had had. On some occasions, it even enabled her to perceive the author’s views better and became more analytical. Although
Uma did not directly evaluate on her skipping strategy, she regarded it as a useful device to help maintain the flow of her reading.

In conclusion, Uma demonstrated a good awareness of this metacognitive strategy, which developed into effective application over time. Also, it is also worth noting that the strategies of skipping the problematic text and rereading were used without having been introduced in the mini-lessons in the course. I hypothesize that these strategies might be spontaneously transferred from her reading habits in her first language.

**Self-monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**

Self-monitoring and evaluation strategy refers to learning behavior that Uma displayed regarding how she regulated her reading performance. In this part of the study I focused on describing and examining her metacognitive awareness in relation to her applications of reading strategies.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Uma’s application of self-monitoring and evaluation strategy was observable during the five weeks. Uma noted that she perceived the benefits of writing and reviewing her journals to see the changes of her reading performance. Each week, she could track her changing reading habits and their consequences.

She looked at her reading in several aspects. First, she monitored and could identify factors that enhanced or hindered her comprehension. Second, as she developed her knowledge about reading strategy use over time, she became more attentive to the monitoring and evaluation of how effectively she had used those strategies to foster her comprehension. She could evaluate both the positive and negative impacts of different strategies on her comprehending process. Also, she noted the importance of the teacher’s modeling of the thinking process of how and when to apply certain strategies. Last, She could delineate her overall reading performance and
tell what she had improved (e.g., identifying main ideas, skimming, note-taking, identifying
details, using context clues, analyzing) and what were still the weak areas that she needed more
practice on (e.g., generating questions, making inferences, summarizing). At the end of the
course, she reflected that her knowledge of reading strategies helped her became less concerned
with the problem of language difficulty in reading over time. Overall, she perceived herself to
have become more strategic, analytical, confident, and motivated when reading in English.

In the third interview at the end of the course, she revealed:

I feel very good that I see my improvements…. Now I have become more analytical; I
Have my own views when I read a passage…. When I have problems, I can solve them
better than before….I can also tell what strategies I should improve…. I want to
improve more….I have a good motivation in learning English now. In the past, I didn’t
have confidence. I wanted to improve my skills, but didn’t know how. [Int 3- W5]

Converting knowledge into effective application. Regarding the issue of learning to read,
because self-monitoring and evaluation is a strategic metacognitive behavior, I considered the
effectiveness of its applications from the view point of the learner’s perceived value of applying
it in relation to her development as a reader. It was evident that Uma’s great sense of self-
monitoring and evaluation turned into effective applications in that it guided her to regulate her
reading performance to better her ability in English reading comprehension.

I perceived that that in addition to the role of explicit instruction of this strategy in this
course for promoting students’ positive awareness of the strategy (through the class discussions,
teacher-student conferences, and the interviews), Uma’s sense in developing this learning skill
had also naturally been rooted in her basic learning habit in her first language.

Regularity and Substantiality of Strategy Application

Along with other aspects of the participants’ reading behaviors regarding their strategy
uses, I also investigated the nature of how actively they employed the strategies they had learned.
An overview of this phenomenon should add some interesting information to the overall picture of how they developed their skills in strategic reading. Based on one of my guiding questions “How frequently was a certain strategy applied?,” I looked at two major dimensions: the regularity and substantiality of their occurrences.

For regularity, I looked at the occurrences of application across the five weeks of practice, that is, how many times a strategy was applied. From the recordings of pair discussions and think-aloud tasks for the total of nine reading passages, I considered the frequency rate of occurrences of strategy applications from six tasks as high regularity and the rate below that as low regularity. By substantiality, I considered the frequency of applications of a certain strategy within a single reading task. High substantiality indicated four or more applications of a strategy. Three or fewer uses were considered to be where quantity does not equate with quality. The only way strategy use could be evaluated as effective was from the resulting comprehension of the reading.

Among various strategies used for the task of probing, Uma employed skimming, making predictions, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, and note-taking with high regularity while she tended to use previewing with low regularity during the five weeks. As previewing was one of the strategies she had not used before, it seemed to take a certain period of time for her to apply it in her reading. Think-aloud protocols showed more regular reflections on this strategy from week three.

When examining the perspective of substantiality of these probing strategies, I only focused on identifying main ideas and using text structure strategy because the dimension of substantiality is not applicable to the nature of other probing strategies that dealt with the global structure of the whole passage such as previewing, skimming, and note-taking. The data revealed
that while Uma worked on identifying main ideas substantially within a single reading task, her use of the text structure strategy was less substantial. However, her reflections indicated that when she applied the text structure strategy, it enhanced her reading process quite effectively. This might be due to the fact, as she reported, that she sometimes felt that the organizational pattern of some reading passages was not clear to her.

From my observations, Uma’s regular use of most probing strategies and the active use of identifying important information in a passage yielded a satisfactory degree of success for her comprehension at the macro level. As a consequence, her general comprehension of a passage at the macro level led to her further strategic reading skills of oral summarizing and analyzing. These two consequential strategies also occurred with high regularity, but summarizing appeared less substantively within a single task than did analyzing which she seemed to be very keen on and put more efforts into.

When reading for clarification and elaboration of ideas beyond what she had comprehended about the general ideas of a passage, Uma generally used identifying details in connection with other supporting strategies such as making predictions, generating questions, using background knowledge, and text structure strategy. Although all of these strategies were applied with high regularity during the five weeks, none of them were used substantially within a single task. The strategy of making predictions while reading the body of a passage appeared more substantially in the tasks from Week 3 as she began to realize the benefits of the strategy. Her conflicting attitudes about generating questions and using background knowledge seemed to prevent her from applying them extensively. Because she did not apply useful elaborative strategies very actively, Uma was not as capable in developing her skills to reach higher levels of strategic reading such as making inferences (reading between the lines or expanding ideas from
the text). This made her less confident in her higher-level comprehension although she had good basic understanding of the general ideas.

As aforementioned, Uma was a learner with a very good sense of metacognition. When she was not able to establish good comprehension of a passage during probing or elaborative processes, she put efforts into solving problems to gain or regain better understanding. Both rereading and using context clues as fix-up strategies appeared regularly and substantially while skipping problematic text was also used in some situations, but with less substantiality. Dictionary use appeared at the minimal level.

In conclusion, with her active uses of probing strategies, Uma appeared to be adequately proficient at comprehending the general ideas of passages. However, with various constraints related to elaborative reading, it led to being less strategic and less proficient at the higher-level. Nevertheless, her high awareness of her shortcomings led her to put effort into applying problem-solving strategies. Although she sometimes could not master higher-level elaborative skills completely, she could apply the problem-solving strategies sufficiently to help lessen problems and facilitate better understanding of text in as much detail as possible.

Case Study 2: Orawan

Orawan’s Background

Orawan was chosen as one of the cases since she had a record of higher English language proficiency than the other participants enrolled in the class. Before beginning the course, she had completed several English courses for her minor field of study. In addition to one Foundation English Course, she took English Writing I, English Reading for Mass Communication, Communicative English for Careers, and English Listening & Speaking I. She obtained grades of A or B in these courses. At the beginning of this research project, she took two pretests: Test One
of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and The Test of Reading Strategies (Form A) that I developed for this project (See Appendices C & D). She scored 62% on the reading section of the TOEFL test (31 out total of 50 items correct) and 76.92% on the Test of Reading Strategies (20 out of 26). After she had completed my class, she took parallel forms of the two tests (Test Two of the former and Form A of the latter), and she tested on both: 68% (42 of 50 items correct) and 96.15% (25 out of 26) respectively.

Orawan as a Reader before the Course

In the first interview in the first week of this course, Orawan told me that, in Thai, she liked reading books for pleasure, and on average she read two novels per week. Also, she read social sciences textbooks for her major field of study. She did not read much in English, but she usually read the Reader’s Digest journals in the bilingual English-Thai version and was able to finish the whole book within a short time. She had a good attitude toward assigned reading in English. She enjoyed reading assigned articles if they were not too difficult.

When asked to describe her previous reading habits and talk about how she read both in Thai and English, she said that when she read in Thai, she usually began by reading the introduction of the book to understand the author’s background and his or her purposes in writing the book. Then, she made a decision whether she wanted to read the selection. In contrast, when reading textbooks, she read in detail even in the first reading and did not take notes because she did not want to interrupt her concentration. Then, she took notes during her second reading to help her remember the ideas presented in the texts. When she read in English, Orawan said she usually tried to figure out what the topic was about and looked for the general ideas of the text first. When she had initial understanding, she would
normally connect the text with her background knowledge. Before joining this course, she usually did not take notes during English reading because most of the assigned reading passages were short and she could remember most of the ideas presented. She said she might have employed other strategies without being aware of using them.

Orawan felt that she had problems with reading when she was disinterested in the topic. On such occasions, her reading performance was less effective. She needed to focus more concentration on analyzing the sentence patterns to understand the text, and she tended to read very differently, that is, only to get the answers for the exercise questions. When she had interest in the topics, she was able to read with more elaborations and more aesthetically, that is she was able to respond to and appreciate the reading from a more personal perspective.

When I asked whether she perceived any connection between reading and writing, Orawan said that she felt that reading enhanced one’s writing abilities. Those who read a lot should be fluent in reading and tended to write well. She explained that a writer would usually learn some new ideas from reading and become more creative in his or her writing, and s/he could learn useful ideas and phrases or idiomatic expressions from the reading texts. Those who do not read much will have a tendency to have difficulties in writing. In her words:

I think if we don’t read, we won’t be able to write well because it’ll be hard even to spell words. This is the same both in Thai and English. And we won’t be fluent in reading…. Those who read more often will read fast…. Sometimes it’s fun even just to read commercial signs…. When we read, we’ll be creative; this helps our writing a lot. We’ll get good ideas from reading; it’s not about copying, but we can get ideas… even more than from watching TV. [Int 1- W1]

Orawan as a Writer before the Course

In Thai, Orawan generally preferred reading to writing. However, she liked writing for pleasure such as writing memos to friends and writing in a diary. For academic writing, as a
junior, she had to write more research papers; she considered research-writing skills difficult. She said this required a great deal of synthesizing skill and ability in writing formal language. In her words:

Being a junior I have to write a lot of term papers. It’s not only copying from various books and putting them into one report. I need to have my own part, too. It was hard when I wrote my first report. We need time for writing a report. We need to write with the formal language, and it’s not only about cutting and pasting. [Int1- W1]

She wrote less than she read in English. For English writing, Orawan mainly wrote for assignments in English courses. She felt that because she was not very good at grammar, and this made her less confident in writing in English. She had taken an English writing class before and she learned only how to follow the prescribed sentences and paragraph patterns taught by the teacher. She noted that students did not have many opportunities to compose written work based on their own ideas and initiatives. She preferred to do writing tasks where she could feel a sense of ownership. In the first interview with me, she reflected on this:

Teacher: Did you take Writing I?
Orawan: Yes, I did. I feel like it was not fun as the lessons focused so much on sentence patterns. In fact, writing should be of our own creation. But in that course, it was more memorizing the sentence patterns the teacher taught us and then trying to use them in our essays. I don’t think it’s good. [Int1- W1]

Orawan revealed two specific problems in her previous writing experience both in Thai and English. First, it was hard to think of how to begin an essay. She reported not spending time planning her writing up front as she thought that she could revise her draft later. The other problem was she was not confident enough to have others (except the teacher) read her work for fear that they might not like it. Especially in English writing, she was concerned that her grammatically incorrect sentences would not allow her readers to understand the meaning that she wanted to convey. She even said that she would feel embarrassed if her peers thought that her knowledge of grammar was not good. I sensed that a lack of self-efficacy with writing made
her reluctant to share her writing. Despite her limited confidence in her written work, she still normally had a teacher and peers read her work and give feedback. However, she sometimes gave more weight to her own preferences, that is, she would choose to express ideas in the ways she originally felt happy with. Also, she liked to judge the quality of her own work prior to its submission to the teacher.

Orawan as a Learner

From the first interview, I perceived that Orawan had fairly high self-confidence. Her reflections on her previous reading and writing habits generally gave me a sense that she had good learning skills. She made decisions about what she wanted to learn and reflected on her own learning performance. She could tell what kinds of learning activities were useful for her or that she preferred.

During this five-week course, on the days that students had pair discussions on their reading and writing tasks, Orawan often appeared to take a lead role in the discussions. She shared how she read passages and wrote her essays with peers and was eager to know how her peers worked on their tasks. Moreover, she seemed to be more eager than most students to read her essays aloud to the class (which seemed to contrast with her earlier attitude of having reluctance to have others read her work --I assumed that my encouragement that mistakes in the classroom were not harmful to learning development helped eliminate her fear of having peers notice her mistakes). Also, she often shared her feelings and opinions on what she had learned from the reading passages or from her peers’ essays. Her enjoyment in learning English was displayed quite clearly and was derived from her feelings of success at what she had accomplished. Generally, she had confidence in her reading and writing tasks during the course. Before she began this course, as seen in the first interview excerpt below, she had expressed her
concerns about her English language accuracy limiting the quality of her written work. At the end of the course, as illustrated in the third interview excerpt, she felt that she improved her writing skills to a satisfactory level. In the first interview, she reflected:

“I’m not good at grammar. It’s OK when I read, but I’m not sure about the tenses when I have to write…. Because I’m not sure about my grammar, I’m not sure whether people will understand my work when they read it. I don’t have confidence. [Int 1- W1]”

In the third interview, she said:

“I think I’ve improved a lot in my writing. I have learned new things in writing. In the past, I never had experience in writing these kinds of things. After I’ve practiced various kinds of essays and talked to my classmates about my work, I know what essay type suits my character the best. In the past, I could not tell … just wrote and waited for the grades to tell how good my work was. [Int3- W5]”

Last, despite the fact that she did not directly discuss how she felt her metacognitive knowledge enhanced her literacy learning, from her successful reading and writing performance and the ideas she shared with peers in general, I perceived that she had good metacognitive abilities to make her a capable learner.

**Orawan: Awareness and Application of Reading Strategies**

As with the analysis procedures employed with the other cases, the framework for the data display and discussion on Orawan’s reading behaviors is based on the four major purposes for cognitive reading strategy use derived from the analyses: (a) probing strategies, (b) elaborative strategies, (c) consequential strategies, and (d) problem-solving strategies. In addition, the metacognitive strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation were included. Within each of the five strategy categories, Orawan’s reading behaviors will be described in terms of three major aspects in relation to each purpose of strategy use: (a) awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application, (b) converting knowledge into effective application, and (c) regularity and substantiality of application.
Probing Strategies

Probing strategies included the strategies that Orawan used to build her comprehension of the main ideas of the paragraphs and to identify the overall important information of the passage in both the first and second read-throughs of a single reading task.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Orawan learned not only that in order to comprehend text, one needs to gain good initial understanding of the “big picture” of a passage, but also that various strategies can enhance this reading process effectively. She revealed in the second and third interviews that her knowledge of how to use strategies had changed her reading habits. She had learned various new strategies and, more importantly, employed them more purposefully. To understand the big picture of a passage, she began to use various strategies to probe for important information. These included previewing and skimming, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, making predictions, generating questions, using background knowledge, using context clues, and note-taking.

In order to gain overall understanding of the passage, Orawan employed one or more strategies together in a given context. For example, previewing was applied in close relation to skimming and to analyzing text structure. She reported that in addition to skimming (which was a strategy she had previously known), she learned that previewing could also help create the initial picture of a passage. Thus, most of the time she used previewing and skimming concurrently to find main ideas at the paragraph level and see the connections between paragraphs in order to construct the big picture. She previewed the topic, headings, and textual clues (e.g., key words, highlighted words, connectors, and transitional words, and sentences at the beginning of the paragraphs) to gain this initial picture. She realized that her skimming was more effective because she had learned to focus on main ideas and skip details, bearing in mind
that she would revisit the details in her second reading. This made her skimming better and faster than before. Previously, her habit in reading English texts, was not to skip any part in a paragraph, and when she failed to understand some details during her surveying phase, she tended not to accomplish the overall understanding of the big picture. In the second interview, she said:

I think I can skim better than before…. First, I read only some main ideas…skip details…will come back to read them later…. and I skip complex sentences. In the past, I didn’t skip anything, then I forgot what I had read easily…. Now I can skim faster. [Int2- W3]

In the third interview, she also compared the skimming skill she had developed in this course with her previous reading habits:

In the past, when a passage had many complicated sentences, I got confused …and if it was an unfamiliar topic, I would not be able to follow the details. I would completely get lost…. Now, though some passages are difficult, but at least I know how to get the tentative ideas out of it…at least, I get the big picture…. I can also get some details, if not all. [Int 3- W5]

She reported a new understanding about text structure, that is, that each passage had its own pattern of organization and rhetorical structure. She applied this knowledge by trying to identify the text structure during previewing and skimming. When she could predict the possible pattern of the passage organization from the topic, she used this knowledge to help provide a framework for her skimming. This was a new strategy for Orawan. She reflected that when she found it hard to identify the text structure, she tended to have some difficulties in tracking ideas in the passage. In the second interview, she reflected about the benefits of the knowledge of text structure that she used in her reading:

When I skimmed I previewed first, and I predicted and looked for the pattern of the passage…to see whether it was a compare and contrast or something else. This made the passage seem clearer…I also use my knowledge about the rhetorical structures I learned in writing essays to help in reading, too. [Int 2 –W3]
On one occasion when she was doing her homework reading assignment, she had difficulty in identifying the organizational pattern of the passage, and she said:

Protocol: OK, I’ll read the passage again…but what is the real pattern of this passage? It’s not very clear. This time I’ll try to take notes and pull out the main idea of each paragraph first, then I may see it. [TA- W5D4]

In situations where she could not initially identify the organizational pattern and/or the rhetorical structure of the passage, she used making predictions and generating questions to direct her skimming. She normally made predictions from the topic connecting it with her personal experience or background knowledge. On some occasions, she could predict the author’s position or views from the topic and an introductory paragraph. Also, she predicted possible details after she could identify the main ideas of the paragraphs throughout the passage.

Her use of the text structure strategy and making predictions reinforced each other to enhance both skimming and identifying main ideas. The following excerpt from the Week 3 protocols illustrates the context in which she tried to use making predictions and generating questions to help figure out the framework for skimming:

Protocol:

From the introduction, I predicted that the author did not like the idea of using e-mail much. He seems to have the ‘cons’ ideas…. It says “not everyone is happy”, and the title is Talk to Me; this made me think that he preferred someone to talk to him, but Who? And why did he have to ask for this? Let me read it. [TA- W3D4]

Another context in which her knowledge of text structure and making predictions led to the overview of connecting main ideas is illustrated in her Week 1 reading assignment as follows:

Protocol:

When I first skimmed, I could see that it was a compare and contrast…. It was about how our brain works…. From the topic, I could predict that the article would talk about what gender our brain is. Let me see the main ideas of the paragraphs.
The second paragraph seems to make comparisons. I want to see what they will compare.

The third paragraph begins with ‘On the other hand’; this shows the contrast…. The main idea of this paragraph tells that women are better than men in general in language abilities. [TA- W1D4]

Moreover, she reflected that she used making predictions more consciously (which was different from her previous reading habit), and it made her enjoy reading more because by applying this strategy, she interacted with the text more actively. The strategy of generating questions also appeared from the beginning of her reading process. Think-aloud protocols (as illustrated above) showed she sometimes raised questions when reading the topic. When she found main ideas, on some occasions, she also raised questions for further information and prepared to find answers in the second reading. She felt that this strategy enhanced her skimming and identifying main ideas as it helped her keep good track of ideas.

Orawan appeared to place great importance on identifying main ideas. Her application of this strategy was ongoing from skimming to the second reading. During skimming, she looked for the main ideas of the paragraphs and tentatively connected those ideas. Her degree of success in identifying the organizational pattern and the rhetorical structure of the passage also affected her degree of success in identifying main ideas. In her second reading, Orawan normally confirmed her understanding of main ideas she had established during skimming, or she tried to derive those that she failed to understand during skimming. When she could identify main ideas, she then connected those ideas and developed notes. However, she noted that when a passage did not have a topic sentence, it was still hard for her to arrive at a complete or clear main idea. In the second interview she reflected:

Orawan: I still have problems in telling the main idea when a paragraph doesn’t have a topic sentence. I’m not good at this…. I can understand the paragraph, but I cannot write down the main idea in my own words well, sometimes it’s
like… not complete. I think I need to improve this skill.
Teacher: Do you think it’s not clear even to say it out in Thai or it’s hard to write it out because it’s in English?
Orawan: It’s not clear enough even in my thoughts in Thai. I think I should be able to do better than this. [Int 2- W3]

Orawan became more aware of the role of background knowledge in enhancing good comprehension. For example, in some contexts in which the topic sentences were not very clear to her, she used background knowledge to help make sense of them. In some contexts, she used this strategy to help infer the unstated main ideas. She said when she did not have background knowledge of the topic, she tended to lack interest in the article, and this sometimes resulted in having difficulties in comprehending the passage. In a daily journal, she reflected this attitude:

The article I read today was longer than the one we did yesterday, and it was also harder. It’s called The Morals of the Chess. It tells about the connection between playing chess and how we could adopt it in real life. I never play chess before, so I don’t know if it’s true or not. [DJ W3D2]

The application of context clues seemed to play two major roles during her process of probing for important information. First, Orawan used textual clues (e.g. sentence connectors) to help identify the text structure of the passage while previewing and skimming. Second, when she had to infer a main idea from a paragraph that did not have a topic sentence, she tried to figure it out from her understanding of the basic gist of the paragraph. In such contexts, where the text fitted with her schema, she tended to use background knowledge (as mentioned above) and context clues in tandem.

The last strategy that Orawan employed for probing was note-taking. She noted that she did note-taking either after or during reading. When she had background knowledge of the topic and could comprehend the text quite well, she would take notes after reading. On the other hand, when she had difficulties comprehending the passage, she would take notes during reading so that she could use her notes to help enhance her understanding. This application of note-taking
played two roles: first, she would take notes after reading an easier text to confirm comprehension and as a way of reminding herself later on what she learned. Second, she would take notes during reading as an aid to comprehension when the text was more challenging. This latter purpose was a new aspect of her reading performance.

Evidence seemed to suggest that on some occasions Orawan decided not to employ certain strategies in certain contexts during this surveying reading. First, she did not preview when a passage was very short, rather, she did her first reading in detail. Second, think-aloud protocols did not show applications of the text structure strategy when she either read a short or descriptive passage. My hypothesis is that those texts were not challenging for Orawan and did not require highly strategic reading. Third, Orawan appeared to mainly translate some short passages and did not demonstrate applications of any strategies (including identifying main ideas and details); nevertheless, her comprehension was correct. However, she used generating questions and text structure strategy to keep track of her understanding while translating the text. Last, she tended not to make predictions within paragraphs where translating was applied, but predictions between paragraphs still occurred. Two main conceptualizations are revealed by these phenomena. First, when comprehension was possible without much difficulty, fewer strategies would be employed. Orawan appeared to apply strategies only when they were needed in a particular context. Second, her translations of long passages were mostly correct despite the fact that her use of fewer strategies could be observable in such contexts. As previous researchers have noted, her behavior seems to indicate that she might have internalized those strategic applications. Many advanced readers who do not struggle with comprehension have few reasons to consciously examine their thinking process (e.g., Paris et al., 1994; Schunk, 1991; Sternberg, 2001).
Converting knowledge into effective application. Orawan’s reading strategy use over the five weeks indicated that she had successfully converted her good declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge of relevant probing strategies into effective applications for understanding important information of passages. As she reported, she learned various new strategies and learned how to improve her use of the previously known strategies and orchestrated them to master the reading at this macro level for this purpose. Her overall evaluation of her abilities in applying probing strategies during the five weeks was positive.

It is interesting to note that her high awareness of strategy uses was more likely to be observed during the pair discussions. In class, she often led the discussions and asked her peers whether and how they used certain strategies during reading. During her think-aloud tasks, there were occasions when she seemed to internalize her applications of strategies, as she did not verbalize them; nevertheless, her verbal translations of the text indicated her good comprehension of the text. In her daily journals, she seemed to prefer to make reflections on her views of the articles she had read and how much she enjoyed activities and interactions with peers and the teacher in the class rather than to consider her reading strategy uses. However, in the interviews, she revealed that one big change in her reading habits was that she knew how to process her reading more purposefully and how to read more analytically.

I can skim better…I use less time…perhaps because I know ways to read…I can decide how much in detail I need or don’t need to read it. It’s better…at least I don’t get confused. …Yeah, I’m happy with it. [Int 2- W3]

Now, I focus on main ideas first…I have a purpose in reading and I ask myself questions. This is different from my past habit…just reading…. Now, though some passages are difficult, at least I know how to get tentative ideas out of it…at least… get the big picture…I can also get some details, if not all. [ Int 3- W5]
In conclusion, Orawan appeared to consciously apply the learned strategies in most situations. The situations where she applied strategies more spontaneously or seemed to internalize her applications also indicated the effective transformation of knowledge into uses (rather than lack of knowledge) since it resulted in successful comprehension. In my observation, her ability to effectively understand the big picture had a positive impact on her second reading for elaboration as well.

Elaborative strategies

Elaborative strategies refer to strategic behaviors that Orawan used to expand her understanding beyond the main ideas of the passage. These included for example, the understanding of details and clarification of meanings related to the main ideas of the text.

Awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application. As previously mentioned, in the first reading Orawan focused on looking for the main idea of each paragraph in order to establish an initial understanding of the big picture of the passage. She skipped the details of the paragraphs and revisited them in the second reading. In her second reading, in addition to confirming the main ideas she had identified during skimming, she expected that these details would elaborate and clarify more ideas in relation to those main ideas she had identified. Thus, her attempts to establish comprehension at this stage involved understanding details and making connections between main ideas and details. In order to accomplish this meaning construction process, Orawan learned to use the strategy of identifying salient details in connection with various strategies such as using background knowledge, making predictions, generating questions, and analyzing text structure.

Generally, Orawan used background knowledge to help clarify and make sense of the details in the paragraphs. She reported that she related her background knowledge to the text
when she first read the topic. During reading, she found that some ideas were related to what she had learned from other subjects or to her personal experience, and these ideas helped her to expand ideas after she had finished reading. She also looked for answers to the questions she had raised during skimming and made further questions in this second reading. Her predictions that she made during skimming lead to her interaction with the new information in a paragraph. She said in the third interview that it was good that she became aware that she could think ahead and see whether her ideas would be found in the text.

In the past I did not know the strategy of making predictions. Now, I have ideas about it. So, (in this class) before I read, I would make some predictions, and then after I read I would see if the ideas were close to what I had predicted. [Int 3- W5]

Her applications of these strategies seemed to vary according to the type of passage. For example, making questions was less evidenced in descriptive and short passages. On the other hand, making predictions and analyzing text structure was more frequently noticed in compare-contrast and cause-effect passages. This knowledge of passage organization and rhetorical structure appeared to help her perceive and react to the author’s views more effectively. For example, the excerpt of the think-aloud protocol below illustrated her thoughts after she had recognized that the passage she was reading was a cause-effect and argumentative article:

Text:

You don’t have to use e-mail for long to realize its down side. It eliminates face-to-face conversation and everything that goes with it. Gone are tones of voices, nuance, an individuality. Gone are audio and visual clues to personality. Gone is any sense of self, replaced by text that looks the same no matter who is typing at the other end.

Protocol:

In this paragraph he has convinced that e-mail has many disadvantages…. Umm, I agree with him 100%….I think we have different hand writing styles, and we can tell people’s personalities from their handwriting….Also, when we use e-mail, we cannot
display much of our creativity…and this is my personal opinion, using e-mail to communicate is like we don’t want to see each other….There are so many things that e-mail cannot give us. [TA- W3D4]

Despite her overall effective reading performance, Orawan sometimes experienced difficulties understanding details due to some language constraints (e.g., vocabulary, idiomatic expressions). In such situations, she employed strategies such as context clues, rereading, and skipping to fix-up her reading process in order to regain comprehension of those problematic parts. (The awareness and applications of these strategies will be discussed in the section on “problem-solving strategies”). Nevertheless, because she could differentiate between important and unimportant ideas, when she failed to understand some details, she reported that she was not very worried about it if she still could comprehend the overall main ideas of the passage. This reflected a changing attitude in reading, and she felt that knowing how to skip some parts of the text helped her maintain her comprehension process more effectively.

Converting knowledge into effective application. With high language proficiency (as compared to the other three case study participants), when Orawan had good understanding of the big picture of a passage, she could move on to perform elaborative reading with relative ease. As evidenced, when she wanted to comprehend the text in detail, she was able to apply certain strategies in a given context properly and without much difficulty. These effective uses of strategies enhanced her abilities to make clarification from details, elaborate upon the main ideas she had comprehended, and connect ideas during her reading process. Good comprehension of text in detail also led to more analytical reading. Her positive feeling of her progress in performing critical reading resulted in greater enjoyment. It seemed that her perception of the benefits of the new reading strategies she learned and her awareness that reading strategically would yield better comprehension led her to apply them actively.
In sum, the performance of her reading along the continuum of her progress seemed to suggest that her awareness of strategies and their applications correlated positively. In other words, with her good declarative knowledge (having awareness of existing strategies), procedural knowledge (of how to apply certain strategies effectively), and conditional knowledge (of when and why to use them), she became more effective in her uses and controls of strategies for the elaborative purpose of reading.

Consequential Strategies

Some strategic reading behaviors occurred only after Orawan was able to construct meanings within the text at a given point during her reading process. These strategies were beneficial because they helped confirm her comprehension and enhance her elaboration and expansion of ideas. I classified those behaviors as consequential strategy use as they were only possible after she had constructed enough meaning. These strategies include summarizing, making inferences and analyzing.

Awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application It is obvious that the three strategies were applied in tandem in Orawan’s reading process. When she read each paragraph during her second reading, she summarized ideas. Normally, when understanding occurred at any point during reading, she recalled and summarized ideas between paragraphs and connected her understanding of the text with her background knowledge. On some occasions, after she summarized a paragraph, she made inferences. Generally, making inferences took place during reading (e.g., interpreting a main idea when there was not a topic sentence in a paragraph or the elaborating of meaning by reading between lines in some contexts) and after reading (e.g., further interpretation of ideas from her notes). Furthermore, she tried to relate the main ideas she could summarize to the author’s views. This seemed to feed her analytical reading process as she
reported that through these processes she thought more about the author’s purposes. To analyze
the author’s views, she also used questions to trace her ideas and interact with the author’s
messages during reading. Also, when she gained the overall comprehension of a passage, she
expressed views and opinions and expanded ideas from the text relative to her life.

Orawan reported that the knowledge that summarizing text could be helpful in fostering
reading comprehension was new to her. She learned to make both oral and written summaries.
This awareness seemed to motivate her to practice oral summarizing during reading in most of
the reading tasks. When she could summarize the whole passage, she felt that it confirmed her
comprehension. Moreover, she perceived that this oral summarizing enhanced other strategies
such as note-taking and analyzing. For instance, in one of her daily journal entries in Week 3,
which she wrote in English, she reflected:

Today I have learned a new type of article structure. This was cause and effect. We
practiced reading skill. It was a short article, but I think it was quite difficult. And
professor taught us a new strategy, which was summarizing. This strategy makes more
efficient in reading skills. For me, it also makes me improve my note-taking. I want to
practice it more, so I’ll be good at reading skill. [DJ-W3 D1]

Also, she reported that when she could make inferences, she felt she was more successful in
comprehending the text. She noted that the practice of writing down her interpretations of the
texts helped clarify her understanding of the passage. She said that she learned to be more
analytical in that she could make inferences or analyze ideas presented in the text, especially the
author’s views, and this made her enjoy reading. In the third interview, she concluded:

I like to analyze the author’s ideas. It’s like making inferences…because we have to
practice writing ideas down,…practice writing inferences and summaries in our own
words helps make things clearer…I like making inferences…We can think more than
what is said in the text… Although my written summaries might not be as good as my
inferences, it helps. [Int 3-W5]
Converting knowledge into effective application. Orawan’s applications of these consequential strategies could be observable during her reading processes for probing and making elaboration. As previously mentioned, since her surveying and elaborative reading was mostly effective, her good comprehension then promoted her higher level thinking skills when she interacted with the text. This emerging higher-level thinking in turn helped confirm comprehension. As she reported, her abilities in making inferences and in analyzing made her become more confident in her reading. These consequential strategies reinforced other strategies for probing and making elaborations as well. For instance, on some occasions summarizing (e.g., at the paragraph level) also led to applications of making predictions of the following parts of the passage and to effective note-taking. The following excerpts of think-aloud protocols showed the contexts in which these kinds of strategy applications took place:

Text:
That might be why men generally do better than women in tests of spatial ability-- being able to picture objects’ shapes, positions and proportions accurately in the mind’s eye. Similarly, boys tend to outperform girls in mathematics involving abstract concepts of space, relationships and theory.

Protocol:
In conclusion, this paragraph tells that men are better than women in the fields such as mathematics, abstract ideas, and theory….In the next paragraph, I think it will talk about women. [TA- W1D4]

Text:
What makes a hero? We all have an image of our hero, but it is not easy to judge what makes it. Our images of heroes in different cultures may vary; however, we can still find some universal qualities for being a hero regardless of cultural identity.

Protocol:
The main idea of this paragraph is in the first sentence. Then, the author says as we have different cultures, we can have different ideas about our heroes. But he also says that there are universal characteristics for heroes. Let me take notes first. [TA- W2D4]
Regarding written summarizing, while Orawan was aware of the rhetorical convention (e.g., format, language usage) of a written summary and said that she had learned some ideas of how to write a summary, she was not adept at it because paraphrasing was difficult. (Although her summaries were better than her peers’ due to her higher English language proficiency, she still lacked confidence in this skill.) She wanted to have more practice in this skill.

In conclusion, despite her constraints in developing summary writing skills, her abilities to produce oral summaries, to make inferences, and to analyze indicated that her declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of such strategies was positively developed and turned into effective uses along the continuum of her progress. Her positive attitude of such strategy uses was a good indicator of her success. In all, her ability to integrate these consequential strategies and her strategy uses for probing and elaborative purposes ultimately resulted in successful reading comprehension.

**Problem- Solving Strategies**

Problem-solving strategies refer to the strategic behaviors Orawan appeared to employ when experiencing difficulties during her reading process.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Although Orawan was more proficient in her reading than the other three case study participants, she still revealed some difficulties in her reading comprehension in English. Of the two major problems she reported experiencing while reading English texts, the first was that when she could not find a topic sentence (despite her good understanding of the paragraph), she found it hard to construct an unstated main idea, or when she could construct a main idea she was not certain whether she had derived the complete or the most important idea. In such contexts, she used the basic gist to help infer the main ideas. Evidence from the think-aloud protocols also showed her attempts to
integrate her overall understanding of the paragraphs with her background knowledge (in some contexts) to interpret the main ideas. In addition to using rereading for problem-solving, on some occasions, she reread the paragraphs to confirm her understanding of the important ideas when she wanted to analyze the author’s views and support her own views. The following excerpt of the think-aloud protocols illustrated this kind of phenomenon:

Text:

In sum, my point here is these qualities are not culturally bound and not limited to any person. Despite not being a popular hero, all of us can certainly train ourselves to become an unlikely hero -- a good man who can take a good care of our world. Today, we are victims of negative forces. I do hope that with the ambition to be heroic in this sense, we will make ourselves a valuable person of our society.

Protocol:

In this paragraph, he wants to tell that the qualities of being a good man are not limited to any particular person. It’s possible for anyone to be a hero, if s/he can be a good person…. In this sense, we will make ourselves a valuable person of our society…. To conclude, he wants to emphasize that these qualities are not culturally bound and not limited to any person. He gives many examples of those good qualities for being a good person, and I agree that we can see such qualities in our king. It’s true that because of those good qualities, we therefore see our king as our hero. [TA- W2D4]

A second reading issue revealed during Orawan’s peer discussions was that some parts of passages were hard to comprehend because of difficult vocabulary. Her commentary supports her reflections that when she came across unknown words, she tried to use context clues (e.g. sentence structural clues, lexical clues) to figure out the word meanings. However, on some occasions, even if Orawan could interpret the meanings from the context, she still used the dictionary because she wanted to learn the exact meanings of those words. Also, as long as she was able to maintain the overall comprehension of the text, she sometimes used skipping some minor problematic text as another strategy to sustain the flow of her reading (as mentioned in the preceding section). Nevertheless, evidence from the think-aloud protocols showed low frequency
of occurrences of vocabulary problems per reading task, thus parallel evidence of skipping. That might be the reason that she did not mention her vocabulary problem in the interviews.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** Evidence showed that when Orawan experienced problems during her reading, she could identify the causes of her problems and chose certain strategies to tackle the difficult texts effectively although she still expressed her concern that she needed more practice in inferring main ideas when there were no topic sentences.

Not only did Orawan use context clues as a fix-up strategy effectively, she also had a good sense of how to use it as a supporting strategy for probing and making elaborations. Rereading not only helped her firm up comprehension, but it also allowed her to read more analytically. It seemed to be applied with less awareness, as she did not recall using it in the interviews or daily journals, but evidence of its use could be occasionally observed in the think-aloud protocols. Her decisions to use skipping when coming across problematic texts such as difficult words or expressions or figurative language suggested that she knew when she could ignore unimportant information in order to maintain the momentum of her reading process. Even though this strategy was rarely applied, she viewed it enhancing her process of achieving overall comprehension.

It should be noted that though the use of context clues was a strategy introduced in class, rereading and skipping the problematic text were not. Thus, I perceived the last two fix-up strategies as having been transferred from her reading habits in her first language.

In sum, whether Orawan specifically and deliberately applied the strategies (with more awareness) or applied them more automatically (with less awareness). Her problem-solving skills
led her to choose appropriate strategies to firm up her comprehension. In turn, this resulted in a successful reading performance.

Self-Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Self-monitoring and evaluation strategy refers to learning behavior that Orawan displayed regarding how she regulated her reading performance. In this part of the study I focus on describing and examining her metacognitive awareness in relation to her applications of reading strategies.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Orawan did not appear to overtly or regularly talk about how she monitored and evaluated her reading performance and strategy uses in her peer discussions. However, despite not specifically commenting on her uses of this metacognitive strategy, actual self-monitoring and evaluation could be observed consistently when she applied certain reading strategies. In some of her daily journals, although she did not identify how she thought about her use of self-monitoring and evaluation, her entries reflected that she monitored and evaluated her actual reading tasks. For example, in Week 4, Day 1, she wrote:

Today I have learned the new kind of article, which is problem and solution. The article today is called Too Many Mouths to Feed? It’s a good example of problem and solution. It has very good organization, so it’s not too difficult. I also practiced these skills: note-taking, making questions while I was reading and making inferences. I think I do it OK. In general, I have a good time today. [DJ- W4 D1]

In addition, when I asked her to describe her perception of her reading performance in the second and third interviews (in Weeks 3 and 5 respectively), she revealed various aspects of self-monitoring and evaluation.

Overall, she displayed a positive attitude about her new knowledge and applications of strategies as they enhanced her reading. She believed that her overall reading performance
improved since she had learned how to apply strategies more effectively. Not only did Orawan report on her effective reading performance, but she could also identify her problems and was aware that she needed more practice on some skills.

She recounted that in her previous reading in English before joining the course, she did not know how to begin and control it strategically, and when she experienced language problems (e.g. difficult sentence structures or unfamiliar expressions), she sometimes could not continue her reading effectively. In this class, she learned to use (both the new and previously known) strategies to lead to better reading than before. Moreover, she learned to be more analytical in her reading. In the third interview, she concluded how she perceived these changes:

In the past, I always began to read a passage with a feeling of a little confusion. If the title was clear, I was lucky; but if it didn’t tell anything, I tended to not understand it. Now, I know that I can focus on main idea of each paragraph first to get the tentative ideas. When I get main ideas, I can skip some details and go on to the next paragraph. …I asked questions…. I have a purpose when I read…. This is different from my previous habit…In the past, I just read, underline words…yeah, read. When I didn’t understand, I did not know what to do….Now, I like to analyze the author’s ideas…. I like making inference. [Int 3- W5]

Converting knowledge into effective awareness. The fact that Orawan generally did not have serious problems in her reading seemed to lead her to reflect less on metacognitive awareness of problem-solving. Therefore, she did not appear to consciously or actively apply the strategy as a tool to regulate her reading behaviors. Nevertheless, considering that her actual monitoring and evaluations took place as ongoing behaviors when she applied certain reading strategies, I assume that it should contribute to her overall success.

In conclusion, although Orawan’s reading performance was successful and evidence of actual self- monitoring and evaluation was exhibited, it seemed that her application of this strategy derived from her subconscious metacognitive abilities rather than her conscious intention in using it as a tool to regulate her reading performance. Indeed, her sense of regulating
her reading behaviors seemed to be rooted in her awareness of the learned reading strategies and her belief that they would enhance her comprehension rather than in the actual awareness of the role of the strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation itself.

**Regularity and Substantiality of Strategy Application**

Orawan used various strategies including previewing, making predictions, skimming, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, and note-taking to acquire general understanding of the passages. Most of these strategies, except the text structure strategy, were used with high regularity during the five weeks. Though the text structure strategy was evidenced in fewer reading tasks, it was used with high frequency within a single task.

The data revealed that she did not verbalize using her knowledge of text structure for probing for important information when she read descriptive and short passages. Instead, the strategy was applied more systematically in the long passages with compare-contrast and cause-effect organizational patterns. The strategy of identifying main ideas of the paragraphs was also systematically applied in most reading tasks except in certain instances when she appeared to translate the paragraphs and seemed to internalize her use of other reading strategies (as already discussed in the section on ‘probing strategies’).

Overall, I considered Orawan to have employed useful strategies so actively that she could comprehend the passages at the macro level effectively and efficiently. Consequently, this effective comprehension also allowed her to apply higher-level strategies effectively, specifically when orally summarizing and analyzing. In some contexts where she opted to just simply translate the paragraphs in a passage, typically when the passage was not a challenge for her, summarizing occurred less frequently. It is also interesting to note that analyzing appeared more substantially in reading argumentative text than other types of passages.
Orawan’s applications of elaborative strategies including identifying details, making predictions, and using background knowledge were at the level of high regularity during the five weeks. The use of generating questions and analyzing text structure (which continued from probing reading) were less regular. Among these strategies, she appeared to employ making predictions more systematically within a single task than the others, especially in the passages with compare-contrast and cause-effect organizational patterns, and she noted that her use of the text structure strategy enhanced her active use of making predictions while reading throughout a passage. Although her uses of background knowledge and generating questions seemed to appear less substantially, her commentary showed that when they were applied, they enhanced the comprehending process quite effectively, and more importantly these strategies helped foster higher-level reading strategies such as analyzing and making inferences. As stated earlier, Orawan reflected that she enjoyed reading when she was able to make further interpretations and analyze the author’s views.

Since Orawan did not have serious vocabulary problems that affected her reading, her metacognitive awareness of problem-solving was not frequently evidenced in the data. That is not to say that she did not use such strategies. Her uses of context clues, rereading and skipping the problematic text as fix-up strategies occurred with little regularity during the five weeks and not substantially in each reading task. Rereading was used more frequently than context clues and skipping were. In addition to using rereading as a fix-up strategy, she sometimes reread to confirm her understanding and her analysis of the text. Using a dictionary was either a compensation strategy when she could not make use of context clues, or when she just wanted to be accurate about the meanings of words even though she could make use of contexts. Her actual self-monitoring and evaluation could be observed regularly during the five weeks. She also
revealed positive perceptions of her overall reading performance. However, as mentioned earlier, she did not make reflections about how she perceived that her metacognitive awareness helped regulate and control her reading behaviors.

In sum, Orawan appeared to demonstrate her active applications of useful strategies during her probing at the macro and elaborative reading levels. With her abilities to master the basic reading strategies, she was therefore able to develop higher-level reading skills effectively in most reading tasks. In addition, I hypothesize that since she did not experience serious problems in her reading, she was not very concerned with the issue of how she needed to better her reading performance. This resulted in low regularity of applying the problem-solving strategies.

Case Study 3: Pailin

Pailin’s Background

Pailin was a student whose academic records identified her English language proficiency as average compared to the others in the class, but throughout the five-week practice, she was obviously and consistently manifesting her feelings of having difficulties with and concern about improving her skills in reading and writing in English. Knowing that affect frequently impedes learning, despite the fact that she was not among those who had the poorest English competency in the class, I decided to include her as a participant in my case studies.

Similar to the other participants, prior to this course, she had completed several English courses for her minor. These courses included two Foundation English Courses, English Reading for Mass Communications, Communicative English for Careers, and English Structure. She obtained grades of Bs and Cs in these courses. Her scores from the two pretests she took at the beginning of this course were 34 % (scoring 17 out of 50 items correct) on Test One of the
Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and 80.76 % (scoring 21 out of 26) on the Test of Reading Strategies (Form A). At the end of the course, she earned 64 % (scoring 32 out of 50 items correct) on Test Two of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test and 94.23 % (scoring 24.5 out of 26) on the Test of Reading Strategies (Form B).

Pailin as a Reader before the Course

In the first interview at the beginning of the course, Pailin revealed that she did not like reading books either in Thai or English. When she was assigned to do a reading task without much of her interest, she got bored easily and did not have a good concentration on the task. She just read textbooks for examinations. In addition to reading textbooks for school, she normally chose to read Thai magazine articles in which she was interested for pleasure reading.

Previously, Pailin had had little experience in reading English text. She seldom read expository texts in English in her major field of studies. Her former English reading habits normally began with her first translating words and then sentences. This pattern was repeated throughout a passage. Often she was not able to continue her reading when she encountered language difficulties; she felt that she had more serious problems with vocabulary than with grammar.

Pailin as a Writer before the Course

Pailin preferred writing to reading because she could express her ideas in writing, while reading involved learning other people’s ideas, which were sometimes not of interest to her. She usually kept diaries in Thai and loved to read the stories she had written in her own diaries.

When writing her academic papers in Thai, she would begin by thinking about the topic and search for the information. Then, she planned the outline for her paper. She normally wrote
two drafts for a paper. She wrote out her ideas as planned in the first draft. In the second draft, she made only minor changes to ideas but focused more on modifying language such as sentence orders to maintain the cohesion of the text. When she had finished her writing tasks, she would hand in her work to the teacher without having anyone else read it even when it was a group-based task.

In her previous experience, she had never thought about connections between reading and writing. However, she held a general conception that the more one reads, the better one should be able to write.

Pailin as a Learner

Pailin always came to my class in the company of some of the other students, but I could feel that she was different from the others because she showed some signs of her anxiety during learning activities. She even confessed in her daily journals that she was afraid to make mistakes in the class or to not meet the teacher’s expectations.

Due to her lack of self-confidence, Pailin appeared to be quiet and shy during class discussions or activities such as reading aloud essays to the class. She did, however, appear more relaxed when she worked with her partners in pair-discussions. In the second interview (Week3), she expressed concerns that she was not good in English, and she felt that her poor language proficiency was a major problem in her development in reading and writing skills. With my encouragements and positive feedback on her progress, her level of anxiety seemed to decrease in the later weeks. In fact, her reflections during reading and writing tasks and in her daily journals indicated that she appeared to monitor her own performance consistently and saw a change. As a result, she became more confident in her progress and continued to put effort in her tasks hoping that she would be able to improve her reading and writing skills in English.
In sum, although Pailin lacked confidence and was concerned about her performance, she was ambitious and worked hard to improve her English literacy skills. At the end of the course, she appeared to be more positive about her progress in English. Also, the scores she earned from the TOEFL posttest evidently indicated her progress.

**Pailin: Awareness and Application of Reading Strategies**

As with the other cases, the framework of the display and discussion on Pailin’s reading behaviors is based on the four major purposes of cognitive reading strategy use derived from my findings: (a) probing strategies, (b) elaborative strategies, (c) consequential strategies, and (d) problem-solving strategies. In addition, the metacognitive strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation is included. Based on the four fundamental probing questions for analysis (as stated in the beginning of this chapter), Pailin’s reading behaviors are described in three major aspects in relation to each purpose of strategy use. These include 1) awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application, 2) converting strategic knowledge into effective application, and 3) regularity and substantiality of strategy application.

**Probing Strategies**

Probing strategies included the strategies that Pailin used to build her comprehension of the main ideas of the paragraphs and to identify the overall important information of the passage in both the first and second read-throughs of her single reading task.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Pailin learned that various strategies could help her acquire an understanding of the general ideas of a passage. Those strategies included previewing, skimming, making predictions, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, and note-taking. She began to apply certain strategies from Week 1; however, it seemed to take her a longer period of time to employ others.
Although her prior focus in reading was to obtain the big picture of the passage, during the first two weeks she did not comment much about her uses of previewing or skipping the details of paragraphs. The following excerpt from her think-aloud protocols illustrates that her first reading still included details of the paragraphs as in her previous habits as she discusses how the text confuses her:

Text:

“Why can’t a woman be more like a man?” goes the exasperated lament. Science is searching for an answer, and researchers have presented some intriguing possibilities. Men and women are different, they theorize, because the slight differences in the way their brains are constructed lead the sexes to process information in subtly different ways.

Protocol:

This paragraph introduces the idea about why women cannot be absolutely the same as men. This leads to studies and research for answers of what make them different. Here, the author talks about the brain. I cannot understand the sentence after the question well. It seems like it just pops up, and this makes me confused. Anyway, I don’t care because I can understand the idea in general. [TA W1D4- H1/ RD]

The applications of these strategies were more frequently manifested from week three. She reported in peer discussions and in the third interview (during week five), that she had both previewed and skimmed a passage. The think-aloud protocols revealed that she previewed the title, subtitle, the beginning of the paragraphs, and other textual clues (e.g., headings and highlight words) in the passage. Unlike previewing, evidence demonstrated her applications of making predictions from the first week. For example, from the title of an article, she predicted possible contents and the author’s views, and observed the organizational or rhetorical pattern of the passage. Think-aloud protocols showed that in some tasks her previewing of the titles (or subtitles) helped her to make predictions. For example:

The title: What Makes My King A Hero of Thai People?
Protocol:

Before I read, I’ll look at the title. It says “What Makes My King A Hero of Thai People?”, which makes it very clear what this article wants to talk about. It talks about a Hero. …This refers to our king…and it wants to talk about Thai people. The words hero and Thai people help tell me know whom the article will talk about.

On other occasions, her observations of text structure helped her predict the contents of the text more effectively. All in all, with her applications of various related strategies, she was more or less able to gain general understanding of important ideas after skimming the passage, although she still noticed that some passages included difficult details which she prepared to read in her second reading.

Two phenomena could be observed during her second reading. First, besides translating each paragraph, she made attempts to locate the topic sentence and understand its main idea. In some paragraphs she confirmed her understanding of the main ideas that she had identified during skimming. She reflected in peer discussions that when she was able to gain the general ideas of the passage, this understanding generally helped establish better comprehension of the details. (The discussion on identifying details is in the section on “Elaborative strategies”.)

Second, in some long (e.g. two-page) passages, she just translated without applying any strategies (e.g. identifying main ideas vs. details) in some paragraphs. In both situations she did try to connect ideas between paragraphs.

However, due to limited English proficiency, Pailin occasionally failed to understand the main ideas of the paragraphs in the first place. When encountering this problem, she sometimes tried to analyze the text structure to help make sense of and to locate and understand main ideas. When she could perceive the text structure and other clues from the context, she could connect
important ideas between paragraphs more effectively (and vice versa on some other occasions).

It should be noted that the applications of text structure strategy were more frequent when she read long passages.

Text:

But no. Many of us are thrilled to let our fingers do the talking. The absurdity of this is most evident in offices where private e-mail systems allow people who sit a few meters from one another to communicate via computer, which they gladly do. (Or in the office where I work, ‘Message me.’) What ever happened to ‘Talk to me’?

Protocol:

This paragraph helps make things clearer because there is a word “But”. This seems to tell why people like to use e-mail to talk….This is similar to the picture of the two men sitting next to each other with their computers at the bottom of this page. There is a saying “Hi David. Do you want to have lunch?”…Why don’t they talk to each other? Why do they have to use e-mail?…So, though I didn’t absolutely understand the paragraph 3, by coming to paragraph 4 which helps to clarify ideas, I can understand it better now. [TA W3D4- H3/RD]

After she finished reading the passage, she began to take notes. Pailin revealed that she was not able to do note-taking while reading. She felt that her notes in the early weeks included too many details. Her practice of organizing big ideas in outlines or graphic organizers (from Week 2) enabled her to improve note-taking skill over time. More interestingly, she noted that her growing ability in differentiating between important and non-important ideas normally helped her produce better notes. (Analyses of her notes over the five weeks supported her self-evaluation of her progress of this skill.) She also commented that the process of note-taking in turn helped her keep good track of important ideas of the passage.

Pailin: I use context clues to help make connections of the contents. And if I know what parts are the modifiers of the sentences, I don’t pay much attention to them. This helps me make good notes, too.

Teacher: So far, you have improved quite well.

Pailin: But [in the early weeks], I was afraid that if I left out some words, my notes might not be understandable. So, I had long notes. But now I know that I don’t have to write every thing down; I try to say things in my own words. And it’s
OK. I don’t have to write long notes. [Int 3- W5]

In her words during a discussion with a classmate:

I feel that this [second] week I can do both reading and writing better than in the first week….Now, I’ve got an idea of how to do note-taking, and the notes help me understand the passage better. It’s easier to follow ideas [using a graphic organizer]. [Dis- W2D5]

Converting knowledge into effective application. Despite the fact that it took a period of time before Pailin began to apply certain strategies in her reading, she eventually learned to improve her ability to understand the general ideas of a passage. As evidenced, although she found some passages difficult, after her attempts to apply certain probing strategies, she was generally able to build a good comprehension of the big pictures. The more strategic she was in her reading, the more she became aware that her initial understanding of their major points could enhance effective reading in the later stage. During her second reading, she reflected regularly that despite not always mastering comprehension of all details, she felt that understanding main ideas still helped maintain overall comprehension at a certain level. She especially asserted that analyzing text structure and note-taking yielded positive results on her reading comprehension.

In sum, Pailin had developed her knowledge of the introduced strategies into relatively successful applications to fulfill her goal in comprehending important ideas of the passage. Her increasing awareness of the connecting roles between certain strategies and overall comprehension enabled her to master this probing stage of reading more efficiently over time. Through her ongoing practice with these strategies, it appeared that their applications in turn reinforced her procedural and conditional knowledge of each particular strategy.
Elaborative Strategies

Elaborative strategies refer to strategic behaviors that Pailin used to expand her understanding beyond the main ideas of the passage. These included for example, the understanding of details and clarification of meanings related to the main ideas of the text.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Pailin was aware that reading comprehension involves understanding both the main ideas and the details of the passage. Therefore, in addition to gaining a general understanding of a passage, she also made attempts to master the details related to the given main ideas. Her clarification and elaboration of the main ideas was seemingly fostered by strategies such as making predictions, generating questions, and using background knowledge in a given context.

Pailin commented during peer discussions and in the second interview that a good understanding of the main ideas or of the details often reinforced each other. However, she noted that while struggling with the language issues (e.g., vocabulary and grammar), she was not able to effectively apply the strategies she had learned to gain greater comprehension of the text in detail.

Teacher: You mean your concentration was more on how to get the meaning of each word?
Pailin: Yeah, I was concerned that if I couldn’t figure out the meanings, I would be confused,…and it’s as if I couldn’t work on so many things at the same time in his kind of situation. [Int 2- W3]

Evidence seemed to support her explanation as it showed that during her second reading, she had only minimally applied the strategies to augment her process of elaboration of ideas.

Pailin revealed that the predictions she had made during the skimming phase helped her interact with the text when she was reading the passage in detail. However, the utilization of this strategy was only noticeable at the beginning of her reading but did not continue throughout the
task as evidenced in the think-aloud protocols. She explained that when she could not understand
the contents, she could not make predictions. She also reflected that when she made a correct
prediction, it enhanced her understanding of the passage whereas wrong predictions tended to
make it difficult to understand details.

Teacher: When do you think you made more predictions during reading?
Pailin: From the title.
T: Did you continue making predictions during reading?
P: Not quite... because I needed to understand the content first. If I couldn’t
understand the content, I couldn’t predict, or my predictions could lead to
misunderstanding. At least I needed to get some tentative ideas before I
could make predictions. [Int2- W3]

Think-aloud protocols also showed that after Pailin had made predictions from the topic,
she occasionally generated questions for clarification or elaboration. However, she noted that,
during the second reading, she primarily paid attention to what the text literally stated; she did
not feel that she had many queries and was not certain about what kind of questions she should
ask. Thus, this strategy was rarely evidenced when she moved onto reading the body of the
passage. However, in the third interview (during week five), she said that when she was able to
make predictions and generate some questions (although the latter strategy was not used often),
they helped her keep stay on track and interact more with the ideas from the text.

Teacher: Can you tell me which strategies you used more frequently, or which
you used less often? What strategies did you find helpful for your
reading?
Pailin: I think I’ve improved everything in general. Making predictions helped a
lot. For generating questions, I didn’t use it much, but it also helped. It
helped me not to lose my concentration on the story. It’s as if I’m
talking to myself. [Int 3- W5]

Pailin also appeared to use background knowledge in her reading at a minimal level.
However, evidence indicated that once her background knowledge enhanced her comprehension,
it led to further applications of the analyzing strategy. For example in one reading task, she noted
that she had some different views from the author about the topic; this might be because her personal experience regarding the issues in the article differed from that of the author. In a discussion with a peer, she said:

I’m not quite sure I understood the message as the author expects or not. It seems like what I read is not like what I have experienced…but the author might have some sources of ideas of his own in writing this. [Diss- W1D2]

In sum, although she appeared to make continuous attempts to master the text in detail, she was still not able to significantly succeed during the elaborative reading processes due to two major factors. First, because reading in detail required a great degree of language competency, her language issues seemed to hinder her ability to apply these supporting strategies to a greater extent. Second, her knowledge about some strategies (e.g. making predictions, generating questions) was not comprehensive enough to allow her to use them more effectively. When her comprehension of details was incomplete especially when she read long passages, Pailin concurrently appeared to use context clues, rereading, and skipping to help augment her understanding during this reading process. (The discussion of these strategies will be in the section on “problem-solving strategies.”)

Converting knowledge into effective application. Knowing that certain strategies could enhance her reading processes for elaborative purposes, Pailin made attempts to employ them to a certain degree. Her ability to comprehend details increased her overall comprehension of the passages. She noted that it also enhanced effective applications of some probing strategies such as identifying main ideas and note-taking.

However, the fact that she was not able to apply certain strategies substantially along the continuum of her practice during the five weeks brought drawbacks to her elaborative reading process. Regarding her limited applications of background knowledge, I hypothesize that if her
language proficiency had allowed her to master the text more effectively, she might have made more attempts to use the strategy and become more aware of its positive role. In addition, her difficulties in comprehending the text might also hinder her ability to move on to higher-level thinking during reading (as her reflection about few queries revealed).

In conclusion, although she appeared to have good declarative knowledge of the targeted strategies, she did not have as strong a grasp of their procedural and conditional aspects. Thus, the incomplete knowledge of such strategies could not yield effective applications at the optimal level that would promote a greater degree of success for the elaborative reading. In relation to this, her language constraints seemed to be a major negative factor in her unsuccessful use of strategy for elaborative purposes. In all, while Pailin appeared to have a general understanding of the important ideas, she was able to comprehend only limited details in her reading passages.

**Consequential Strategies**

Some strategic reading behaviors occurred only after Pailin was able to construct meanings within the text at a given point during her reading process. These strategies were beneficial because they helped confirm her comprehension and enhance her elaboration and expansion of ideas. I classified those behaviors as consequential strategy uses as they were only possible after she had constructed enough meaning. These strategies include summarizing, making inferences, and analyzing.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Pailin learned that good readers use certain strategies including summarizing, analyzing, and making inferences to develop their high-level thinking skills to promote maximum reading comprehension. With this knowledge, in most of her reading tasks, when Pailin was at the point of establishing her understanding of a given part of the text during reading, she tended to make oral summaries of
those ideas; however, this process seemed to take place with little consciousness. Her awareness of this strategy use was reflected more obviously in peer discussions when she shared her summarized ideas of the passages. Usually, her summaries reflected her basic ability to correctly comprehend the general ideas of the passages, but on some occasions, when she compared her ideas with peers, she found that she misinterpreted some parts of the passages. Nevertheless, she reported that when she had reviewed and made connections of main ideas between paragraphs, she tended to be able to summarize accurately, and this made her feel that she had a good comprehension of the passage.

Teacher: When you got main ideas of the paragraphs, did you look back to connect them?
Pailin: Yes, I did. And when I could do this, I feel like I could summarize and understand ideas better. [Int 2- W3]

However, her ability to produce a written summary in a language other than her mother tongue was much more challenging than making an oral summary in Thai -- her first language. During her practice of summary writing in weeks three and five, Pailin asserted that her poor English language proficiency was a major hindrance in developing her skills of writing a summary. First, in spite of reaching a certain level of comprehension of the passages, her language constraints caused her to write her first draft of a summary in Thai. In fact, she even had to use some words or phrases from the original text when trying to paraphrase ideas for a summary in English. Second, she found that when she could not completely understand the majority of ideas in the passage, it was hard to summarize her unclear comprehension in written text. Third, on some occasions, though she wanted to include some supporting details to help make clear the ideas she summarized (in her own words), she was not certain about how to incorporate them properly. Nevertheless, she noted that when she could produce good notes, they helped to produce both written and oral summaries.
Her think-aloud protocols and her reflections during peer discussions also showed that Pailin occasionally made attempts to perform critical reading. After she understood the text at some points during her reading process, she tried to analyze and make inferences of the author’s views. She expressed both her agreement and disagreement with the ideas the author presented in the passage. The level of effectiveness of her analyzing ability seemed to correspond to the degree of her comprehension of the text. In the interviews, she also recounted that when she could not understand the passages well, she was not quite confident of the ideas she had analyzed.

Teacher: During the reading of a passage, did you think about the author? For example, think about what s/he wanted to say.

Pailin: Yes, sometimes I did. Sometimes I agreed, but sometimes I disagreed. But I just kept my thoughts to myself; I dared not to share them in the class. I didn’t have much confidence (of my ideas), and I was afraid that they might be wrong or not be complete. [Int 2- W3]

Converting knowledge into effective application. In conclusion, with her awareness of the benefits of these higher-level strategies, Pailin appeared to make attempts to apply them in her reading. How competently she could apply them seemed related to two important factors. First, as already mentioned, the degree of effectiveness of her applications of these consequential strategies resulted from her level of comprehension gained from the text. Second, because she did not have a complete conceptualization of how and of when to execute certain strategies efficiently (e.g., she mentioned not having a clear concept in a summary writing), she could therefore build the skills of these strategies at the basic level.

Despite her attempts to apply consequential strategies, Pailin still could not widen her expertise to any great extent. Moreover, her abilities of expanding on ideas from the text were not obviously noted in her reading. In short, she still could not perform higher-level reading effectively. I hypothesize that if she had performed elaborative reading more successfully (as I
have discussed in the preceding section), she should have been able to exercise consequential strategies (e.g. summarizing, making inferences, and analyzing) for higher level thinking more effectively.

In sum, Pailin’s awareness and knowledge of these higher-level strategies could not develop into applications at the optimal level despite the fact that she made attempts to apply them. Evidence seemed to suggest that in addition to having a clear conception of procedural and conditional knowledge (besides the declarative knowledge that she already had), the ability to develop such strategies effectively requires a great command of the language. I hypothesize that the knowledge of higher-level strategies should develop into more effective and more extensive applications with less difficulty when the language proficiency promotes successful comprehension along the continuum of the reading process. Then, extensive applications of these strategies should promote positive impacts on promoting successful reading with higher-level comprehension.

Problem Solving Strategies

Problem-solving strategies refer to the strategic behaviors Pailin appeared to employ when experiencing difficulties during her reading process.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. During the five weeks of this course, Pailin experienced various difficulties in achieving her reading comprehension. She asserted that her language problem was a major factor hindering her. In her daily journals, peer discussions, and think-aloud tasks, she identified several aspects of language problem that prevented her successful comprehension. These included unknown vocabulary, lexical, grammatical and syntactical structures, and unfamiliar style of writing. As mentioned earlier, Pailin explained that she was not able to apply the learned strategies effectively while she was
facing language problems. In addition, she realized that her lack of background knowledge about
the content of the text also prevented her complete understanding of some passages.

When Pailin encountered language difficulties and her comprehension failed, she used
context clues, rereading, and skipping as repair strategies to tackle the problematic text in a given
context. In addition to these three cognitive strategies, Pailin also used a dictionary and peer
consulting as compensation strategies. Using context clues was applied most frequently. She
even noted that in some contexts using this strategy helped her make better sense of the text than
did checking word meanings from a bilingual English-Thai dictionary.

Her words in the second interview:

I’ve checked the meanings of these three words (the key words in the passage)…but the
dictionary gives very similar meanings, so I have to read the details carefully to see how
they are different. [Int 2- W3]

Skipping occurred more frequently than rereading. Rereading occurred only in the tasks on long
passages. She reported that during skimming, when focusing on important ideas, she normally
**skipped** difficult words or phrases she came across. In her second reading, she skipped the
problematic details if she felt that they were not very important, or if she was not able to
understand them after having tried it repeatedly. These three strategies were applied together or
with other supporting strategies. For example, when she reread a problematic text, she used
context clues (including lexical, syntactic and textual clues) to help figure out the meanings. On
some occasions, using context clues was applied with the text structure strategy.

Teacher: When you could not understand the text, what did you normally do?
Did you feel that you could solve problems better than before?
Pailin: Yes. I skipped that part first. I thought that perhaps other paragraphs (that
follow) might help clear the ideas later…. When I understood them, then
I could see the points of that [problematic] part better.
T: So, you skipped, then came back to read it, and used context clues.
P: Yes. [Int 3- W5]
However, it should be noted that the language problem was not the only pertinent factor that hindered her effective comprehension. Pailin’s perception of her language limitations seemed to overshadow her awareness of other problematic issues. Another important negative factor that prevented her successful comprehension was her inadequate conception of how or when she could use certain strategies (e.g., making predictions, generating questions, using background knowledge for elaborative reading) effectively. This caused weaknesses in applying strategies, but Pailin did not seem to put effort to rectify this problem.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** Although learning how to apply certain repair strategies was not a major focus in the classroom mini-lessons, Pailin knew how to manage her problems in certain contexts to a certain level. She could use context clues (which was an introduced strategy) effectively in most situations and was well aware of their roles in enhancing the process of constructing meaning more successfully. However, she did not directly comment on how she perceived the impact of rereading and skipping. Nonetheless, her actual applications evidenced in her think-aloud protocols seemed to suggest that they should enhance her reading as they increased her satisfaction with her progress after she had applied them.

Unfortunately, Pailin’s applications of the fix-up strategies seemed only mainly to enable her to continue her reading process rather than to help promote greater comprehension at a greater extent. It should be noted that when she reread the problematic text (which occurred less frequently than skipping), she was still not able to apply other useful strategies that could enhance high-level thinking (e.g., predictions, generating questions, using background knowledge). As a result, even after rereading, Pailin was still generally not able to efficiently build her comprehension beyond a general understanding. In other words, despite having applied fix-up strategies, her comprehension of specific information was not at an optimal level.
In conclusion, her awareness and knowledge of problem-solving strategies turned into applications only at the level that they helped her continue reading but did not help her gain successful higher-level comprehension. It was obvious that her low English language proficiency and her lack of good procedural and conditional knowledge of effective problem-solving strategy use prevented her from achieving the optimal performance of her reading.

**Self- Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**

Self-monitoring and evaluation strategy refers to learning behavior that Pailin displayed regarding how she regulated her reading performance. In this part of the study I focused on describing and examining her metacognitive awareness in relation to her applications of reading strategies.

**Awareness / knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Pailin learned about the strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation and exhibited ongoing applications of this strategy. She monitored her comprehension, strategy use, and any problems she experienced in English reading. She was able to evaluate her performance in each task and identify various factors that enhanced or impeded her comprehension. She reflected that various factors such as knowledge of strategy use, short passages, familiar vocabulary, and the author’s simple style of writing helped ease and enhance her reading process. Conversely, texts with difficult vocabulary and expressions, complicated sentence structures, and unfamiliar styles of writing were hard for her to comprehend. Moreover, her language difficulties prevented her from successfully applying the reading strategies she had learned.

In relation to her self-monitoring and evaluation, she described some obstacles in her applications of various strategies. In the early weeks, after having practiced making predictions and note-taking, she still had difficulties using them. She viewed her incorrect predictions as a
failure of the strategy use (despite having learned that the main purpose of using predictions in reading was to help her interact with the text). She put too many details in her notes. In weeks three and five, she expressed great concern about her ability to write a summary. She noted that her poor ability in paraphrasing resulted in a poorly written summary. Occasionally, she experienced problems in differentiating between main ideas and details, especially when the passages were quite long.

At the same time, in week two, she positively evaluated her reading comprehension, and she noted that she had less difficulty because the (descriptive) texts were not difficult. Her daily journals and discussions with peers from week three reflected both successes and difficulties in using strategies in her reading as seen below:

**Feelings of Success:** Today I read the second article with the collective organizational pattern. Its title is Music’s Surprising Power to Heal. It’s quite fun… not as (difficult) as what I had expected. I could understand ideas … and there were many cases as examples. This made the [author’s] ideas more convincing. Tomorrow I’ll have to write the first draft of my summary of this passage. I’ll try!! …[DJ- W5D2]

**Difficulties:** Today I read the article ‘The Morals of the Chess’, which is a cause-effect passage. It was very difficult, …difficult words and sentences. At least it was good that I could work together with my partner. We had to write a summary for it….It’s difficult because I could not think about words I could use [to express ideas]. Besides, I’m not sure if my understanding was the same as other people or not. The three main keywords had similar meanings, I had to read examples to figure out the ideas, but it was still hard. [DJ- W3D2]

In the interviews, she could identify what strategies she used frequently (e.g., making predictions from the topics, identifying main ideas and details, using text structure strategy, and context clues) and what she tended to use less frequently or rarely used (e.g., making predictions during reading, generating questions, and making inferences). Moreover, although she still expressed concerns about her reading performance, she also revealed feelings of having
improved her abilities in applying some strategies over time (e.g., identifying main ideas, using text structure strategy, and taking notes). In the second interview, Pailin noted that before she took this course, she did not have much knowledge of reading. After learning about various reading strategies, she made attempts to apply them. Although she was not able to employ some strategies effectively and extensively due to her English language constraints and the influence of her former reading habit of mainly translating the text, she could perceive that she had improved to a certain level.

Pailin also, in both interviews, expressed her positive attitude toward her reading performance. She noted that although she still needed to improve many skills, she recognized that her knowledge and use of reading strategies made her reading process more purposeful. Overall, she changed her change her reading perspectives and behaviors over time.

Teacher: What changes do you generally see in your habits in English reading?
Pailin: I feel as if I am more attentive in my reading process. I’m more aware of what the important information is as well as what the details are. When I know strategies and use them, I tend to have a clearer direction when reading a passage…In the past, I just read …yeah…read. [Int 2- W3]
Pailin: I think I’ve generally improved in everything….
Teacher: How happy are you with your reading now?
P: I’m happy with it…but not to the best.
T: You can take your time to improve it.
P: Yes. [Int 3- W3]

Converting knowledge into effective application. In summary, during the five weeks, Pailin gradually converted her knowledge of this metacognitive strategy into application. Her use of self-monitoring and evaluation appeared to have a positive impact on her reading development in that it helped her have a better perception of her reading performance and of the factors that influenced her reading ability. It should be noted that this strategic behavior took place less consciously while she performed the actual reading tasks, but more consciously when she reflected in her daily journals and in the interviews.
However, considering her progress along the continuum of converting awareness of this metacognitive strategy into application, I believe that although evidence suggested that she developed a better sense of self-monitoring and evaluation, she did not demonstrate her perception of how this strategy use could help control or regulate her overall reading performance. If she had thought about how she could use self-monitoring and evaluation to help her improve her abilities in applying other reading strategies, Pailin should have been able to develop her reading skills to a greater extent.

**Regularity and Substantiality of Strategy Application**

Among probing strategies, Pailin employed skimming, making predictions, identifying main ideas, and using text structure strategy with high regularity during the five weeks. Reflections related to applying previewing and note-taking were less regular. The data revealed that Pailin began to use previewing from week three. This phenomenon seemed to indicate that it took a certain period of time for her knowledge of this strategy to transform into application. At the same time, although she had to practice note-taking in all reading tasks (as required assignments), she only commented on this strategy during the early weeks (when the strategy was introduced in the mini-lessons) and in the interviews. Nevertheless, the notes she produced after she had learned the note-taking techniques showed progress.

The strategies of identifying main ideas and using knowledge of text structure were both applied substantially within a single reading task. The text structure strategy was observed much more notably when the passages were long. Pailin’s abilities to comprehend general ideas of passages allowed her to exercise her strategies of summarizing and analyzing at a basic level. These two higher-level strategies occurred with high regularity during the five weeks but not substantially within a single task.
While she appeared to have mastered her probing skills quite well, in the later weeks, Pailin tended to use elaborative strategies during her reading for more details less frequently. Her applications of using background knowledge and generating questions were at a low regular rate in her reading tasks during the five weeks. Making predictions, especially from the topics of the articles, appeared regularly from the first week. However, she did not use predictions substantially during her reading of the body of passages. As she noted, even though she knew strategies, she could apply them when she was struggling with language problems. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Pailin not only used the text structure strategy in the probing process, but she also used it quite substantially to enhance her process of making clarifications and elaborations. As a result, this seemed to help develop her skills of summarizing and analyzing at a basic level. At the same time, it seemed hard for her to develop the skill of making inferences due to her language constraints.

Pailin’s self-monitoring and evaluation could be observed regularly throughout the five weeks. Her reflections of her performance were voiced frequently during peer discussions, in her daily journals, in the interviews, and even while reading. However, her self-monitoring and evaluation behaviors did not result in effective problem-solving decisions. The data revealed that her uses of repair strategies such as rereading, using context clues, and skipping problematic text were at ‘low regularity’ and ‘low substantiality’. Although Pailin’s low language proficiency seemed to prevent her from using context clues extensively, this strategy appeared most frequently. She tried to apply the strategy it whenever possible. However, she still had to rely consistently on a dictionary to tackle her vocabulary problem. Skipping appeared more frequently than rereading. She seemed to make attempts with the latter strategy only when her comprehension failed during long passages.
In conclusion, Pailin’s uses of her probing strategies seemed to adequately support her reading ability to comprehend at a macro level. On the other hand, her minimal level of applications of elaborative strategies resulted in a low rate of successful interaction with and comprehension of text at higher levels. Although she recognized her problems, Pailin could not regulate her reading strategy applications in order to yield a better performance. All of her weaknesses mainly seemed to be rooted in the problem of language proficiency and inadequate ability of strategy use.

Case Study 4: Tongchai

Tongchai’s Background

Tongchai was a sophomore with little previous experience in English reading and writing. Prior to enrolling in this course, he had taken three Foundation English Courses in which reading practice focused on product-based comprehension exercises. He earned grades of C in these courses. Tongchai took Test One of the Reading Comprehension Section of the TOEFL Complete Practice Test (Mahnke & Duffy, 1996) and the Test of Reading Strategies (Form A). He earned 6% (scoring 3 out of 50 items correct) on the former and 53.83 % (scoring 14 out of 26) on the latter. At the end of the course, he completed posttests using the parallel forms of the two tests: TOEFL (Test Two), and the Test of Reading Strategies (Form B). He earned 38% (scoring 19 out of 50 items correct) and 88.46% (scoring 23 out of 26) respectively.

With regard to his previous reading experience in English and the results of his pretests, Tongchai was one of the students who had low language and reading proficiency. Thus, I decided to include him in my study.
Tongchai as a Reader Before the Course

In the first interview I had with Tongchai in the first week of class, he told me that he did not like reading. However, he did more reading than writing both in Thai and English because he considered reading as a means to access information. Still, he said he preferred to listen to news on television rather than to read newspapers. He usually read some articles in Thai journals in the food science field, which was his major field of study. He did not read textbooks weekly but spent three to four weeks per semester reading them daily to prepare for midterm and final examinations.

When Tongchai read in English (as for the Foundation Courses he had taken), he did not always know the meanings of many of the words in a paragraph, so he relied heavily on a bilingual dictionary, then translated the text sentence by sentence. He had minimal exposure to using reading strategies.

During the first week of the course, Tongchai revealed that he could not complete an assigned reading passage of approximately two pages within the 30 to 40 minutes as the teacher expected it to take. He took at least an hour to finish, and then only understood some parts of the passage. Tongchai observed that when he could not understand the beginning of the passage, he would usually fail to comprehend the remaining text as well.

Tongchai as a Writer Before the Course

Tongchai said he did not write much in English; however, this infrequency did not indicate a dislike of writing. He had a positive attitude about writing, but did not have much opportunity to practice. Before joining this course, he had generally practiced only sentence and paragraph writing, seldom having an occasion to write compositions about his own life.
experiences. He said that in the past, he had never thought about the goal of his composition or his audience. He felt that it was just an assigned task, with the teacher as the only reader of his work.

Tongchai noted he did not have any problems in Thai writing, but in English writing, grammar was his major problem. When I asked him how he thought about the process of writing an essay, he said he had learned that he should begin with an introduction, then move onto the body, and have a conclusion for his composition. This was what he had learned about writing a composition in Thai, so he did the same in English writing. His answer indicated a product-based orientation to writing.

**Tongchai as a Learner**

During the five weeks of the course, Tongchai appeared to be a motivated but not very strategic or independent learner. He indicated that he wanted to improve his reading and writing in English; he was attentive during the mini-lesson activities, active during the pair discussions, and eager to share his personal experiences relating to what he had read during class discussions. He was especially enthusiastic about reading his compositions aloud to the class. During the conference sessions with me, it was obvious that he relied on my advice about how to improve his work, and he had a positive attitude toward writing multiple drafts.

However, Tongchai did not manifest many of his higher-level thinking skills (e.g., making inferences, analyzing) during reading. When he reflected on his reading and writing performance, he was more likely to focus on the problems he had experienced, but rarely discussed solutions. Nevertheless, he recognized the differences between his previous reading habits and the new ways he tried to read using strategies introduced in class.
Tongchai: Awareness and Application of Reading Strategies

As with the three other cases, the framework of the display and discussion of Tongchai’s reading behaviors is based on the broad categories reflecting the four major purposes of cognitive reading strategy use: (a) probing strategies, (b) elaborative strategies, (c) consequential strategies, and (d) problem solving strategies. In addition, the metacognitive strategy of self-monitoring and evaluation is included. Within these four broad categories, Tongchai’s reading behaviors are described in three major subcategories in relation to each purpose of strategy use. These are: (a) awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application, (b) converting strategic knowledge into effective application, and (c) regularity and substantiality of application.

Probing Strategies

Probing strategies included the strategies that Tongchai used to build his comprehension of the main ideas of the paragraphs and to identify the overall important information of the passage in both the first and second read-throughs of his single reading task.

Awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application

Tongchai learned that in order to build successful comprehension, he should initially be able to understand the general ideas of the passage. Thus, when he read, he mainly focused on looking for the main idea of the paragraphs. During the first two weeks, due to his language constraints (e.g., not having adequate knowledge of vocabulary and sentence structures), he was only able to read a given passage very slowly and complete just one read-through per task. The main reason for not performing the second reading was the influence of his previous reading habits. That is, he still read every word in every sentence and spent a lot of time checking meanings of the unknown words. Tongchai told me in the second interview that it was hard for
him to change these habits. Although he had learned some useful reading strategies in my class, when he performed the actual reading task, he just could not manage to apply them. Moreover, he felt that when he was not able to translate words and sentences, he would not be able to understand a passage.

Teacher: Coming to Week 3, how do you see changes in your reading habits? How did you use the reading strategies you had learned?

Tongchai: I’m not good at translating meanings of words. If I check the meanings of all the words, I am not able to finish my reading. So far, I sometimes made guesses…like [the idea] might be something like this…I began with previewing [the beginning of the paragraphs] and then I read in detail. At the beginning [of this course], I did something like this …it’s my habit, but I also have tried to change it.

Teacher: What did you use most of your reading time for?

Tongchai: Translation. I couldn’t translate well. When I read at home and had more time, I would check the meanings of most of the words.…It also took much time to understand a paragraph and link ideas between paragraphs. …It took a great deal of time to understand the overall ideas and summarize them. If I cannot understand the general ideas, I can’t write an essay for the topic. [Int 2 – W3]

The think-aloud protocols also showed that during the first two weeks he just concentrated on decoding the text sentence by sentence, translating it into Thai, and trying to find the main ideas.

It should be noted that although Tongchai’s main focus was to understand the main ideas of the paragraphs in order to discover the big picture of the passage, at the same time he tried to understand details because he could perform only one reading per task. He was concerned that if he skipped any part of the paragraph, he would not be able to comprehend the passage. Evidence in his think-aloud protocols also revealed some situations where Tongchai translated and comprehended the text but with difficulty in identifying the main ideas. Also, on occasion, he experienced vocabulary and grammatical problems that eventually resulted in inaccurate or incomplete translations of ideas.
That might be why men generally do better than women in tests of spatial ability – being able to picture objects’ shapes, positions and proportions accurately in the mind’s eye. Similarly, boys tend to outperform girls in mathematics involving abstract concepts of space, relationships and theory.

Protocol:

Oh!…this paragraph…What does this mean? That might be why men….Why are men better than women in general…in spatial ability….What does it mean? Space….In tests about the space, men are better. Yes? And they can tell better about the pictures, position and proportion…. I cannot understand…. They can object (He meant ‘set an objective’.) …They (the authors) might mean that men are cleverer…. Do they? …huh…Do I make a correct translation?…In the areas of mathematics, astronomy, relationship, theory…. Why are men better than women? …because of the [different] structures of their brains….Ummm, the main idea should be in the last sentence…. Similarly, boy…Ummm … No…no… [TA- W1D4]

He sometimes even had not realized that his translation was inaccurate until he connected those ideas and felt that it did not yield a good sense to him. More interestingly, on other occasions, his translation at sentence level was correct, but he failed to understand the overall meanings of the paragraph. His failure to build the big picture of the passage in such situations sometimes brought him feelings of confusion and anxiety.

Although he had learned that skimming was a useful strategy, he did not begin to apply the strategy until week three. Tongchai reflected that although he could utilize the strategy well, skimming helped him to understand the general ideas of the passage faster than he could when using his previous reading habits. However, he revealed that when he skimmed, he still read every sentence but tried to read more quickly than before, skipped unknown words, and did not translate every sentence. As a result, he gained time for the second reading.

During skimming, he also tried to employ making predictions, previewing, and using the text structure strategy. He reflected on these strategies during peer discussions. In the last interview when I asked him to describe how he read a passage, he said that he tried to get some
ideas from the title of the article and predicted the tentative contents of a passage, and sometimes made predictions about the subsequent text when he had finished reading a paragraph. However, making predictions was not observed in the think-aloud protocols when he read the body of the passage. After he had previewed and made predictions from the title of the article and the introductory paragraph, most of the time his previewing was limited to the text at the beginning of the paragraphs (because he had learned that main ideas were mostly located there) but did not include other parts of the passage such as headings or other textual clues. On the occasions when he could identify the organizational pattern of a passage, he used it to support his preliminary understanding of the text in order to gain the basic idea of the paragraphs. However, he noted that this strategy seemed not as useful when he encountered vocabulary problems and failed to determine those word meanings. It was obvious that in such situations, his language difficulty hindered his application of the strategy.

Tongchai did not make many reflections on using note-taking. Nevertheless, in a peer discussion in Week 1, he told his partner that he was not able to finish reading and note-taking in the allotted class time. During his think-aloud task about the reading homework assignment during the same week, he also expressed his concern that his notes included too many details. In the later weeks, he tried to take notes using a graphic organizer (learned during Week 2). After he reviewed his notes (taken in Thai first), he was able to see the connections of the main ideas, and this helped him have a better understanding of the passage. However, he noted that note-taking made him read so slowly that he sometimes could not finish his second reading in class. In the third interview, he revealed:

Note-taking helped me remember the important ideas. When I read each paragraph, I first translated it in Thai. Then, when I had read many paragraphs, I sometimes forgot some ideas…. When I looked back at my overall [English] notes, I could see the overall ideas. [Int3- W5]
In a pair discussion, he told his partner:

In this second reading, I could understand more ideas in each paragraph. I could read up to paragraph 7….I couldn’t finish [the whole passage] before we discussed it. I was slow because I had to take notes….If I had just underlined the main ideas, I might not have spent so much time like this. [Dis- W5D2]

In summary, from week three on, Tongchai tried to use several strategies to enhance his understanding of the general ideas even though he was still not able to apply them in the very efficient ways. At least he realized that when he used such strategies in his reading, he felt that he could comprehend the passage better than before.

**Converting strategic knowledge into effective application.** It was evident Tongchai had knowledge that the introduced strategies could help build his comprehension of the general ideas. However, during the early weeks of the class, his progress was affected by his previous habit of using translation so copiously. This seemed to prevent him from applying new strategies he had learned in his reading. Moreover, his translation alone did not aid his ability to identify the main ideas and comprehend the general understanding of a passage effectively.

Generally, although he made attempts to apply some strategies from Week 3 on, the applications were neither adequately substantial nor sufficiently effective in promoting successful comprehension at a satisfactory level. Indeed, he said despite understanding the teacher’s explanations and modeling, he still was not able to execute them by himself. His reflections of how he had applied strategies to gain understanding of the general ideas (as described above) obviously indicated that he needed more comprehensive procedural and conditional knowledge of these strategies. Any applications of these two aspects of knowledge would only be possible through extensive practice. In addition, owing to his inadequate language
proficiency, he encountered many impediments in experimenting successfully with the strategies he had learned in his reading.

In brief, although Tongchai had over time more or less developed his abilities to apply his knowledge of the introduced strategies to enhance the process of probing reading, his reading skill for this purpose still needed a great deal of improvement.

Elaborative Purpose

Elaborative strategies refer to strategic behaviors that Tongchai used to expand his understanding beyond the main ideas of the passage. These included for example, the understanding of details and clarification of meanings related to the main ideas of the text.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. As aforementioned, Tongchai recounted that during the first two weeks he read the assigned passages only once. From Week 3, during his second reading, his main purpose was to understand the text in detail, but he still concurrently appeared to make attempts to identify or confirm his understanding of the main ideas again in most paragraphs. In addition, he still used translating as a major means of establishing his comprehension without realizing that meanings are also derived beyond the combination of translated words or phrases. Thus, when he mistranslated the text, his comprehension of the details failed. And when the understanding of the details did not support his understanding of main ideas, he could not achieve successful overall comprehension. It seemed that because he tried to make sense of all the information at the same time, he could not do it effectively.

Besides translating, Tongchai also occasionally used context to make sense of the text and generated questions to help clarify details. However, these strategies seemed to be applied with uncertain knowledge and low awareness. At some points he raised questions for
clarification of the content and made predictions, but he did not appear to seriously look for the answers to his questions or interact with the text in order to trace ideas that he had predicted. In the second interview, he told me he was uncertain about what types of questions he should ask, or when he should use questions in his reading. In short, he generally did not have a good skill in generating questions, and thus he could not tell whether this strategy might be useful.

Teacher: Can you tell how you used the strategy of generating questions?
Tongchai: I have tried generating questions, but so far I could not use much of this strategy. I know that I should make questions while reading, but I don’t really know at what point I could do that. So, I normally just followed what the text said.

Teacher: When we read [some parts of] a passage together in the class, I showed how I made questions. Do you think it might help you if you could make some in your reading?
Tongchai: I don’t know. [Int2- W3]

Also, his think-aloud protocols showed that he usually tried to make sense of the text by connecting the parts he understood, or he just guessed at meanings. When his understanding of the context was correct, it seemed to enhance his interpretation; however, when he had inaccurate understanding of the preceding context, it led to further misinterpretation.

Converting strategic knowledge into effective application. The phenomena of how Tongchai tried to master the details of a passage seemed to indicate that he had low awareness and inadequate knowledge of how to employ useful strategies to enhance the process of clarifying and elaborating. He could achieve only basic comprehension derived relative to his ability to translate text into his first language. Although he generated questions and made use of the context to figure out the meanings of text as additional strategies, the applications appeared at the minimal level and did not yield significant success in clarifying or elaborating ideas. Consequently, I did not perceive he had a positive attitude about the benefits of these two strategies.
In sum, I identified three major causes that prevented Tongchai from achieving successful elaborative reading. First, his low English language proficiency seemed to make him satisfied with his basic understanding of the text at the surface level. Second, his misconception that comprehension could be derived from word by word translation prevented him from expending greater effort to apply other useful introduced strategies. In addition, because his cognitive capacity was mainly occupied in the decoding and encoding (from English to Thai) processes of the text, he then was not able to apply the learned strategies effectively at the same time. Last, it seemed that the less salient, benefits of certain strategies (e.g. generating questions, making predictions, using background knowledge) were not clear to him and did not trigger his awareness of how to apply them. Despite having declarative knowledge, Tongchai was not able to efficiently develop his expertise in applying some strategies due to his lack of procedural and conditional knowledge of these strategies.

In conclusion, the nature of his progress in converting his awareness/ knowledge of useful strategies for elaborative purpose into application fell in between the continuum of attempting some applications (with a relative low level of consciousness) of the learned strategies, but the attempts were not very efficient due to the various difficulties he experienced. Such limited applications could not foster an effective reading process.

Consequential Strategies

Some strategic reading behaviors occurred only after Tongchai was able to construct meanings within the text at a given point during his reading process. These strategies were beneficial because they helped confirm his comprehension and enhance his elaboration and expansion of ideas. I classified those behaviors as consequential strategy use as they were only
possible after he had constructed enough meaning. These strategies include summarizing, making inferences and analyzing.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Tongchai had learned that good readers make summaries, analyze ideas from the text, express their opinions, and make further interpretations from what they have read. In most of his reading tasks, the think-aloud protocols showed that at some points of a passage, after he had identified and connected ideas between paragraphs, he sometimes orally summarized them. These behaviors generally occurred more substantially when the passages were long. During peer discussions, he occasionally began to share a summary of what he had understood from the passage. However, it should be noted that his summaries were not always accurate since his translations and comprehension of the text were not accurate. On some occasions, he became aware of his mistakes when he felt that what he summarized did not sound logical to him.

Protocol:

Now, I have finished reading the passage. I’ve finished translating it. Umm, I feel like I made some bad translations because I cannot answer some questions that follow the passage. I can answer only some of them… I think that the author wants to say that the internet is useful, but he doesn’t like e-mail because at the end of the article, he told people to contact him by telephone. Does he want to convey that communicating via e-mail makes him feel lonely?…He doesn’t like it. Something like this. [TA –W3D4]

However, he did not always seem to recognize that his understanding of the text was not completely correct until he had opportunities to check it with peers.

Like other students, Tongchai had opportunities to practice writing a summary in Weeks 3 and 5. His reflections indicated that while he was reading a passage, he underlined the main idea of each paragraph and took notes on those ideas in Thai. After he had read several paragraphs, he would review the ideas he had underlined and make a summary of them in English. Then, he compared it with the Thai notes he had previously made to see if the overall
meanings made sense to him. During peer discussions, he also revealed that he was not confident about expressing his understanding clearly in English in his written summary. In addition, he was not certain about how many details should be included in a summary. In my observation, this could be due to the fact that he still did not have a strong skill for identifying important vs. non-important information. However, in the last interview he noted that he generally felt that summarizing (and I assumed he was referring to both oral and written summaries) helped him have confidence in what he had comprehended. Simply put, it made him feel that he had understood something from what he had read.

Other consequential strategies such as analyzing and making inferences were rarely apparent in his reading. When they were applied (as evidenced in some tasks in the think-aloud protocols and pair work with peers), it seemed that they occurred spontaneously (without intent) during his reading and translating processes.

**Converting strategic knowledge into effective application.** As previously stated, Tongchai’s main concern with his reading was to understand the main ideas of the paragraphs in order to gain general understanding of the passage. With his belief that summarizing was useful, he appeared to apply his knowledge of the strategy in most of his reading tasks. Although he encountered difficulties in writing a summary, he still perceived that it was relatively helpful in fostering his comprehension of general ideas. In brief, he made attempts to apply the strategy but was not able to consistently control the effectiveness of his applications. However, the role of the strategy to confirm his preliminary understanding should have a positive impact on his overall comprehending process (no matter how accurately he could perform the tasks.)

Similar to other higher-level cognitive reading strategies, Tongcai’s difficulties in writing a summary could be attributed to two major factors. First, he needed much more English
linguistic competency to improve his skill in paraphrasing and summarizing ideas into English written text. Second, in addition to the basic declarative knowledge he had, he needed to develop a better conception and perception of the procedural and conditional knowledge of the strategy. This would help promote more systematic and efficient applications of both oral and written modes of the strategy.

Regarding inferencing and analyzing, if Tongchai had been able to apply strategies for more effective elaborative reading, he should eventually have been able to accomplish reading with these two high-level thinking strategies.

**Problem-Solving Strategies**

Problem-solving strategies refer to the strategic behaviors Tongchai appeared to employ when experiencing difficulties during his reading process.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** As an EFL reader, especially with low language proficiency, Tongchai certainly experienced various problems during his reading process. Obviously, he perceived his vocabulary problem as a major obstacle to his reading fluency. In the first interview, he reported that he had had limited practice in English reading before taking this course. He was often unfamiliar with the vocabulary in a passage he read and needed to rely heavily on a dictionary which hindered the automaticity of his decoding and thus his comprehension. In this course, he still read almost every sentence, and during the early weeks, he still relied more on using a dictionary than on applying other introduced strategies.

However, it was not only limited vocabulary that adversely affected his reading ability. Evidence indicated that he also experienced several other problems. One major problem was due to his general language constraints in English, not only the isolated vocabulary words. He
appeared to have difficulties in understanding sentences with complex syntactic structures, inferences, difficult idiomatic expressions and figurative language, and texts with unfamiliar styles of writing. Second, his limited strategy applications meant he could not use them as effective tools to improve his reading ability. His preconception during the early weeks about the dominant role of translation seemed to prevent him from thinking about other strategic reading behaviors. Although he experienced difficulties and was aware of the need to fix these problems, he did not make obvious attempts to do so.

Nevertheless, after he had experienced reading difficulties using his previous reading habits, Tongchai eventually tried to change his reading routines and apply some useful strategies to a certain level. In addition to some strategies he employed for probing and making elaboration, Tongchai also used rereading, guessing meaning from the contexts, and skipping to revise his comprehending process. During peer discussions, he also always checked his understanding of the problematic parts of a passage with his peers.

He applied rereading when he failed to translate and comprehend the text, especially when he felt that those parts of the passage might be the main ideas. When he reread, he tried to use his basic understanding of the given context to help guess the meanings of the problematic text. But due to his low language proficiency, the actual lexical and syntactic clues were not as accessible to him. The excerpts that follow illustrate this:

Text:

Imagine for a moment that it was e-mail and not the telephone that was invented in 1876. Now imagine that it was the telephone and not e-mail that was developed a century later. Wouldn’t we all be junking our keyboards while touting the phone as the hot new communications medium of the moment? No more typing, boss! We can actually hear each other!
Protocol:

OK, I’ll translate this paragraph. Let’s imagine back to the year 1876 to see if there was e-mail but there was no telephone. Then, if we imagine in the opposite way that now we have only telephone but no e-mail…Umm… “that it was e-mail and not the telephone that was invented in 1876. Now imagine that it was the telephone and not e-mail that was developed a century later. In the century that there was a development… Wouldn’t we all be junking our keyboards while touting the phone as the not new communications medium of the moment? No more typing, boss! We can actually hear each other! We won’t have any ideas of how to communicate by using telephone…” Umm…What does this mean? This paragraph is confusing….I don’t understand. I cannot translate it. Let’s imagine… if there was e-mail but no telephone or if there is telephone but no e-mail…Is it possible? [TA- W3D4]

However, in the contexts where he could construct meaning of it, he sometimes corrected his previous understanding. In addition, because Tongchai came to realize that checking the meaning of every unknown word interrupted the flow of his comprehending process, he tried to skip some unknown words or problematic parts unless he felt that it might be important information. However, his think-aloud protocols of some tasks showed that when he skipped the text, he generally did not appear to revisit it.

Converting strategic knowledge into effective application. With his understanding that the three strategies were useful to help him repair his understanding of the text, Tongchai applied them quite consistently. Evidence from the think-aloud protocols showed that normally rereading helped him acquire better understanding of the problematic text except when the passage was too difficult for him. His attempts to apply the strategy of rereading regularly and quite substantially in some tasks should suggest that he perceived its benefit. This should also imply that good awareness of when, why, and how to use rereading led him to have purposeful and relatively effective applications of the strategy.

His perception about his better reading fluency when applying skipping to help maintain the flow of the comprehension process also indicated his relative success in applying the strategy
of skipping in one aspect. Nevertheless, the fact that he did not revisit the skipped text could also suggest that on some occasions it was used more as a tactic employed to escape rather than to solve the problem. Besides, his inability to use context clues (e.g., lexical and syntactic clues) also led him to make ineffective guesses about the text on several occasions. Such performances indicated his need for better declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge of the strategy.

In conclusion, although the three strategies had yielded a relatively positive impact on his reading performance, the latter two seemed to be less effective. Also, it should be noted that there were some other aspects of his reading problems that Tongchai did not seem to be aware of (as I discussed earlier). Therefore, he was not attentive to tackling those problems; rather, he put his main effort toward dealing with vocabulary difficulties. I consider this a significant weakness of his problem-solving metacognitive awareness.

**Self- Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy**

Self-monitoring and evaluation strategy refers to learning behavior that Tongchai displayed regarding how he regulated his reading performance. In this part of the study I focused on describing and examining his metacognitive awareness in relation to his applications of reading strategies.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** Tongchai did not specifically reflect on how he perceived that his self-monitoring and evaluation impacted his reading performance. However, there was evidence that he regularly applied these metacognitive strategies during the five weeks. In his daily journals, he generally expressed the ideas that had learned about some new strategies, but still could not use them well when he had to read independently. Furthermore, his recognition that his language problems hindered his
comprehension process was regularly manifested in both the daily journals and peer discussions. He also considered time constraints as a problem for successful reading.

In the interviews, in response to my guided questions, Tongchai made more substantial reflections on his comprehension, reading fluency, and strategy uses. Despite various difficulties he had experienced, he felt that he could improve his reading fluency and comprehension to a certain level after he had changed his reading habits, as he reported in the last interview:

What I see as my changes from this course are, first of all, I’m more interested in reading articles in English. In the past, I didn’t want to read them. Now, when I read a passage, I also want to analyze what I’ve learned from it….I think I can read [as well as write] faster, too….I can understand what I’ve read better than before. [Int 3- W5]

He learned to use making predictions, previewing, skimming, and identifying main ideas vs. details to help him build up his overall comprehension, but he still needed more practice on applying these strategies as well as other strategies that he had not consistently tried.

In sum, it seemed Tongchai had started to develop his sense of this metacognitive strategy during the five weeks; and this made him become aware that he needed to change his reading habits. He did indeed attempts to change them after the mid point of the course. However, as mentioned, he did not express explicitly how he perceived that self-monitoring and evaluation helped him regulate his reading behaviors.

**Converting strategic knowledge into effective application.** Since Tongchai did not directly discuss how his self-monitoring and evaluation impacted his reading progress, it was not obvious what he perceived the role and the benefits to be of this metacognitive strategy. Considering his positive evaluation of his overall improvements during the later weeks, I hypothesize that the metacognitive awareness he had developed contributed to his progress. At the same time, despite having this metacognitive awareness, Tongchai did not appear to think seriously about using the strategy as a learning tool. His reflections seemed to suggest that from
his self-monitoring, he was aware of the need to perform reading more strategically in addition to extensive practice; however, he was not able to clarify for himself how he could improve his performance more effectively. This fact seemed to indicate that besides a greater knowledge of reading strategies, he also needed to have a better conception of how to use this metacognitive strategy to support his reading skill development. He needed to be able to use it more consciously in order to achieve optimum success.

**Regularity and Substantiality of Strategy Application**

As I have mentioned in the preceding sections, Tongchai’s prior goal for reading in English was to try to gain the general understanding of a passage. During the first two weeks of the study, he was still strongly influenced by his previous reading habits. His preconception that translation would provide an understanding of the text was hard to overcome, and he continued to read and translate every sentence, used a dictionary to check meanings of most words, and then tried to find main ideas. Thus, except for identifying main ideas, other introduced probing strategies such as previewing, skimming, making predictions, and analyzing text structure were minimally applied during these early weeks. Fortunately, however, these strategies became more regular from Week 3.

As he became more aware of using various strategies to enhance his probing process, it seemed that Tongchai could improve his ability to comprehend text at a macro level to a certain degree. The comprehension that he had acquired at this level also allow him to apply the higher-level strategy of summarizing. His application of summarizing could be observed quite regularly during all the five weeks. The think-aloud protocols showed that he reviewed and summarized the paragraphs while he was reading a passage. He also discussed his understanding of the passages with peers.
For elaborative reading, Tongchai added only the strategy of making predictions and generating questions to enhance his understanding of details to his previous habits of translating and guessing meanings from the context. However, both new strategies were neither regularly nor substantially applied. Nor did he frequently use his background knowledge in his reading. This resulted in limited ability to make clarifications and elaborations of the text. With his poor applications of elaborative strategies, he was not able to master the strategies at the higher level such as making inferences and analyzing. These two consequential strategies occurred only at a minimal level.

Although Tongchai was aware that he had various problems in his reading, as reflected in his daily journals and during peer discussions, he did not discuss the issues at length. In the interviews, he tended to make comments that he needed more practice with the various strategies he had learned. Unfortunately, as I have mentioned in the preceding sections, his incomplete metacognitive awareness did not seem to enable him to identify causes for his weaknesses in reading other than the issues of language problems. He did not address any problems regarding ineffective strategy applications. Consequently, his attempts to solve the reading problems that appeared regularly throughout the five weeks were limited to using of fix-up strategies (e.g., rereading, skipping, and context clues) to eliminate problems due to language difficulties.

In conclusion, although Tongchai was introduced to various strategies for his reading, his regularity and substantially of application were generally low. Such inactive use of strategies would clearly impede the degree of his progress.
Cross-Case Analysis on EFL Readers’ Strategy Use

In the preceding sections, I have presented findings regarding the awareness of, knowledge about and application of reading strategy use and the metacognitive awareness during reading of the four EFL learners in this study. Based on the findings of the reading behaviors for each participant, using cross-case analysis techniques (the procedures mentioned in Chapter 3) suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), I developed further constructs for each case. Then, I reviewed these derived constructs across the four cases and identified similarities and differences among them. Despite the fact that each participant had his/ her own unique style of reading, certain similarities of behaviors among the four participants and differences between the two proficiency groups (i.e., participants with high vs. low proficiency) could be identified. In addition, the discussions on the derived constructs are performed in connection with relevant findings and theoretical concepts reported or proposed by preceding researchers.

It is important to note that I have developed the analyses of the participants’ behaviors and the further constructs in terms of their strategy use in relation to the theoretical model of reading comprehension processes suggested by Irwin (1991). She suggested that during reading five processes may take place simultaneously. These include microprocesses, integrative processes, macroprocesses, elaborative processes, and metacognitive processes. In this study, the data revealed phenomena showing connections between the participants’ applications of reading strategies and these five processes, as illustrated in Table 1.

Based on this connecting framework of analysis, the derived constructs can be explained under three major themes. These themes reveal the participants’ overall English reading proficiency regarding their knowledge and abilities in applying reading and metacognitive strategy use: (a) Thai EFL learners and their reading strategy use for macro reading processes,
(b) Thai EFL learners and their reading strategy use for elaborative reading processes, and (c) Thai EFL learners and their metacognitive awareness in reading in English. (Because the data did not yield substantive information regarding the participants’ strategy use during the micrprocesses and integrative processes, I therefore did not include these aspects in the analysis.)

Table 1

Connections Between Comprehension Processes and Participants’ Employed Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension Processes</th>
<th>Microprocesses: Understand individual sentences</th>
<th>Integrative Processes: Understand and make relationships between individual clauses or sentences</th>
<th>Macroprocesses: Comprehend, connect, retain, and summarize general ideas</th>
<th>Elaborative Processes: Elaborate &amp; expand ideas beyond literal text</th>
<th>Metacognitive Processes: Aware &amp; control reading cognitive behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Strategies</td>
<td>Probing Strategies</td>
<td>Elaborative Strategies</td>
<td>Metacognitive Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Previewing</td>
<td>- Predicting</td>
<td>- Problem-solving: repair strategies: rereading, context clues, skipping</td>
<td>- Self-monitoring &amp; evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Predicting</td>
<td>- Background knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Skimming</td>
<td>- Generating questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analyzing</td>
<td>- Analyzing text structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Text structure</td>
<td>- Context clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Context clues</td>
<td>- Identifying main ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Background knowledge</td>
<td>- Clarifying details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identifying main ideas</td>
<td>- Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Note-taking</td>
<td>- Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Translating</td>
<td>- Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequential Strategies</td>
<td>Consequential Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesizing &amp; Summarizing</td>
<td>Synthesizing &amp; Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thai EFL Learners and their Strategy Use for Macro Reading Processes

Shared and differing behaviors and perceptions regarding strategy use among the learners with high and low language proficiency were identified in the analyses. This section presents and discusses findings in regard to their reading at the macro level.

The Four Cases and Their Similar Strategy Use for Macro Reading Processes

Irwin (1991) explained that during macro processing, readers execute their efforts toward comprehending and retaining idea units based on the organizational patterns of passages. During macro processing, learners may attempt to understand each individual idea, connect and synthesize those ideas, and summarize them into related general ideas. Along the continuum of their progress during the five weeks, the four Thai college students in this study shared certain aspects of knowledge and strategy use in their macro reading processes.

The four participants learned that in order to comprehend text successfully enough to gain the big picture of the passage, they needed to be able to identify the main ideas as well as use other related strategies to enhance a general understanding effectively. All of them acquired declarative knowledge of useful strategies that good readers typically apply to help foster effective reading processes at this macro level. They all reported using previewing, making predictions, skimming, using the text structure strategy, and note-taking to enhance their ability to identify, comprehend, and retain important messages from the passage. However, each of them had different levels of skillfulness in applying these strategies.

Through their practice in developing strategic reading skills during the five weeks in this course, the four students gradually built up their knowledge and awareness of the roles of these individual strategies and the fact that one strategy enhanced another during the reading process of a given reading task. They learned that skimming would yield comprehension of the big
picture, and that effective skimming involved identifying important vs. non-important ideas, skipping non-important information, and connecting the main ideas to form a general understanding. They also learned that they should preview and use their knowledge of the organizational pattern of the passage to help provide the framework for skimming. They recognized that previewing, making predictions, using the knowledge of text structure, and using notes they had produced enhanced skimming to foster even more successful comprehension of the general ideas. They realized that failure to use certain strategies effectively in a given context resulted in less successful comprehension. However, the higher proficiency readers seemed to be more able to make explicit reflections on how strategies worked together in an interrelated manner during reading. This finding corresponds with what Wongpaisaj (1995) noted about successful readers in her study; they tended to perceive the connecting roles of strategies, and they showed more systematic thinking and were able to describe more clearly their strategy use than were unsuccessful readers.

These four Thai college readers were also able to describe how they had used reading strategies to foster their comprehension of the text at this macro level. For example, they made predictions from the titles, previewed introductory paragraphs, and previewed the beginning of other paragraphs in a passage. However, the higher proficiency readers (Orawan and Uma) seemed to apply the strategies more thoroughly as they included previewing of headings and textual clues. Uma and Orawan realized that success or failure in applying the text structure strategy affected their skimming and comprehending processes of the general ideas. Pailin also mentioned that her observations of text structure enhanced more effective predicting and previewing processes. A similar positive impact of knowledge of these organizational patterns and rhetorical structures of text used by these EFL learners used to contribute to their
comprehension was also found in Cristina and Martinez’s study (2002). They concluded that the most positive reading effect occurred when students recognized the patterns and could reproduce information from the text accordingly. Uma reported that when she did not know what to predict, she used previewing to help guide her predictions. Similarly, Orawan used predictions and questions to help keep track of ideas when she was unable to use knowledge of the text structure to provide framework of her skimming. And even the least proficient reader, Tongchai realized that when he began to skim the text using the strategy of previewing and making predictions in week three, he was able to perceive the big picture better and faster.

All the participants attempted to apply these related probing strategies in order to master their comprehension of the general ideas derived from connecting the main ideas of the paragraphs in a passage. They also learned how to make use of note-taking to enhance their comprehension of the passage. Evidence showed that Uma, Orawan, and Pailin had applied most of the introduced probing strategies for the macro reading processes regularly from Week 1 although they employed each individual strategy with differing regularity and substantiality over the five weeks and in any given reading task. Tongchai, the weakest of the four readers, eventually applied these strategies more regularly, but only after the third week.

Although these four readers developed their skills in applying useful strategies in differing degrees, they all shared a positive attitude regarding the benefits of the strategies to their reading comprehension, and this seemed to reinforce active applications, which in turn yielded more effective reading performance over time. After they had practiced reading by applying their knowledge of useful strategies, all four participants could generally perceive that reading more strategically helped improve their reading performance and comprehension so that they were able to achieve a general understanding of an English passage. As a consequence, they
were able to connect, synthesize, and produce a summary of ideas as the ultimate reading
performance at this macro level (Irwin, 1991). They also perceived that their ability to perform
higher-level skills of synthesizing and summarizing in turn helped to confirm themselves their
understanding of the passage. Clearly, due to their different levels of English language
proficiency, each one’s ability to control his or her macro reading processes was also at a
different level. In other words, the accuracy of their comprehension and summaries (both oral
and written) as the ultimate indicator of comprehension was parallel to their perceived reading at
this macro level varied.

Lastly, regarding the issue of the written summary, though each participant’s ability
varied, all of them still shared the same perceptions that despite learning a basically good
understanding of a passage to be summarized, they had limitations when producing a good
summary. Generally, they had problems in paraphrasing and making decisions about how many
supporting details should be included. Kirkland and Saunders (1991) classified these two aspects
as ‘internal constraints’. They explained that when one is working on writing a summary, his or
her “cognitive load is determined by a number of interacting internal and external constraints”
(p. 106). Among other factors, the second language proficiency and the formal schemata (e.g.,
format, rhetorical pattern, and conventions of written summarizing) can be considered the
dominant internal constraints. In addition to comprehension ability, the second language skills
necessary for producing a written summary include writing (e.g., vocabulary, grammar,
composing) skills required to convey thoughts and information. Inadequacy in any of these skills
can bring about “semantic distortions, inability to paraphrase, and other problems” (p. 108). The
fact that the participants in this present study were uncertain about how to properly include
supporting details in any of their summary seemed to indicate overall an inadequate formal
schemata of the rhetorical convention of a typical written summary. However, it should also be noted that external constraints including the task environment (e.g. level of readability, clarity, and length of the material) can also affect the level of their success.

**Differences in Reading Strategy Use between Readers with High vs. Language Low Proficiency**

Based on the four participants’ English academic profiles (as presented earlier), Orawan and Uma (Cases 2 & 1) were the learners with higher English language proficiency while compared to Pailin and Tongchai (Cases 3 & 4). Findings about reading behaviors regarding strategy use during macro processing suggested that there were some different aspects between the higher proficiency learners and those with low English language proficiency.

**High proficiency EFL readers and their strategy use for macro reading processes.**

Between the two participants with the higher command of English, Orawan appeared to be more competent than Uma since she reported fewer language and comprehension problems during reading. Regardless, however, of their slightly different levels of language proficiency, they shared some similar reading behaviors and perceptions.

Both participants asserted they had become more strategic in their reading for general ideas in that they were able to use their strategies (both previously learned and newly-introduced in this course) more purposefully and efficiently than at the beginning of the course. This reflection was born out in their observable behaviors and products. Their comprehension at this macro level suggested that their declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of probing strategies eventually developed into successful application. They learned to choose a certain strategy or even apply related strategies together in a given context to promote their understanding of the general ideas. Orawan said she continuously practiced skipping details during skimming because she realized that it helped her process information more effectively.
than before. Knowing that previewing helped guide the tentative direction to reach the big picture of the passage faster, she used it concurrently with skimming most of the time. However, in short and descriptive passages, Orawan did not appear to apply the strategy. Schunk (1991) explained that there are reasons that students may not engage in applying strategies even though they know that the strategies are useful. For instance, in the contexts in which they learn “easy” materials, they might not think it necessary to make attempts to execute their strategic ability or metacognitive skill. When Orawan could identify the organizational pattern of the passage, she used this knowledge to structure both her skimming and identifying main ideas. She even used making predictions and generating questions to help her connect and keep track of main ideas. She chose to take notes after reading easier texts to confirm comprehension, but took notes during reading more challenging texts to help create initial understanding.

Uma also appeared to be consciously making efforts to develop her skills in applying the introduced strategies for reading at this macro level. Her levels of declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of different strategies greatly influenced her decisions about how to apply them in her reading. For instance, she reported that it had taken her a certain period of time to be certain of how and why previewing and making predictions enhanced reading. As such, her applications of some strategies became more regular after she had an understanding and the confidence for how and why she could use them. Evidence showed that Uma gradually actively applied such strategies, and she felt that her applications became more spontaneous over time. This phenomenon of the positive development of awareness and application of strategies resembled that of Orawn (as described earlier) and was similar to that in Afflerbach’s study (1990), who found that when readers perceive that strategies contribute to an efficient understanding of the text, they put efforts into applying them more actively. Also, Uma only
applied strategies when she could perceive their roles clearly. One example to illustrate this is that she was not very confident in using background knowledge to help interpret main ideas, thus she applied it less regularly. All in all, she reported that knowing how to skim for important information using related supporting strategies enabled her to read more effectively than before.

Overall, these two participants developed a good awareness and the abilities to apply strategic reading skills during their macro reading processes. With their good knowledge of the introduced strategies, they appeared to apply most of them at a ‘high regularity’ rate. They had clear purposes associated with making choices in applying different strategies. Both asserted that the strategies helped them not only to complete their reading tasks without abandoning them in the middle (as previously occurred) but that the strategies also yielded effective comprehension in their reading at this macro level. Moreover, this preliminary understanding had a positive impact on elaborative reading processes as well. For instance, Uma described her process to her partner after she had read an assigned passage in class. She began to find main ideas of the paragraphs, then underlined those ideas and took notes, and then reviewed their connections. Her understanding of these ideas made it easier when she read the passage again in detail. Similarly, Orawan reflected in an interview that after she had read for main ideas, it was easy for her to select which parts of the details she would like to concentrate on.

Low proficiency EFL readers and their strategy use for macro reading processes. Pailin and Tongchai exhibited lower English language proficiency than Orawan and Uma. Between them, Pailin appeared to be more competent than Tongchai as she had taken more English language courses prior to enrolling in this course. Nonetheless, some phenomena regarding the knowledge and the applications of strategies in their reading of English text at the macro level of
reading were common to both. The nature of their reading skills and perceptions differed from those of the two more proficient readers.

Both Pailin and Tongchai reported that although they had learned about how they should read strategically to gain comprehension of the general ideas, it was still hard for them to use and apply these strategic skills because they were still more influenced by their previous reading habits. Therefore, it took a great deal of time to develop their knowledge of certain strategies into effective application. During the early weeks, especially for Tongchai, it seemed that his previous habits of seeking meanings mainly by decoding and translating the text were a big barrier to trying the strategies he had learned. This slowed the improvement the new habits of strategic reading. It should be noted that this overreliance on decoding and translating strategy that clearly appeared in Tongchai’s case was also found among the low-proficient Thai EFL readers in Adunyarittikun’s study (2005); he emphasized that this interfered with their overall comprehension. Expending too much cognitive energy or attention on text level features results in a lack of automatic decoding. This affects fluency and comprehension (Samuels, 1994).

These two participants exhibited the same difficulty in reading at the macro level in that they could not perform very effective skimming especially during the early weeks. First, although they tried to focus on identifying and comprehending main ideas, they were not able to skip unimportant details during skimming the paragraphs. Interestingly, the low-proficient English native high school readers learning a foreign language (French, German, and Spanish) in Hosenfeld’s study (1977) and an EFL Chinese low-proficient college reader in Auerbach and Paxton’s study (1997) also exhibited this deficient behavior during reading. During the first two weeks, Tongchai and Pailin still appeared to read almost every sentence of the passages and relied heavily on bilingual dictionaries. Thus, they required a great deal of time to comprehend
even the general idea of the passage. Similar to Li’s belief about how to best comprehend English text (Auerbach & Paxton, 1997), Tongchai and Pailin’s reflections on their previous beliefs that they needed to know all the words in the passage and that if they had skipped details they might not be able to understand the passage seemed to indicate incomplete skill in identifying important vs. non-important information in these two less proficient readers.

Second, these two participants began to regularly apply previewing starting in Week 3. Pailin seemed to subsequently develop a good skill in this strategy, but Tongchai did not appear to use the strategy comprehensively; his previewing was limited to only the introductory part of the passage and the beginning of paragraphs. He did not cover headings or textual clues (highlight words/phrases) that appeared in the body paragraphs. Third, their previous habits of copying phrases or sentences from the original texts still dominated their note-taking skills, resulting their notes included too many details. Their knowledge of using the graphic organizers and outline techniques seemed to help them improve this skill in the later weeks. Nonetheless, because of the strong influences of their previous reading habits, they were generally able to apply fewer introduced probing strategies at a ‘high regularity’ rate compared to the two high-proficiency participants.

Another major constraint in reading encountered by these two participants was due to basic language problems. Despite the fact that they were able to more or less comprehend the general ideas of the passage, their low English language proficiency made their reading at this macro level troublesome, especially when the passages were difficult for them. It was obvious in Tongchai’s case that his limited command of English made him read so slowly that he did not even get to his second reading of a passage during the early weeks. Moreover, it caused inaccurate translations, which resulted in inaccurate comprehension. The low effectiveness of the
Translation strategy evident in his reading also appeared among the low-proficient Thai college readers in Adunyarittikun’s study (2005). Indeed, Tongchai and Pailin sometimes failed to understand main ideas of the paragraphs in the first place due to their vocabulary problems. Their poor knowledge of lexical and syntactic structures (e.g., sentence connectors, transitional words) occasionally hindered their abilities to identify the organizational patterns at both paragraph and passage levels. In brief, these language difficulties prevented them from being able to actively and effectively apply the strategies they had learned in order to enhance their reading processes. Tongchai’s inadequate applications of useful strategies could not promote successful comprehension at the optimal level, especially during the early weeks. Nevertheless, their efforts to develop strategic reading skills to master the text at the macro level improved over time, however not as much as the more proficient language learners, Orawan and Uma.

In conclusion, with their difficulties in converting declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of certain strategies into effective applications, Pailin and Tongchai appeared to need a great deal of time to improve their skills in reading mastery at this macro level. Nevertheless, through continuous practice during the five weeks, they began to report and evidence actual positive impacts of strategic behaviors on their overall reading performance.

**Thai EFL Learners and their Strategy Use for the Elaborative Reading Processes**

This section reports findings about: (a) the similarities of reading behaviors and perceptions among the four cases, and (b) the differences between learners with high vs. low language proficiency regarding their strategy use and performance during elaborative processes.

**The Four Cases and Their Similar Strategy Use for Elaborative Reading Processes**

Irwin (1991) defined elaborative reading processes as the involvement of a reader in making related elaborations beyond ideas included by the author. However, these elaborations
can contribute to the comprehension of the message that the author intends. Some similar behaviors and perceptions among these four Thai college students in regard to their reading strategy use for elaborative purposes were found in this study.

The four participants were aware that in addition to comprehending the important text information at the macro level, they needed to go beyond the literal meanings in the text to make inferences and elaborations on the author’s ideas. In relation to this knowledge, they were aware of strategic reading behaviors that would enhance effective elaborative reading.

With a basic awareness of elaborative reading, the four participants were able to describe how they used certain strategies individually and together to fulfill this purpose and could also describe the strategies’ roles in fostering comprehension. As mentioned in the preceding section, Uma recognized the positive role of making predictions; she applied the strategy in most reading tasks. When she was able to identify the organizational pattern of the passage, she used it to guide her predictions. However, it should be noted that Uma had some preconceived notions about her ability to effectively use the elaborative strategies of using background knowledge and generating questions. In certain contexts she was uncertain as to whether these strategies might actually distract her from the correct meaning of the text. Thus, her perception of their usefulness was dependent on the textual context of the text. For example, when she recognized words she had learned from other subjects (e.g., terms in psychology), she felt that using this previous knowledge to connect with what was being described in the text was useful to help interpret it; on the other hand, in contexts in which she expected to get a message corresponding to her personal experience but did not, it made her uncertain about her understanding.

Orawan perceived the useful role that predicting had upon her ability to interact more actively with the text and the author’s views. She also noted that she felt good when she could
connect the text with her background knowledge (e.g., knowledge from other content-area subjects or her personal experience) because it normally enabled her to expand upon ideas from the passage. Overall, she was able to perceive the connections between reading at the macro and elaborative processing levels; she felt that her abilities to comprehend important ideas, clarify specific information, and elaborate upon those ideas promoted optimum comprehension.

Pailin reported that despite her low frequency of applications of elaborative strategies, when she was able to apply them, she perceived they enhanced her comprehension. For instance, generating questions (although she could not apply this strategy frequently) helped her keep good track of and interact with the author’s views. Using background knowledge helped her to interpret and analyze ideas. Additionally, she also noted that when she achieved elaborative reading, it also reinforced her reading at the macro level; comprehending details helped clarify main ideas and enhanced note-taking. (Nonetheless, it was not very often that she was able to succeed with this higher-level comprehension.) Tongchai, because he was able to apply elaborative strategies only at the very minimal level, could neither clearly express why the strategies were useful or how to use them.

In short, all four participants appeared to make attempts to apply the introduced strategies such as making predictions, generating questions, using background knowledge, and using the text structure strategy to enhance their comprehension process of the text in more detail. Also, comprehension moved along the continuum of understanding from literal to conceptual, they also tried to develop their higher-level elaborative reading skills of making inferences and analyzing ideas to a certain extent. This awareness or knowledge of the higher-level reading strategies and abilities to increase meanings in reading seemed to basically derive from the schemata that they brought to their reading. As Anderson (1994) asserts, while reading, if a
reader instantiates a schema and it “gives a good account of the objects and events described in the message” (p.469), it will facilitate successful comprehension.

The effectiveness and the degree of strategy use seemed to be relative to English language proficiency at this higher level. With her higher English language proficiency, Orawan was able to perform higher-level elaborative reading more efficiently than the others could. She even articulated her progress in analytical reading skills in that she was able to expand on ideas from the text and interact with the author’s views. This ultimately gave her a sense of enjoyment when reading English texts. Although Uma was successful in establishing good comprehension of the text at the macro level, she reported that without much relevant background knowledge, it was hard for her to make inferences from what was literally stated in the passage. However, as by nature she was an analytical reader in her first language, she appeared to make attempts to analyze and express her views toward ideas she had learned from a second language passage. Pailin, similar to Uma, despite her language difficulties in reading, attempted to develop analytical reading skills as clearly noticeable along the continuum of her progress. However, the level of her ability to master this higher-level reading was dependent on her ability to comprehend the text in a given context. Tongchai seemed to have declarative knowledge of these higher-level strategies. However, with his English language constraints and incomplete procedural and conditional knowledge, he exercised his reading skills at this elaborative level very minimally.

All in all, the four participants shared a similar constraint, but to differing degrees, in developing their elaborative reading skills. When they had to deal with detailed text, the issue of language difficulties came into play. This phenomenon parallels other findings in previous research in second language reading that suggest “reading difficulties are closely associated with
L2 reader’s level of proficiency in the target language” (Mohktari, 2002, p.3). Nevertheless, none of the participants appeared to abandon their reading in the middle of the task (as they had previously done). Instead, when they failed to master overall comprehension, they were aware of problem-solving strategy use and made choices to apply certain strategies to repair understanding in a given context, albeit with some choices working better than others. Their ability to continue the reading process generally made them gain confidence in their performance. As Schunk (2003) explains, when learners believe that they can improve their performance relevant to the specific contexts, they will feel efficacious and motivated to continue their learning tasks. This fact was also evidenced in Mason’s study (2004) in which she concluded that students’ self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation developed positively when they were aware of their own competence in strategy use.

Differences in Reading Strategy Use between Readers with High vs. Low Language Proficiency

My findings also suggested some different aspects of participants’ reading strategy use at the elaborative level. Generally the more proficient readers shared certain similarities while the less proficient readers shared others. Elaborative reading requires much more language competency than reading at the macro level. Uma, whose English language proficiency was higher than Pailin’s and Tongchai’s but not as high as Orawan’s, appeared to share some common aspects with her high proficiency peer and other aspects with her lower proficiency peers.

High EFL proficiency readers and their strategy use for the elaborative reading processes. In Block’s study (1986) of both native and non-native college readers of English texts, he found that the more successful readers had greater potential to focus on interpreting and analyzing the text in order to gain the message conveyed by the author more effectively. In this study, Orawan
and Uma exhibited similar behaviors. As a matter of fact, Orawan, the most proficient reader in this study, was constantly able to achieve effective higher-level reading performances in various skills (e.g., making inferences, analyzing ideas from the text, expressing opinions, expanding ideas to the world) and ultimately interacted with the author’s views most actively of the four. Still, Uma seemed to share a certain degree of success at the elaborative reading level; she was occasionally able to reach higher-level comprehension and analyze the author’s views as well. Generally, this ability was primarily exhibited when she was able to digest the details in a given context or discern the connections of messages between paragraphs effectively. In such situations, she appeared to be more analytical. The aesthetic nature of her interactions with the ideas presented in the text was also observable in some passages. However, when she felt her comprehension was not complete, she tended not to have the confidence to try further interpretations. In short, with their adequate declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of certain elaborative strategies, they were able to apply them to clarify and elaborate ideas of the text effectively. When they were able to achieve complete comprehension, they were then able to perform analytical reading. It was obvious that the successful overall comprehension Orawan accomplished as a result of her effective elaborative (as well as probing) reading helped her perceive the positive roles of the introduced strategies; she therefore appeared to practice using them, including those at the higher-level (e.g. analyzing and making inferences) more consistently than the other students. The ongoing practice of such strategic reading strengthened her achievement of higher-level reading. As mentioned, her sense of enjoyment in analytical reading in English stands as a good indicator of her success. Uma, because she was not very confident in her English language ability and still experienced vocabulary problems in some situations (although she was able to master some of the basic elaborative strategies such as
making predictions and the text structure strategy) tended to be reluctant to apply strategies such as generating questions and using background knowledge in some contexts (See Case 1). As a result, despite the positive attribute of being an analytical reader, her skill in making inferences from the text was still not at the optimal level. It should be noted that her reluctance in applying these elaborative strategies seemed to be rooted in her concern that they would lead her to misinterpret the text. Researchers such as Irwin (1991) have also noted that irrelevant inferences do not lead to successful comprehension. Similarly, the gap of ability in applying higher-level strategies such as making inferences that appeared between Orawan and Uma was also evidenced in Sugirin’s two EFL above-average proficient readers (1999). That is, the one who earned higher scores in a reading comprehension test used inferencing more frequently. However, for Uma, her successful comprehension at the macro level and her abilities in elaborative reading to a certain extent enabled her to positively develop some higher-level reading skills over time. Her analytical reading ability in her first language also enhanced similar performance in her English reading in English when she was able to overcome her language problems.

Despite the different degrees of success in reading at this level between these two readers, they shared the common perception that when they felt they were successful in their strategy applications, it helped them confirm that they were able to acquire complete comprehension. For example, when they realized that they were able to correctly interpret the author’s views or analyze ideas they had learned from the passage, they felt confident in their reading performance. Their sense of achievement engendered a positive attitude toward their development in becoming strategic readers. Similarly, the successful second language readers in
Hosenfeld’s study (1977) also experienced the same kind of development and feelings of achievement when they had success in applying strategies.

Low EFL proficiency readers and their strategy use for the elaborative reading processes. As aforementioned, elaborative reading requires a fairly solid command of English, Pailin and Tongchai, who were generally considered lower proficiency English language learners, encountered difficulties in mastering reading at this level. However, even Uma, who generally shared certain aspects of reading abilities with Orawan, appeared to exhibit a performance similar to her lower-proficiency peers in several aspects of elaborative reading. This unexpected commonality seemed to corroborate Cummins’ explanation about the linguistic threshold hypothesis (1979, 1981): readers will not be able to transfer their L1 reading ability to L2 reading effectively until they develop and are able to attain a certain level of the target language proficiency.

First, with their English language constraints and uncertain procedural and conditional knowledge of certain strategies, Pailin, Tongchai, and Uma were only able to apply the introduced strategies in their reading at low regularity and substantiality rates, and they generally demonstrated less effective elaborative reading performance. Similarly, in Adunyarittikun’s study, Thai college low-proficient readers employed only a low percentage of elaborative strategies classified as interactive strategies (2005). In this study, the most dramatic illustration regarding the effects of inadequate language command could be seen in Tongchai’s case. His limited English language proficiency obviously hindered his abilities to apply strategies and generate effective elaborations from the text. He occasionally produced inaccurate translations, which yielded inaccurate comprehension of specific information (despite correct general understanding in some passages). Consequentially, this led to further misinterpretation. Pailin
also asserted that when she was struggling with the language problems, she was not able to master strategy applications effectively. When she compared her interpretations of the text with those of her peers, she occasionally found that her comprehension of some details was inaccurate. Although Uma was able to comprehend and elaborate ideas from the text better than her two less proficient peers, she still observed that it was much more challenging for her to master more elaborate ideas from the text because it required a greater command of the language and relevant background knowledge. On some occasions, her language constraints inhibited her confidence in her comprehension at this higher level.

In addition to their English language limitations, the nature of elaborative reading processes and strategy use for reading at this level appeared unclear to them. Although these three participants recognized the introduced elaborative strategies such as making predictions, generating questions, and making inferences from the text, they did not seem to have comprehensive perceptions of how to apply them efficiently to promote their comprehension at the higher-level reading. There were numerous situations where they were uncertain if they had applied those strategies effectively in their own reading.

The most noticeable aspect of these three readers was their uncertainty about the strategy of generating questions. Even though they had learned in the mini-lessons that the basic ‘WH-questions’ could help them to interact with the text, they were still not able to articulate a specific question or identify at which particular point during their reading process they should generate one. I hypothesize that their weakness in this strategy use could be due to the negative influence of their previous reading habits in that they were not trained to use generating questions as a strategic action to derive meanings from the text. Thus, they applied this strategy at the low ‘substantiality’ rate within a single task. Their most commonly asked questions were at a literal
level and seemed to be limited to questions such as “What is next?” or “What does this mean?”
This phenomenon seemed to resemble findings from previous studies regarding the kinds of
questions readers have generated in reading expository texts. After reviewing those studies,
DuBravac and Dalle (2002) noted that more questions for clarifying contents were generated
from narrative texts; in expository texts, more questions were found that directly addressed
specific linguistic problems (e.g., vocabulary and sentence structures) or those problems caused
by miscomprehension of the text. In brief, the low rate of the strategy applications seems to
suggest that the strategy may have fewer salient features that were hard for these participants to
perceive, indicating their failure to utilize this strategy could be attributed to various related
factors such as inadequate procedural knowledge, language constraints, overall limited reading
ability, or even memory capacity. DuBravac and Dalle (2002) hypothesized that a reader may
lack ability to generate a question if s/he cannot master such cognitive challenges and fails to
connect the text to events beyond the text. This failure makes it difficult to develop
comprehensive knowledge and to translate strategic knowledge into effective application.

The participants’ applications of background knowledge appeared also at low frequency.
Uma noted that she was afraid that this strategy might misguide her in understanding the text, for
example, in the contexts where her personal experience contradicted the author’s ideas offered in
the text. She also recognized that without relevant background knowledge, she could not
conceive of further inferences to make. This fear of making a wrong inference made her seem
reluctant to apply the skill. The problem Uma experienced may be well explained by DuBravac
and Dalle’s assertion (2002) that a reader cannot make overall meanings only from the text, but
s/he needs to bridge the information gap with the logical thinking from his/her background
knowledge. Furthermore, they observed that previous studies have indicated that readers generally find it easier to fill information gaps in narrative rather than expository texts.

Similarly, Pailin was afraid that a wrong prediction might result in misinterpretation; therefore, she was reluctant to use this strategy. And while Tongchai sometimes made predictions or generated questions, he did not seem to seriously monitor and verify his predictions or seek answers to the questions he had made. Also, there was evidence that these two participants made the majority of their predictions only from the titles and introductory paragraphs, but discontinued predicting when reading the body of a passage. Their failure in effectively applying this strategy might be due to what Afflerbach (1990) has explained happens when readers cannot find specific cues in the text to engage with their appropriate schemata: predictions become difficult to generate (as evidenced in Pailin’s case). Also, a failure to monitor the predictions they have made yield in incomplete comprehension (as evidenced in Tongchai’s case).

Pailin also noted that despite her awareness of the benefits of these elaborative strategies, she could not apply them extensively because her cognitive capacity was limited by her attempts to decipher the language during reading. Tongchai’s reading behaviors indicated that he was not even cognizant that meanings could be established beyond translation of individual words/phrases. Therefore, his attempt to construct meaning beyond the literal level was minimal. All in all, the low effectiveness of applying of these basic elaborative strategies only minimally impacted their higher-level reading performance.

During the five weeks of this course, these EFL readers, especially Pailin and Tongchai, showed that they needed a great deal of time and practice to develop their skills in elaborating and expanding ideas from the text. With practice, each participant did begin to develop his or her
skills over time. Both Uma and Pailin appeared to attempt to develop their elaborative reading skills, including making inferences and analyzing, even though they lacked confidence in their performance; indeed, their applications were evidenced at quite a minimal level. I hypothesize these attempts were due to their first language analytical reading skills (as revealed in the first interview about their backgrounds). However, evidence seemed to indicate that they were not always cognizant of their emerging skills. They seemed to be more aware of their inferences or analyses when they made attempts to raise questions or to interact with the author’s views, or when they consciously connected the text with their own experience or background knowledge. On other occasions, making inferences or analyses took place without much of their awareness.

Tongchai, during the early weeks, attempted mainly to decode and translate the text; thus his ability to process information beyond the micro, integrative, and macro processes (Irwin, 1991) was limited. In the later weeks, when he could perform his second reading for a task and appeared to apply some strategies, he seemed to develop his overall ability for comprehending details (when they were literally stated) more effectively, but his skills in elaborating and expanding ideas was not obviously noticeable.

In sum, my findings illustrate that these three participants’ English language constraints and their incomplete knowledge of useful strategies were two major factors that hindered the effective development of their elaborative reading skills. If they could overcome their weaknesses in these two areas, they should be able to increasingly develop their higher-level reading skills in English over time.
Thai EFL Learners and their Metacognitive Awareness in Reading in English

This section presents findings about: (a) the similar aspects of metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use among the four cases, and (b) the different aspects of metacognitive strategy use between high vs. low language proficiency learners.

The Four Cases and Their Similar Aspects of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Use

Metacognitive awareness is the “awareness and control of one’s own cognitive processes” (Irwin, 1991, p. 4). In relation to reading behaviors, it is the reader both knowing whether he is successful, and managing cognitive abilities to achieve text comprehension. This metacognitive awareness should enable a reader to regulate and control the performance of his reading task effectively (Hartman, 2001; Irwin, 1991; Pressley et. al., 1987).

The findings have illustrated several aspects of metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use shared by the four learners. In this course, these students were taught several cognitive reading strategies and also told that good readers monitor and evaluate their own performance and try to solve problems they encounter in their reading to reach the highest level of understanding of which they are capable. During the mini-lessons, pair activities and discussions, and teacher-student conferences and interviews throughout the five weeks, participants were encouraged to build an awareness of their metacognition. I could perceive that their sense of metacognition was rooted in their first language reading habits, which parallels the nature of the construct suggested in previous research studies (Alderson, 1984; Carrell, 1991). As a consequence, it appeared that all of them consciously applied self-monitoring, evaluation, and problem-solving strategies in their reading.

The participants’ awareness of their metacognition during reading was observable from their reflections in the interviews, daily journals, and peer discussions. Their comments
suggested that the four participants monitored for problems they experienced during reading, evaluated both their problem-solving abilities and the effectiveness of their reading strategy use and the comprehension they had finally achieved. They were aware of the strengths they had developed in their reading as well as the weaknesses that still prevailed. For instance, although Orawan asserted that her new strategic reading habits brought her a sense of enjoyment in reading English texts, she still recognized her weakness in inferring main ideas when they were not directly stated. Likewise, Uma perceived that she had become more strategic in her reading, and her confidence in problem-solving strategy helped lessen her concerns about her language constraints. Yet, she realized that her reading skills at the higher level were not very efficient. Both Uma and Pailin could identify several problems that hindered their reading comprehension such as vocabulary and grammatical problems, issues of text readability, differences between their socio-cultural experience and those of the authors. Pailin continued to express concerns about her reading abilities despite the fact that she had improved over time. And clearly, Tongchai and the others (including Orawan, when working on some reading passages) claimed that language problems were the major obstacles to efficient reading. Besides his concern about language problems, Tongchai was also aware that although he had learned new strategies, he was not able to use them effectively when he had to read by himself.

The four participants could generally identify their problems, and they made attempts to tackle them, each with a different degree of success. They appeared to apply repair strategies during both macro and elaborative processes. The three common fix-up strategies all of them applied in their reading were using context-clues, rereading, and skipping problematic text. Since using context clues was an introduced strategy, most of them learned to use it when they encountered vocabulary problems. Uma even noted that she made a great change from her habit
of relying on a dictionary to using more context clues. Tongchai appeared to use context clues much less frequently than the others since his English lexical and syntactic knowledge seemed inadequate to promote his success in trying it; thus, he tended to use the dictionary more frequently than the others. Rereading and skipping were the strategies transferred from their first language reading habits that tended to be applied more spontaneously. These two fix-up strategies were also evident among Thai college readers in Adunyarittikun’s study (2005). I hypothesize that all participants chose rereading as one fix-up strategy because it helped them regain global understanding of the text. From his review of various studies, Brown (2002) summarized the role of the rereading strategy as resulting in comprehension similar to comprehension gained from underlining, note-taking, or annotation. At the same time, skipping problematic text helps maintain reading momentum, a noticeable behavior exhibited by the subjects of this study.

More interestingly, although the four participants applied fix-up strategies in their reading, the data showed that Uma was the reader who appeared to use context clues and rereading most frequently, and she used skipping less frequently than the other two strategies. I hypothesized that Orawan did not have to employ much in the way of problem-solving strategies because she did not have many serious problems with constructing meaning. Pailin and Tongchai used the fix-up strategies less frequently than Uma (even though they had poorer reading performance) perhaps because they were less conscious of their problems in some contexts or did not know how to deal with the problems. Brown (1978) argued that unsuccessful reading can be attributed to the fact that a learner lacks metacognitive skills to monitor their comprehension and repair their problems to regain their understanding when it falters. And though all of these
participants’ basic problem-solving awareness led them to employ a compensation strategy of using a bilingual English-Thai dictionary, it seemed helpful only in some contexts.

Overall, the participants’ awareness of strategy use and comprehension monitoring and evaluation, regardless of how efficiently they were able to develop their reading performance, generally helped them progress in developing their reading skills more strategically, and this yielded more effective comprehension in English reading than they had previously attained. All of them were generally aware of the roles and benefits of the reading strategies they had practiced in this course, especially when they were successful in applying them. Also, they were aware of the importance of teacher’s explanations and modeling of why, when and how they could make use of certain strategies. Throughout the five weeks, they more or less consciously offered reflections on how effectively they applied those strategies in their reading. However, it seemed that Uma was the only participant who reported explicitly that her metacognitive awareness helped create the positive changes in her reading performance during the five weeks. She noted that having reviewed her daily journal entries about her reading practice, she could perceive how much she had progressed as well as what skills she still needed to improve. The other three participants did not seem to have this advanced awareness of the role of their comprehension monitoring and evaluation as a useful tool to help them regulate and control their reading behaviors.

Differences in Reading Metacognitive Awareness between Readers with High vs. Low Language Proficiency

Paris and Jacobs (1984) stated “Skilled readers often engage in deliberate activities that require planful thinking, flexible strategies, and periodic self-monitoring...[whereas] novice readers often seem oblivious to these strategies and the need to use them” (p. 2083). In this
study, although the four participants displayed some similarities in the general aspects of their awareness and application of metacognitive strategies, certain different behaviors could be observed between the participants with high vs. those with low language proficiency.

**High EFL proficiency readers and their reading metacognitive awareness.** Good readers are generally able to reflect on and monitor their reading performance. Having good metacognitive awareness, they are also likely to be able to regulate their strategy use for reading (Mohktari, 2002). As mentioned, Orawan and Uma asserted clearly that becoming more strategic in their reading resulted in a more proficient reading performance. The first common aspect noticeable between these two participants was that their self-monitoring and evaluation led to effective problem-solving. More interestingly, they not only used context clues and rereading as repair devices, but these strategies were also applied to enhance reading during macro and elaborative processes (even if they did not encounter problems), especially when they wanted to confirm their comprehension and expand ideas from the text. In this context, rereading seems to help the reader process information and construct meanings beyond the syntactic level of the text, and this may eventually lead the reader to reach a level of aesthetic reading (Brown, 2002). For example, when Uma applied rereading during skimming, she also appeared to preview and use the text structure strategy to enhance her rereading process; when she used the strategy to gain more elaborative ideas of the text, she also tried to use background knowledge and context clues to enhance her rereading process. Similarly, Orawan tended to apply rereading together with context clues to regain or confirm her comprehension. It was evident that her rereading for confirming comprehension was quite spontaneous and it occasionally led to analytical interpretations. Both of them applied skipping of problematic text at a low rate of regularity; most of those texts were revisited.
I believe these high proficiency readers (as compared to the other two participants) succeeded in applying their metacognitive strategies during reading; however, Uma appeared to be more conscious of this application than Orawan in that she could describe clearly how it worked to regulate her reading. Based on the fact that Orawan was more successful in her reading, she might have internalized her knowledge about how she regulated her reading performance and thus have been less likely to verbalize it.

Low EFL proficiency readers and their reading metacognitive awareness. Sheorey and Mohktari noted “low-ability readers reported a lower level of awareness and strategy use when reading academic materials than did high-ability readers” (2002, p. 6). In this study, although Pailin and Tongchai demonstrated their metacognitive awareness to a certain degree, they did not seem to know how they could use strategies of self-monitoring and evaluation to help regulate and control their reading performances. A similar phenomenon was also reported by Adunyarittikun (2005). His findings indicated an ineffective regulation of reading strategies by low-proficient readers.

Pailin appeared to be more attentive than Tongchai was in applying metacognitive strategies, which I hypothesize is due to her strong awareness of metacognitive knowledge rooted in her first language reading. However, with her poor skills in English reading, she did not know how she should solve the problems she encountered. Tongchai was generally aware that he had language constraints and that he was not able to apply strategies effectively, but he could not identify the specific problems. However, both of them still made attempts to solve their problems, and they perceived at a certain level that they had made progress in their reading. Thus, I hypothesize that, although their metacognitive skills were not at optimal levels, as their
English language proficiency improves, their metacognitive knowledge and application should grow to benefit their overall reading performance.

Another aspect that these two low proficiency readers had in common was that their application of repair strategies seemed to contribute to their ability to continue reading but not aid in overall comprehension. This was quite obvious when the passage was too difficult for them. Despite their attempts to use context clues or rereading, they were not able to regain comprehension, and this seemed to make them choose to skip the text (as an avoidance tactic rather than a problem-solving one). Also, it should be noted that they applied skipping more than rereading. For Tongchai, when he skipped the problematic text, he tended not to revisit it. This behavior was also evidenced among Thai college low-proficient readers in Aduyarittikun’s study (2005). In addition, with his poor command of English, Tongchai was not able to use context clues effectively, and this led him to make inaccurate guesses. Pailin also noted that even though she tried to reread the problematic parts of a passage, often she was not able to use other supporting strategies to enhance her rereading process. As a result, she could achieve only a general understanding. Their limited success in comprehending the problematic text despite applying rereading or context clues at a certain degree suggests that such strategies can provide proficient readers (e.g. Orawan and Uma in this study) with success in acquiring comprehension beyond the syntactic level (Brown, 2002); however, this might not occur with the lower proficient readers.

Carrell’s explanation of this phenomenon is that “If … the reader is not aware of his or her limitations as a reader or of the complexity of the task at hand, then the reader can hardly be expected to take preventive or corrective actions to anticipate or recover from problems” (2001, p. 232). This supports Schunk’s supposition (1991) that the learners’ lack of complete
understanding that metacognitive strategies improve their performance can lead to situations where they do not fully engage in metacognitive activities. This lack of awareness seemed evident in the low proficiency readers in this study. Pailin and Tongchai did not seem to be able to verbalize nor even seem to be aware that in addition to their poor language proficiency (which they perceived as a major problem in their reading), the fact that they lacked adequate procedural and conditional knowledge of various introduced strategies was also problematic. Although they had a limited perception of how and when they could make use of the strategies they had learned effectively in a specific task, they did not seem to be aware that they needed to fix-up their procedural and conditional knowledge of such strategies. I believe that if these EFL low proficiency readers have continued opportunities to be exposed to reading English texts in increasingly volume, they should be able to expand their word recognition skills and thus their automaticity. This would result in increased vocabulary acquisition and syntactic knowledge, freeing them from some issues related to their language problems (Krashen, 1987; Samuels, 1994). Concurrently, if they are more aware of their shortcomings in strategy use and make attempts to develop better procedural and conditional knowledge, they should be able to make their reading processes more strategic and efficient.

Lastly, it is important to note that this 5-week course marked the first experience these four EFL learners had in being trained to use various cognitive strategies in English reading and to reflect on their reading metacognitively. It was therefore inevitable that there were many challenges for them to overcome during reading. Considering this, I believe that the limited practice time these students had (only five weeks) and the readability levels of some of the chosen texts might have been contributing factors resulting in a ceiling effect on the level of progress they could ultimately achieve. Indeed, Veenman and Beishuizen found that time
constraints on studying a complete text impeded comprehension, and they suggested that
students should be provided with enough time to study a difficult text to “allow metacognitive
skills to be effectively called upon” (2004, p. 635). Similarly, Schunk (1991) maintained that it
was important that learners have adequate time to allow them to expend adequate effort for
successful metacognitive learning. Therefore, if Tongchai and Pailin, had been allowed more
time for extensive practice of each introduced reading strategy, had access to easier texts and
more deliberately guided tasks on strategy applications (that better suited their English language
levels), they might have been able to exercise their strategic reading skills in a greater extent.

Uma: Awareness and Application of Writing Strategies

In this section, I will describe findings from the analyses of the phenomena in which
Uma employed writing strategies. The framework of data display and discussion on Uma’s
writing behaviors is based on the three purposes for cognitive writing strategy use derived from
the analyses: (a) planning strategies, (b) drafting strategies, and (c) reviewing strategies (which
include metacognitive self-monitoring and evaluation). Within each of the three strategy
categories, her writing behaviors will be described in relation to the frame work of the two major
aspects: (a) awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application, and (b) converting
knowledge into effective application. It should be noted that writing activities were consistently
controlled in the classroom lesson plans; that is, students did the planning and the drafting of the
first writing task on Day 3 and did the reviewing of their work on Day 4 of each week. In
addition, they had a weekly homework assignment with the second writing task after the Day 4
class and had it reviewed on Day 5. Therefore, students consequently had consistent
opportunities to apply the introduced strategies regularly and substantially during the five weeks.
Planning Strategies

The planning strategies include goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, thinking about audience, using background knowledge, and collecting information for a writing task.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. In order to prepare her thoughts to be communicated through the written text, Uma learned that there were various strategic actions she could apply in the planning stage. In each task of extended essay writing, because students were also required to hand in the plan of their work, Uma wrote down her ideas for each planning stage on paper.

From the beginning of this course, she appeared to apply the introduced strategies in her writing. She described her planning process as beginning by the goal of her essay and thinking about her tentative audience. With her goal, she thought about the topic and thesis statement she wanted to convey to her audience. In some tasks, it took her a while to translate her thoughts into a clear thesis statement. Even though she appeared to connect between the goal of her essay to her audience, she generally did not imagine about a specific group. In the last interview at the end of the course, she said that her readers could be anyone who might be interested in her topic; the potential groups could be male or female adults, children, teenagers or children, male, or female depending on the topic of the essay.

Because Uma learned that one way that good writers generate ideas for their essays was to search for relevant information from many available sources, she began her generating process by reviewing the reading passage she had read during the week. She normally selected the most interesting idea in the passage for the topic of her extended essay. She sometimes added ideas from her personal experience. On other occasions, her topic was derived from her personal experience and background knowledge, and she related it to the ideas she had learned from the
reading passage. On such occasions, she felt that it was easier to develop her essays in that she could generate the contents more informatively and felt more enthusiastic about her writing. For instance, while planning her writing homework assignment in Week 2, she reflected:

> What should I write about my hero?…Perhaps, if I write about someone in my family, it might be easier for me …yeah, about grandfather….It should be OK. I think I’ll be impressed with my essay about him. Let me try. [TA- W2D4]

As she also mentioned in the first interview, she loved to write to express her ideas and feelings, and it appeared that she always incorporated her views in her work. She noted that in Week 1, she made quite long notes of ideas she wanted to write. She copied key words or phrases from the reading passage to put in her notes hoping that she could use them in her essay. In Week 2, she could make more concise notes in her own words. Later on, she tended to note ideas she had generated using a graphic organizer or an outline.

Previously, Uma held the basic concept that an essay needed to have an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. Gaining new knowledge about the rhetorical structures, she began to think about what components of ideas she should have for the different types of essay she was writing and she tried to fit her ideas with the pattern. Uma had some difficulties organizing her ideas for some tasks. In Week 1, when writing a persuasive essay, her classmates and I (as the teacher) commented that despite the interesting ideas she had, the organization of her text made it hard to follow. In Week 3, she recounted having difficulty and needing to make adjustments in fitting ideas she had generated with the rhetorical structure of an argumentative essay. However, she appeared to have a positive attitude toward improving this skill. The following excerpt from a daily journal entry written after she had her drafts read by her peers and the teacher illustrated her thoughts when experiencing this kind of situation:

> How difficult it is! I think I can write… but it isn’t quite good as I think it should be . My friend Pearl read my essay and commented that it didn’t have a good
organization. I tried to write it again. My second draft that is better. I gave it to my teacher….She told me that I should reorganize my ideas. So, I tried to improve it at home. I know one of my weaknesses. I don’t have a good process thinking and writing. I’ll improve it. [DJ- W1D4]

Uma also noted that she used different amounts of time for the planning for different types of essays. For example, writing an argumentative essay required more time for planning than writing a descriptive essay. It seemed that writing an essay with a more complicated rhetorical structure demanded greater skills in generating, organizing, and maintaining the coherence of ideas. In the later weeks, she developed her planning skills without difficulty.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** Uma’s planning skills developed over time. As the instances of her planning process in the writing tasks during the five weeks were identified, I considered that her knowledge of planning strategies generally developed into effective applications. Consequentially, she perceived the values of such strategies in enhancing her writing and made attempts to apply them consistently. Unlike her conflicting attitudes towards some reading strategies, in writing she did not mention that certain strategies were not helpful nor did she appear to select only certain strategies to apply in her writing. Instead, she appeared to make more attempts to handle the skills she had difficulties with (e.g., writing a clear thesis statement, fitting her ideas with the rhetorical structure).

However, especially at the beginning of the course, some constraints were evident in developing her skills of some planning strategies due to different factors. First, although Uma came to develop a general sense of audience, she did not seriously think about having a real, specific audience for her work. This could be because her previous writing practice was with a product-based learning approach in which students were taught to create a piece of work without awareness of it as a real tool for communication with the outside world. Second, her limitations with English language proficiency also seemed to hinder her abilities to translate and organize
her ideas into written text when the rhetorical patterns were challenging, though she was confident that she would be able to completely convey her ideas.

However, overall, Uma perceived that knowing useful strategies especially for generating and organizing ideas enabled her to plan her thoughts more effectively before beginning to write her drafts. In the second interview, she revealed:

Before [this course], it was so hard even to write a single paragraph. Now, I begin to have ideas of how to write, so it’s getting easier. First, I’ll have a major idea for my essay. Then, I do the planning… tell about my goal, think about who my readers will be, think and list what I can use from my notes [from the reading passage] and think about my own experience… Making a plan helps me not to forget ideas when I write my drafts…. I think I can think about ideas for my essays better than before and it’s fun. I can do better in organizing ideas now. In general I think I’ve improved in making my plan. [Int 2- W3]

Drafting Strategies

Drafting is a process of translating thoughts into written composition. The strategic behaviors that were related to the act of composing that took place during this process are described and discussed.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Uma learned that a good composition requires multiple drafts. She reflected that she usually spent more time in writing the first draft than the others. She began her first draft by following her notes of ideas that she had generated and organized during the planning stage. She commented that she just “wrote them out first”. In addition to developing main ideas in her draft as planned, she also expanded details for those ideas. Sometimes, adjustments of ideas from the notes were made during drafting. While writing the first draft, Uma tended to stop to read her sentences and paragraphs at certain points (e.g., before moving on to a new paragraph) and reviewed her notes she had made during the planning stage.
In general, her concentration during her first draft was on content. As her focus of writing at this stage was on expressing ideas, she reported that she sometimes wrote parts of her first draft in Thai. Because she was not very confident with the accuracy of her English grammar, she was mainly concerned whether her audience would understand her ideas. Then, she shifted to the issues relating to language presentation (e.g., accuracy of words, sentences, idiomatic expressions, style of writing, the organization of contents) during writing the second and third drafts. In the third interview, she reflected about her drafting process:

Teacher: What do you generally concentrate on while you are writing your first draft?
Uma: More on the contents. I want to make my idea clear first. If it’s clear, it’ll be easier [for the readers] to understand…Normally, I’ll write in Thai first.

T: In the second draft, what do you mainly adjust?
Uma: Organization… and I try to make the language clearer. If I have too many details, I sometimes cut them out. [Int 3- W5]

She noted that her limitations of language competency both in terms of vocabulary and in grammar sometimes hindered the composing process. She could not as easily express her ideas in clear English as she could in her first language. This forced her to play around with the language, but she was uncertain about its overall clarity. She felt that this constraint impeded her ability to maintain text cohesion and cohesiveness as she composed. In a revision discussion on the first draft of a descriptive essay in Week 2, she made the following remarks about her composing process:

I don’t feel I did well (in this draft). I didn’t have much vocabulary. I had problems in grammar and in composing sentences. Sometimes I didn’t know what connectors I should use, so I just began the new sentence without making any connection. My text lacked cohesion. Sometimes my sentences had too many phrases. Then, the paragraph was confusing. I tried to use simple words and avoid writing long sentences. However, I was not sure whether I wrote clear sentences. [Dis- W2D4]

Her problem with organizing ideas to fit with the rhetorical structure recurred during the drafting process. Especially, when the rhetorical structure was more challenging (e.g., that of an
argumentative essay), she spent much time on revising the content and the organization of text both at the paragraph and the global level during her first draft. As she reported, any adjustments of organization of ideas were normally made in the later drafts. In a revision discussion on the first draft of an argumentative essay in Week 3, she reflected:

Peer: What did you think difficult?
Uma: How to present my arguments…. But it might not be very difficult as the teacher has already demonstrated how to present these ideas. …What might be difficult is how to say against the possible negative arguments…. Do you like my essay? What about the connections between paragraphs? … I’m afraid that the ending is too short. I might make some changes. Actually this isn’t my real first draft. I’ve already revised some content…. I might reorganize ideas in the conclusion part in the second draft…. I may need a connector to help keep it flowing better. [Dis- W3D4]

Converting knowledge into effective application. As illustrated above, when Uma reflected about ability in drafting, she tended to express her concerns about the difficulties she experienced in composing her essays. At the beginning of the course, she did not have much confidence in her first draft. However, she was more confident with her second and third drafts. Her confidence in writing in English generally developed over time.

Considering that drafting is a strategic writing action that translates ideas into written text, I view Uma as able to apply this strategy purposefully. She thought about how to make her ideas clear to her audience. She tried to keep the coherence of ideas and follow rhetorical conventions. She was well aware that in writing drafts, it is important to maintain good coherence of ideas and accuracy of language to produce good quality work. With this awareness, she consistently made attempts to improve her drafts to meet the two demands.

In brief, the knowledge Uma had that drafting requires fluency and accuracy of language seemed to serve as effective guidance for her to improve her drafting skills. And along the continuum of her progress during the five weeks, her positive attitude in writing multiple drafts
finally yielded a great improvement in her composing performance in English writing. This was
a significant change from her previous writing habit in the first interview, of writing only a
single draft “I wrote only one draft, and made corrections, changed, or added ideas in that one
draft before I handed it in.”

Reviewing Strategies

Reviewing strategies include revising, editing, and evaluating a draft for a writing task.
These strategies took place along with the applications of planning and drafting strategies.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Revising and editing
were employed for the purpose of refining the ideas and the language of the text, and were
interrelated. Uma learned that revising which would lead to multiple drafting should finally
create a better quality of essay. As reflected in the third interview and the peer discussions
illustrated above, she perceived this strategy as a means to ensure the clarity of her messages to
her audience. Because she was concerned that her readers might not understand well the ideas
she wanted to convey due to some ungrammatical or unclear sentences in her essays, she began
to revise and edit her work even during the writing of her first draft. In a pair discussion in Week
1, she told her partner that it took her about an hour for planning and writing the first draft, and
she spent much time writing and changing details to support the main ideas she had planned.

Furthermore, Uma learned that good writers also had someone read and give comments
on their work in order to revise their work to better suit the interests of the audience. Thus, in this
course she became aware that having conferences with her immediate audience (e.g., classmates,
teacher, and friends) was helpful. When she had conferences with her peers and the teacher, she
sought advice and evaluation from them. She noted that when having discussions with peers, she
wanted mainly to know whether they had a good understanding of her message. She was also
interested to hear any ideas they might suggest though she might not always include them in her essays. She perceived that their comments helped her to improve the clarity of her essay. This excerpt from her daily journal exemplifies her positive attitude regarding revising based on her immediate audience response: [DJ- W4D4]

Today I shared the first draft of my essay (dialogue journal) with my classmate so that I could write my second draft. She said my introduction was not quite clear. I agreed with her. I should have made it clearer than this. She also said that I should express my feelings more. Yeah, I think that might help make my journal more convincing. I think it’ll be better in the second and third drafts….I felt good to share my work with my classmates and hear their comments. It was also good to get new ideas from them.

Uma reflected that with the feedback on her first draft, her focus was normally on refining the language (e.g., editing word choices, tenses, sentence structures, etc.) and on organizing text to make her messages clearer. She believed that if her essays demonstrated good clarity of ideas, it would be convincing to her readers, as she occasionally reflected during peer discussions:

Week1: I’m not sure whether the readers will understand what I want to say. Some sentences might not be clear because of the words I used and the grammar might not be correct. [Dis-W1D4]

Week 3: If it’s clear, it’ll be easier to understand…. My grammar might be wrong…. I think I may have to make some corrections”. [Dis- W3D4]

Thus, when she submitted her second draft, she appeared to mainly expect me (as the teacher) to make corrections and suggestions on grammar and language usage. She reflected that she sometimes wanted to try writing more complex sentences, but because she was concerned that it might distort the meaning she wanted to convey, she tended to rewrite the parts by using simpler language (as I suggested).

Converting knowledge into application. Uma’s awareness of the benefits of the reviewing strategies developed positively over time. With this knowledge of how to revise and
edit her work, she became more confident in writing the later drafts. Her comments indicated that she developed her awareness that the writing process includes the process of refining and that voices from her audience should be taken into account. In addition, she acknowledged the role that language proficiency played in this refining process.

It should be noted that during her reviewing process, a metacognitive awareness of self-evaluation and problem-solving came to play. Her monitoring and evaluation of her planning and drafting processes recurred during the reviewing process. She recognized her weaknesses and identified what she had improved. She evaluated the quality of her drafts both in terms of contents and language. Feedback from her immediate audience (peers and the teacher) helped her decide what adjustments were necessary to suit their expectations and her own satisfaction. In addition, she monitored how she could use the teacher’s modeling to guide her skills in applying the new strategies she had learned. She said this made her more confident in experimenting with them, as reflected in the third interview:

Teacher: Did you gain any ideas when I demonstrated how to work on different strategies during each [writing] process?
Uma: It helped me feel more confident that I wouldn’t make mistakes. If I tried it by myself, I might not have been sure whether it was correct. When I saw your examples, I had a clearer picture of what would be correct. [Int 3- W5]

I consider Uma’s strong awareness and knowledge of the related reviewing strategies (revising, editing, and evaluating) guided her to control her revision purposefully. The improvements she had made between various drafts for her essays eventually yielded effective communication of the messages she wanted to convey (See Appendix K for examples of her written work). She noted that her writing habits changed a great deal. In all, with extensive practice during the five weeks, she became more confident in her writing, could tell what types
of essay she was good at, and no longer felt that writing in English was too difficult. In the third interview at the end of the course, she discussed her self-monitoring and evaluation clearly:

   Teacher: Have you monitored your progress and what changes did you see in your writing skill?
   Uma: I monitored [my writing] all the time…. Writing daily journals is very useful. It makes me see my own performance…. I can tell what I have improved and what skills are still not very good. It’s still not the best…but I know what I’m good at…. When I looked back at my portfolios, I felt the language I used in the essays in the later weeks was getting better…. I have motivation in learning English now. [Int 3- W5]

Orawan: Awareness and Application of Writing Strategies

As with the analysis procedures employed in the other cases, the framework for the data display and discussion on Orawan’s writing behaviors is based on the three purposes for cognitive writing strategy use derived from the analyses: (a) planning strategies, (b) drafting strategies, and (c) reviewing strategies (including metacognitive self-monitoring and evaluation). Within each of the three strategy categories, her writing behaviors will be described in relation to the framework of two major aspects: (a) awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application, and (b) converting knowledge into effective application. It should be noted that writing activities were consistently controlled in the classroom lesson plans; that is students did the planning and the drafting of the first writing task on Day 3 and did the reviewing of their work on Day 4 of each week. In addition, they had a weekly homework assignment with the second writing task after the Day 4 class and had it reviewed on Day 5. Therefore, students had consistent opportunities to apply the introduced strategies regularly and substantially during the five weeks.

Planning Strategies

The planning strategies include goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, thinking about audience, and using background knowledge or collecting information for a writing task.
Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Orawan liked writing extended essays because she could express the opinions about what she had read. When she did her writing tasks, she could connect her reading and writing to real experience. Her discussion with a peer in Week 2 about an extended essay on Albert Einstein reflected this connection:

Luckily I had a chance to read another article about Einstein besides what we had read in our class. It was about his private life, and I thought I wanted to write about this aspect of his life rather than what people usually know. I got the idea that actually he was like us in the sense that sometimes he was successful and sometimes he faced some failures. This is normal in our life. That was why I wrote about this. [Dis- W2D4]

Writing extended essays obviously promoted her sense of ownership as she felt that they were her own creations, not just the imitations of the instruction of the taught models as she had experienced in her previous English writing course. The excerpts from a daily journal entry and the second interview below exemplify this attitude:

It’s fun that I can write about my own opinions based on what I read. I like the new techniques, which I have never done before about planning [setting a purpose, generating and organizing ideas] and drafting and drafting again. [DJ- W1D3]

Writing in this course is fun. I don’t have to block our ideas like when I did in the Writing I course. [Int 2- W3]

She learned various strategies for planning her essays including goal setting, thinking about audience, collecting information, and generating and organizing ideas. As she gained new knowledge of various essay types (e.g., persuasive, descriptive, argumentative, dialogue journal, and summaries), she became aware of the conventions of their rhetorical structures.

It normally took Orawan some time to decide on the topic of her essay. Generally, her topic was derived from the big ideas she had learned from the weekly assigned reading passages or from her personal experience and previous related reading materials. The title of her essay normally reflected her goal and its theme. However, Orawan generally did not have any specific
She said her audience could be anyone that would have a chance to read her work. The think-aloud protocols offered more thoughts about her audience in the persuasive and argumentative essays. Also, in a daily journal entry from Week 3, she reflected that an argumentative essay created a true sense of audience and communication. She felt it was real because she could present her arguments to her readers as well as needing to defend her arguments against the possible opposing views. In a daily journal entry, she wrote:

I think planning for an argumentative essay was very interesting. I felt like I was talking to my audience more than when writing a persuasive essay, perhaps, because I also had to defend my opinions. [DJ- W3D3]

Usually, she used her background knowledge to help generate more ideas for the topic. She seemed to spend more time on generating ideas for the introduction because she was not certain whether her thesis statement was clear. She sometimes wrote her thesis statement in Thai first, and then translated it into English. On the one hand, her written work indicated that her skill in translating her goal into a thesis statement improved in the later weeks. On the other hand, she tended to have quite rough preliminary ideas for the body and conclusion. She revealed that she did not like to think in much detail when planning the contents of the essay since she could add more ideas when composing a draft, and she would have a chance to revise it. However, when generating ideas, she thought about how to organize them to fit the rhetorical structure of the essay type she was working on. Her view about planning was as follows:

Normally I stick to the big ideas of what I had planned, but my plan was usually short. Even in the body paragraphs, I didn’t plan in detail what I want to write about…. I wanted to hear comments from my classmates. [Int 2- W3]

It should be noted that these planning processes normally took place recursively. For example, after she had generated and tried to organize ideas in her notes, she sometimes reviewed, added more ideas, and reorganized them. Also, she appeared to be flexible in her
planning depending on the nature of the task. When she wrote dialogue journals in Week 4, since she learned that they required a less specific format, she tended to spend less time in setting a goal and generating ideas. Instead, she paid more attention to expressing her views and interacting with the views presented in the reading passage from which she developed her essay.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** It was obvious that Orawan’s knowledge of various planning strategies generally developed into effective application. Her skills in controlling a good planning process enhanced her overall writing skill over time. The plans that she put on paper reflected that her planning process was well thought out. For example, she knew how to set a goal for her work, she understood what could enhance her process of generating ideas; and she decided to what extent she would generate the preliminary ideas for her essays (See Appendix K for examples of written work).

However, evidence seemed to indicate factors for some constraints during the planning process. First, despite having a clear goal, the knowledge that a good composition should have a clear thesis was new to her. She had lacked this concept in her previous experiences in English writing and her first language writing. Therefore, in the early weeks she was still uncertain about how to write a good introduction that included a comprehensive thesis statement. The think-aloud protocol of her writing assignment in Week 2 demonstrates her uncertain feelings: Orawan wrote her introduction in Thai first. Then, she translated it into English:

**In the introduction I will write “For me, my father is not just give birth to me, but he is my hero because he loves me more than anyone, and he is my inspiration.”** Is it OK? [TA- W2D4]

Second, her feeling of having limitations in expressing meanings in English began from the process of generating ideas due to the English language constraints (although she was a participant with a higher English language competency). She noted that she could generate many
ideas in Thai for the topics of her essays, but she sometimes could not express them well in
English. As a consequence, she was occasionally not sure whether the planned ideas would
effectively communicate to the readers. For example, in a pair discussion in Week 1, she
revealed this concern:

I could think of many ideas but it was quite hard to write them out…. I might make
some grammatical errors…. Grammar is a hard thing…. I don’t know if I can
convince the readers about my ideas.  [Dis- W1D4]

Nevertheless, this concern seemed to eliminate after she had opportunities to discuss her work
with her peers and the teacher. Simply put, feedback from audience during her draft revision
helped her develop confidence about her skills in generating ideas and in developing sense of
rhetorical conventions.

In conclusion, concerning the practice of writing using planning to effectuate writing,
Orawan became aware that planning was important to enhance the process of drafting in that it
allowed her to keep good track of the key ideas she wanted to express to her audience. In the
interviews, she described her attitude about planning:

Without planning my writing might not have good organization because there
were so many ideas I wanted to write about…. I think if our planning is OK, our
contents will be OK…. If we don’t have good planning, it will be hard to write an
essay. [Int 2- W3]

For me, planning was the most important even though I didn’t plan in detail. It
helped me while writing my drafts to keep track of my key ideas as planned and
organized. [Int 3- W5]

Drafting Strategies

Drafting is a process that translating thoughts into written composition. The strategic
behaviors related to the act of composing that took place during this process are described and
discussed.
Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. Orawan revealed that in her previous experience in writing in English, she did not have the concept of writing multiple drafts for an essay. Having learned to do it in this course, she had a positive attitude towards this process. Although her prior focus of her first draft was to convey ideas to the readers, her major concern was on grammatical accuracy. As illustrated above, she was uncertain whether, when her essay had ungrammatical sentences or improper language usage, it might lead to miscommunication. However, she did not spend too much time on editing her first draft because she did not want to obstruct the flow of her ideas; she planned to do it later. Sometimes, however, while writing her first draft, she had difficulties in choosing proper grammatical usage and words and to express her ideas and stopped to check meanings of words in a dictionary. The think-aloud protocol of her writing task for a homework assignment illustrates this phenomenon:

OK, I got an introduction based on ideas from the reading passage. I want to say that the different brains led to different abilities…or capabilities …is it better? So my point is when we grow up, there might be… may be…or must… perhaps too strong. …These might be special careers… specific careers…. I’m not sure what words I can use here. …Let me read it again. …So I think suitable careers for them is…are scientists, mathematicians…. Let me check the meaning in the dictionary first. I think it’s OK.

[TA- W1D4]

She spent a lot of time on composing her thesis statement to reflect her overall topic goal in the introductory paragraph. Then, she wrote out the major ideas as planned and would normally add details to expand those ideas in her first draft. Thus, the strategy of generating ideas was applied recursively during the planning and drafting processes. She also tried to organize ideas in each paragraph to suit the rhetorical structure of the essay. In addition, as I mentioned, she expected that the feedback from her audience (her classmates and the teacher) during the revision process would help guide her revisions. The excerpts below illustrate her expectations of feedback from her readers:
From my first draft, I still have to revise a lot, especially my grammar and vocabulary. I’m looking forward to my friends’ and professor’s advice tomorrow.

[DJ- W2D3]

Basically I wanted to know whether they could understand what I wanted to convey. Sometimes I received other comments, too…. Generally, they felt OK with my essays but sometimes suggested that I might need to add some details to support my points.

[Int 2- W3]

Also, Orawan seemed to be flexible in controlling her writing process. For example, in Week 4 when she wrote a dialogue journal, the think-aloud protocol showed that instead of working on the planning process prior to writing the first draft, she generated ideas for her journal while developing her first draft.

In interviews, she reported that when she worked on the second draft, her focus was on editing and refining the language. She paid great attention to choosing sentences to make sure that her readers would understand her text and would be convinced by the ideas she expressed. However, in the last interview in Week 5 she said that in addition to editing for accuracy and proper usage, in the later weeks she paid more attention to revising the contents when she received feedback from her classmates and the teacher. She noted:

Generally, when I finished my draft and read it, I would see what I liked or did not like much. Sometimes I kept it, but sometimes I made a lot of changes. In the early weeks, I made more of corrections on grammar. In the later weeks, I made more changes of ideas in my second drafts [after talking with peers]…. I also included lots of my opinions in every essay. [Int3- W5]

Converting knowledge into effective application. Orawan appeared to handle her drafting process with good awareness that developing multiple drafts strategically would enable her to compose her work and use it to effectively communicate to her readers. This knowledge led her to improve her abilities in producing well-organized contents and in maintaining the linguistic accuracy of her work while developing her drafts. She was satisfied with her first drafts although she knew that they had some grammatical errors, which she was prepared to edit later. She
thought she did well in writing out her key ideas to suit the rhetorical structures of the essays. She also reviewed what she wrote while writing each draft. After she finished her draft, she normally evaluated her work, wanted to hear comments from her readers, and anticipated revisions.

As an EFL student writer, the issue of English language proficiency seemed to play a significant role in her mastery of the drafting process despite the fact that she had higher English language proficiency than the others in this study. Her concern that her language accuracy problems would result in less effective communication made her focus more on editing the language than on revising the contents in the early weeks. However, this concern did not entirely eradicate her awareness of the need to refine the contents of the text to suit the expectations of her audience. Therefore, in addition to ascertaining if her audience understood her work, in the later weeks she was also inclined to make changes according to their advice. In short, her sense of audience increased parallel to her progress in writing. Despite certain constraints in composing skill, evidence from her written work showed that she was eventually able to produce well-written essays in her final drafts.

**Reviewing Strategies**

Reviewing strategies include revising, editing, and evaluating a draft for a writing task. These strategies took place along with the applications of planning and drafting strategies. **Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** It seemed apparent from the peer discussions and her daily journal entries that she regularly made reflections about how her audience’s comments played a role in the reviewing process of her writing. Generally, she received feedback on both content and language usage. As previously mentioned, she believed that these comments would help her to write better subsequent drafts. Her positive attitude towards the
importance of audience feedback was occasionally reflected during the five weeks. For example, in a daily journal entry in Week 1, she noted that after she had a chance to read aloud her persuasive essay in the classroom, she felt more confident in her work after perceiving that her audience agreed with her ideas. A daily journal entry in Week 3 also illustrated her attention to the feedback she received:

Today I shared my first draft of an argumentative essay with my peers. They thought its content was not as good as my previous essays, so I rewrote and reorganized some ideas. I like writing an argumentative essay, but it was difficult to make it clear and correct. …I’ll wait for the professor’s suggestions and see how I can improve my writing.

[DJ- W3D5]

Although Orawan normally both maintained the main ideas she had generated and the original organization of those ideas, she seemed to be more inclined to modify the content of her essays according to her audience’s comments (as seen in the excerpt of the third interview above). In short, her increasing sense of audience appeared to greatly influence the revision of her work.

In addition to incorporating to the audience’s comments, during the reviewing process, Orawan also exhibited the metacognitive strategies of self-monitoring and evaluation. She usually read and evaluated her drafts. As a reader of her peers’ work, she also paid attention to how they maintained coherence of ideas and their choices of sentence patterns. Sometimes she compared the ideas she presented in her essays to those of her peers.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** Orawan believed that revisions and modifications of her work would eventually improve its quality, so she consistently paid great attention to how she could benefit from this process. That she always listened to her audience’s views, reviewed her work, and considered how she could improve it to communicate her ideas more effectively indicated her strong potential for converting her knowledge of the reviewing
strategies to application. Her own awareness of certain weaknesses in certain language accuracy led her to apply the editing strategy quite carefully.

Her written work during the five weeks showed improvement of her language accuracy over time. Concurrently, her increasing awareness that good compositions should convey clear messages to the audience and create mutual connections between the writer and readers led her to pay attention to revising content accordingly. As a result, her essays seemed to satisfy the expectations of her readers (See Appendix K for examples of written work). In conclusion, her application of reviewing strategies had positively impacted her writing skills.

Overall, Orawan revealed a positive attitude about learning writing through this process approach as it increased her awareness of her performance. In the third interview, she revealed that she perceived she had progressed greatly in her writing skills. In fact, she felt good when she could discern what she could do well in her writing, especially identifying what writing style fitted her personality. This greatly differed from her previous English writing practice in that she had not been able to clearly evaluate her own performance but just only relied on the grades as the indicators of her abilities. In the third interview, she revealed:

Writing in English is something new for us. So far I’m happy with my progress in general….It’s normal that we’ll feel good when we can do something. Now when I hear comments from my peers about my work, I can tell what kind of writing I’m good at. In the past, I could not tell until I received grades, or when the teacher told us that it was good.

[Int 3- W5]

Pailin: Awareness and Application of Writing Strategies

As with the analysis procedures employed in the other cases, the framework for the data display and discussion on Pailin’s writing behaviors is based on the three purposes for cognitive writing strategy use derived from the analyses: (a) planning strategies, (b) drafting strategies, and (c) reviewing strategies (including metacognitive self-monitoring and evaluation). Within each
of the three strategy categories, her writing behaviors will be described in relation to the framework of two major aspects: (a) the awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application, and (b) converting knowledge into effective application. It should be noted that writing activities were consistently controlled in the classroom lesson plans; that is students did the planning and the drafting of the first writing task on Day 3 and did the reviewing of their work on Day 4 of each week. In addition, they had a weekly homework assignment with the second writing task after the Day 4 class and had it reviewed on Day 5. Therefore, students had consistent opportunities to apply the introduced strategies regularly and substantially during the five weeks.

Planning Strategies

The planning strategies include goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, thinking about audience, and using background knowledge or collecting information for a writing task.

Awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application. Similar to Tongchai, it was Pailin’s first experience in writing essays in English because she had never taken any English writing course before. Therefore, knowledge of writing strategies was entirely new to her. From the beginning of the course, she learned about the planning process and various planning strategies and began to apply them in her writing tasks. She reported that she usually put her plan on paper in Thai first and then translated it into English, but sometimes did it in both languages; thus she spent much time in planning her essay. Evidently, her main concern was that her limited language abilities would prevent her from expressing ideas effectively when writing drafts. An excerpt from a journal entry in the first week illustrates her concern:

It took very long for me to come up with ideas for my essay. I could not think of words and sentences in English to express those ideas. This made me spend more time for this process. [DJ- W1D3]
The writing assignments in this course required students to compose essays extended from the assigned passages they read during a week. However, Pailin noted that it was difficult for her to choose a topic for an essay by herself. Especially during the early weeks, she revealed that she found it hard to set a goal for her topic and plan the ideas for the introduction of an essay. She often reflected in her daily journals and during the think-aloud on her uncertainty about what she wanted to write. The entry below exemplifies this feeling:

I had more problems in writing than reading because I did not know what to write about. Then, I got some ideas, but I still had problems in using words, sentences, and tenses. I don’t know what to do. [DJ- W1D4]

As mentioned earlier, she normally generated ideas in Thai first. However, she selected only those ideas that she thought she could express in English to develop an outline or an organizer of main ideas for her essay. She even changed some ideas in her plan if she began to write her draft and found that she could not express them. She reported that she liked to use her personal experience and background knowledge about the topic to for her content and to use ideas she had learned from the assigned reading passage to support her points. She also reported that her notes from the reading passages were useful for the process of generating ideas in writing. On some occasions, when she did not have enough ideas for her topic, she would decide to search for more information from other available sources.

While generating ideas, Pailin also thought about how to organize those ideas. Because knowledge of the rhetorical conventions of essay writing was new to her, she also had difficulty in developing the content to suit the conventional pattern of each essay type. Therefore, when she had to compose her text with a more challenging type of structure (e.g., argumentative), she tried to adapt the teacher’s model (demonstrated in the mini-lesson) of how to plan the rhetorical
structure of the essay. The excerpt from a think-aloud protocol while she was working on her writing homework assignment in Week 3 speaks of this situation:

For my plan, I think I’ll write in Thai first about some advantages and disadvantages of e-mail. Then, I’ll try to group which ideas can be my arguments and what ideas that other people may argue. I might follow the teacher’s way of organizing arguments. I might begin with my arguments and present ideas to support them; then I’ll prepare to defend against the negative arguments I can think about. Will it be difficult? Or can I just write about my ideas and what views I think people may possibly have different from mine? [TA- W3D4]

Although Pailin seemed to have constraints in goal setting and generating ideas, she did not lack a sense of audience when planning for her essay. As she said, “I wanted to make ideas easy for the readers to understand” [DJ- W1D3]. Generally, she intended to write for readers of about her age. Indeed, on some occasions, she focused her writing to meet her audience’s expectations, but on other occasions, she just wanted to express ideas as she wanted without thinking much about the audience.

Converting knowledge into effective application. Based on the new knowledge about how she could think effectively for the planning process of writing, it appeared that Pailin developed her strategic skills for this purpose over time. However, along the continuum of her progress during the five weeks, she experienced difficulties in using planning strategies to a certain extent. I hypothesize that the shortcomings of the development in such skills can be attributed to various factors. First, her difficulty in goal setting and selecting the topic for an essay might be due to the fact that she had not previously had the authority to make a decision for her own tasks, even in her first language writing. Second, planning ideas for the introduction of an essay seemed to be a big issue for her because of the different rhetorical conventions between English and Thai compositions; the introduction of an essay or a composition in Thai does not always need to include a thesis statement. Third, her English language constraints
obviously affected the process of generating ideas. She was not completely able to convey all messages she wanted. As mentioned, she sometimes had to change the planned ideas because she was not able to translate her thoughts into English text. The issue of language difficulty seemed to discourage her from exercising the strategic skill of generating ideas.

Despite the difficulties she experienced, Pailin still appeared to make consistent attempts to apply the introduced planning strategies to enhance the writing process. Positive development could be observed in some aspects of her planning skills. For instance, her skill in organizing ideas to suit the rhetorical convention of different essay types improved over time. In addition, her written work clearly demonstrated the improvement resulting from her constant attention to maintaining good coherence of ideas and cohesion between sentences in an essay (See Appendix K for examples of her written work). Pailin revealed that because she was aware that she would have to write an extended essay from the assigned reading passage, she then became increasingly attentive to ideas presented in the reading passages and tentatively began to think about some ideas for her essay. She made observations of how the authors of the articles expressed their ideas and also how they composed their texts. This enhanced her planning process in writing.

Her reflections in two interviews indicated that being aware that she needed to plan strategically for her essays, she began to learn to connect her reading with her writing purposefully:

Pailin: When I read a passage, I also looked at how the author organized ideas; it would help my writing because I would have to write my own essay about the passage and it would be something similar. So, I could learn how to make an introduction or a conclusion. The details would be different….I also learned the style of writing.

Teacher: So,did it help you improve your way of thinking, or your language more?
Pailin: Both. The two things happened together. [Int 2- W3]

Pailin: In the past when I read a passage, it was just to complete the reading…and see if I could answers the questions. In this course, when I read, I knew I had to write something about it, so I was more attentive to my reading, both to the content and to the organization of ideas. Everything can be a useful guidance. [Int 3- W5]
Drafting Strategies

Drafting is a process of translating thoughts into written composition. The strategic behaviors related to composing that took place during this process, are described and discussed.

Awareness/knowledge of the strategy and context of application. Pailin learned the concept that a good essay should be processed through writing multiple drafts. She developed her first draft based on ideas and organization as planned. Her focus while writing the first draft was on expressing clear ideas in the written text. The strategy of generating ideas was also recursively applied at this stage. However, because of her language constraints when translating her thoughts into a written English text, not only did she spend a lot of time to compose the introduction of an essay, but she also found it hard to expand details from the key ideas she had planned. In a pair discussion of the revision of her first draft of a class writing assignment, she revealed her difficulties to her peer:

When I began to write my draft, I had the problem of not knowing how to express my ideas. I just kept thinking but didn’t know how to continue. I didn’t know how to compose my text to make it clear as possible for readers to understand….While writing, I sometimes got stuck because I didn’t know what words or sentences I could use to explain what I wanted to convey, so I spent a lot of time writing my first draft….The most important problem was grammar. [Dis-W1D4]

On various occasions, she felt that the sentences she tried to compose did not exactly represent her thoughts. Also, being aware that she could revise and edit her draft later, she occasionally wrote some parts of her first draft in Thai so that she could maintain the flow of her ideas. She was always concerned that the language inaccuracy would lessen the clarity of the meanings she wanted to communicate. Although her written work in later weeks showed progress in language accuracy and composition skills, her concern about this issue still remained. In the think-aloud task of her summary writing homework assignment, she reflected:
I think I could explain about this passage in Thai….I understand it….The problem is the vocabulary and grammar in English…When I have to write it in English it’s hard. I have problems in using words, tenses, connectors to link my sentences. It’s like… I think in Thai, but when I translate it into English, the sentences still sound like Thai sentences. I can’t solve this problem. I’ll be careful. [TA-W5D4]

Pailin regularly reflected about thinking of her readers while writing her first drafts. She was uncertain whether she could get her messages across to them. Think-aloud protocols showed that during draft writing, she stopped to review and modify her text. She spent much time organizing her ideas to suit the rhetorical structure of the particular essay type she was working on. She revealed that when she had a difficulty beginning her first draft in the later weeks, she sometimes went back to review the essays she had written in the earlier weeks to get a sense of how to compose ideas together or to look for a writing style that she might be able to adapt for a new task. The excerpt below exemplifies this kind of situation:

Now, I’ll begin to write my draft….I still don’t know how to begin….Umm…Let me look at my previous essays…to see how I expressed my ideas….I might also find some sentences that I used in those essays, and like them. I might be able to use them here again. [TA-W3D4]

When Pailin wrote her later drafts (she generally wrote three drafts for an essay), she reported that she did not make many changes to the content (though she might make some elaborations of ideas). Instead, she tended to focus on correcting grammar and refining the coherence of ideas and cohesion of sentences she had already composed. In the third interview, she revealed in response to the teacher’s question about the change of focus from the first to second draft:

Teacher: From the first to the second draft, what did you focus on between content, organization of ideas, or grammar?
Pailin: When writing the first draft, I focused on the content. For the second draft, I looked at sentences…connectors and grammar. I tried to make sentences sound better.
T: So, in your second draft, you didn’t change your ideas much?
P: The ideas had been set, but I knew I had made mistakes on grammar.
Approaching the end of the course in Week 5, having learned from her teacher’s modeling, using the (assigned) reading passages, and her own preceding essays as the models of how to express ideas, her written work indicated that she was able to develop her composing skill over time.

Converting knowledge into effective application. Evidently, Pailin became increasingly aware of important elements in composition skill and tried to perform her writing strategically over time. She made attempts to apply her knowledge and awareness of useful strategies in her writing consistently. The fact that she was well aware that the text she composed should have both clarity of ideas and accuracy of the language significantly indicated her potential to be a good writer. She was well aware that the clarity of the language affected the clarity of ideas and in turn yielded effective communication.

Her attempts to learn about writing techniques from available models as mentioned above suggested that she had high motivation to develop her writing skills. Her continuing efforts and increasing ability to develop a skill in maintaining the cohesiveness of the ideas in her essays seemed to make her satisfied with her own progress to a certain extent. However, it should be noted that while she became more knowledgeable about how to perform her drafting process effectively, her English language constraints still appeared to have a negative effect on her ability to develop her procedural knowledge about her composing skill into highly effective applications, and this condition seemed to discourage her throughout the five weeks.

Reviewing strategies

Reviewing strategies include revising, editing, and evaluating a draft for a writing task. These strategies took place along with the applications of planning and drafting strategies.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. In addition to her knowledge that good essay writing required the process of writing multiple drafts, Pailin
concurrently became aware of the important role of the reviewing strategies. In the mini-lessons, she was introduced to the concept that good writers improve the contents of their essays by revising of ideas, editing the accuracy of their texts, and evaluating their work. Moreover, the opportunities of having conferences with peers and the teacher for reviewing purpose strengthened her awareness of this writing process. Pailin, as aforementioned, was struggling with translating her thoughts into English text and was mainly concerned that the inaccuracy of the sentences in her drafts would lessen the clarity of the meanings she wanted to convey. Therefore, she appeared to pay great attention to editing her work during the writing of her later drafts. Also, she was observed during peer discussions that she frequently sought advice on how to write correct sentences or even asked her peers to help correct her text.

Besides her prior concentration on editing for language accuracy, Pailin focused to make changes on her organization of ideas since she perceived that good cohesiveness of ideas would yield effective communication. She reported that in the second draft, she tried to connect sentences and add connectors to aid the cohesion of her text. Similarly, when she read her peers’ essays, she also concentrated on if and how they maintained the coherence of ideas in their work. However, she did not make substantial changes of content because she was already satisfied with her planned ideas.

**Converting knowledge into effective application.** As described above, despite the difficulties in composing her first draft, Pailin’s knowledge of editing and revising strategies seemed to bring her a certain degree of satisfaction with her overall writing performance and production. In addition to her attempts to improve the quality of her work by herself during the first draft, she felt that having her immediate audience (classmates and the teacher) read her
drafts was beneficial. She perceived that their comments served as good guidance for revision, especially allowing her to eliminate problems regarding the issue of language accuracy.

Her daily journals reflected this attitude:

Today the teacher let us work on the second draft of our essay. She also gave advice and helped correct some sentences. This made me feel more confident in my work. I have to correct a lot of words and sentences, especially the tenses; that’s the most difficult thing. [DJ- W1D4]

Today I wrote my second draft. I was glad that I had had my classmates read my first draft. They made comments and helped correct my sentences. This essay is still not very good because I still have the same old problems…vocabulary and how to connect sentences. I feel like it doesn’t have good connections between sentences…It’s not smooth. I do want to improve this skill. [DJ- W3D4]

In addition, her attempts to seek models to help guide her composing skills could be seen as a good strategy for skill development as it brought her ideas of how to produce a good essay.

Similar to the other participants, along the continuum of her progress, Pailin appeared to regularly monitor and evaluate her performance. In the early weeks she identified her weaknesses in some aspects of the planning and drafting processes. For example, she was mainly concerned about her skills in generating and organizing ideas and appeared to make attempts to improve them. At the end of the course, she acknowledged her progress in these skills. The evidence in her written work supported her self-evaluation. Overall, Pailin became increasingly aware of the positive role of the reviewing strategies, and she noted that her knowledge of writing strategies had helped her learn how to write in English more effectively than before. In the second interview, she said, “This is my first English writing course. I have improved my writing skill a great deal though I still cannot work to the best of my ability.”

Tongchai: Awareness and Application of Writing Strategies

As with the analysis procedures employed in the other cases, the framework for the data display and discussion on Tongchai’s writing behaviors is based on the three purposes for
cognitive writing strategy use derived from the analyses: (a) planning strategies, (b) drafting strategies, and (c) reviewing strategies (including metacognitive self-monitoring and evaluation). Within each of the three strategy categories, his writing behaviors will be described in relation to the framework of two major aspects: (a) awareness/knowledge of strategies and context of application, and (b) converting knowledge into effective application. It should be noted that writing activities were consistently controlled in the classroom lesson plans; that is students did the planning and the drafting of the first writing task on Day 3 and did the reviewing their work on Day 4 of each week. In addition, they had a weekly assignment with the second writing task after the Day 4 class and had it reviewed on Day 5. Therefore, students had consistent opportunities to apply the introduced strategies regularly and substantially during the five weeks.

**Planning Strategies**

The planning strategies include goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, thinking about audience, and using background knowledge or collecting information for a writing task.

**Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application.** The knowledge of how to process his essay writing in English was entirely new to Tongchai. At the beginning of the course, he commented that there were so many things to do in writing. When the teacher explained the different processes and even demonstrated how to apply planning strategies for a task in essay or composition writing, he still could not understand well of how he would apply them. However, he began to develop a sense of applying various planning strategies when he wrote the first essay of his own. In his daily journal entry in Week 1, he wrote:

Today I learned about writing. The topic I wrote was about the computer and the internet. The teacher showed us how we could write an essay. There are so many things to do in writing. I learned many techniques. At first, I felt a bit confused. However, when I began to write my own essay and had a chance to ask the teacher again, I felt I understood it. It was the first writing task. It might not be very good. [DJ- W1D3]
The think-aloud protocols showed that he began his planning by setting a topic for his essay. His topic was usually derived from an idea found in the reading passage from the previous class (as the task required). He noted that after selecting an idea he wanted to write about and thinking about his personal experience related to that idea, he then set the topic and the goal for his essay. He also commented that he wanted to make the topic of his essay attractive.

During a peer discussion in Week 1, he said he had learned a new concept of having a thesis statement in an introduction of an essay, but he still could not set his goal clearly. From Week 2, he became more aware of how to set his goal, and in the second interview in Week 3, he told me that he had tried to improve his skill in writing a clear thesis statement to reflect his goal, and it was getting better. The excerpts of his reflections below show his awareness of and progress in the skills of goal setting and generating of ideas:

Week 1: When I began to work on this task, I didn’t have one clear idea of what to write about and how I could write it. I just had a few ideas, so I put them together first and tried to begin my essay. [Dis- W1D4]

Week 2: I wanted to write about Einstein, about what kind of person he was, his personality, and how he was important. In the first paragraph, I wanted to tell who he was and how important he was. In the second paragraph, I told about his life at school and when he began to discover his theory. In paragraphs three and four, I talked about his research that influenced the use of the nuclear bomb in the war. I used my knowledge and linked it with what I read from the [assigned] passage. At the end, I wanted to conclude that he became a great scientist because he was humble, hard working, and clever. [Dis- W2D4]

Interview: When I planned my ideas, tried to think how I could make my introduction clear. It should be straightforward to let the readers know what I want to talk about…I thought that it was getting better. [Int 2- W3]

Evidence from his work also supported his reflection of this strategy (See Appendix K for examples of his written work).

Tongchai’s sense of generating ideas for his essay developed over time from what his first description of not having many ideas of what to write about in the first week. He learned to
develop the skill beginning with getting some ideas from the reading passage he had derived the topic from and including his background knowledge in his essay (as illustrated above). On some occasions, when he did not have enough ideas to start writing about, he searched for more information from other available sources. He revealed that he generated ideas by writing notes in Thai. Then, he translated those ideas into English. He noted that when he had prior knowledge about his topic, he could generate ideas better and faster. For example, in a daily journal entry in Week 2, he wrote:

In this writing task, I felt I could generate ideas faster…and write with more details [compared to my last essay]. This might be because I had some knowledge about Einstein. [DJ- W2D3]

He told his peers that from Week 2 he did not feel he was having difficulties in generating ideas. When he had ideas for his essay, he made a list or an outline of them. He was aware that the ideas in the body paragraphs should be well connected with the thesis statement. Also, he tried to follow the rhetorical convention of each essay type. For instance, in writing an argumentative essay, he generated ideas for both positive and negative arguments and prepared to present his position in the essay.

Although Tongchai developed a sense of having a goal and generating ideas in his writing task and tried to improve his ability to express his goal in a clear thesis statement, he did not seem to fully develop a real sense of audience. During peer discussions and the interviews, he reflected that he just planned what to write but did not think much about a wide audience. When writing a draft, he was concerned whether his readers would understand his essay. Although he developed this sense positively along his progress during the five weeks, his vision about his audience was still only limited to his teacher and classmates, and he viewed his teacher
as the prior reader. In sum, his sense of audience did not develop beyond his classroom community.

Teacher: When you planned ideas for your essay, did you think about your readers?
Tongchai: Not yet, I just thought about how I could make my essay relate to the points from the (assigned) passage I had read. [Int 2- W3]

Teacher: Did you think about your audience?
Tongchai: Approaching the end of the course, I tried to.
Teacher: What did you think about them?
Tongchai: I wanted my classmates to read and wanted to know whether they agreed with my ideas…sometimes I wanted to tell about my feelings…like when I wrote about my father. [Int3- W5]

Converting knowledge into effective application. It was evident that Tongchai became aware of the planning process and strategies and gradually developed such knowledge into applications when writing his essays. Along the continuum of his progress, he also experienced an awareness of what he should do in his writing process, but he was still not able to actually apply certain strategies effectively. At the beginning of the five weeks, he recognized his weaknesses in planning his writing tasks, and he tried to improve his uses of those strategies such as goal setting, generating, and organizing ideas. At the end of the course he was able to apply such strategies purposefully and these strategic skills developed positively over time.

Despite his own overall positive evaluation of his performance, constraints in applying some strategies could be observed. I hypothesize that such ineffective applications were attributable to various causes. That he did not develop a good sense of a wider audience for the real communication beyond his classroom community was due to never having practiced writing in a process-based approach in the past. In other words, he had never thought about his writing being as an authentic means of communication with the real world. In this course, although the teacher encouraged students to have a real audience in mind when they set their goals for their
tasks, students’ awareness of this strategy did not appear to develop at a remarkable level, as is obvious in Tongchai’s case.

Second, because of his limited English language competency, Tongchai tended to write short essays. His peers occasionally commented that he should have elaborated further on some ideas. This indicated that he still needed to improve his skill in generating ideas more effectively, or he needed to improve his language competency so that he could express more about the ideas he had generated. Third, despite having a good awareness of the organizing strategy, he sometimes described his difficulties in organizing the ideas he had generated to fit the rhetorical structure of the essay type he was working on. The concept of rhetorical convention was also new to him.

Nonetheless, regardless of how effectively he could apply each individual strategy, Tongchai learned to begin his writing process with planning. He acknowledged that planning that planning was important for writing an essay and that the planning strategies he had learned helped guide him to move on to the process of writing drafts purposefully. In the third interview, he said:

I’ve learned many techniques for writing, especially planning. I wrote my first draft as I had planned. I thought planning had a great effect on my writing. [Int3- W5]

Drafting Strategies

Drafting is a process of translating thoughts into written composition. The strategic behaviors related to the act of composing that took place during this process are described and discussed.

Awareness/knowledge of the strategy and context of application. Tongchai learned that good composing skills developed through writing multiple drafts. As aforementioned, he revealed that in the first week he did not have many ideas to write about in his essay, so he began
his first draft by just writing some ideas out. In the later weeks, as he could generate ideas better, he could write in greater detail in his first draft. Generally, in subsequent drafts he followed the ideas as he originally planned. Interestingly, Tongchai reported that from Week 1 to Week 3, he did his first draft in Thai, and then he tried to compose the English version from this native language draft. However, in Week 4, he revealed his concern that translating from the first language draft into English version took a great deal of time and that he might not have to do this on his final exam essays. Thus, he began to try to compose the first draft in English. In two daily journal entries, he wrote:

Today I practiced writing a journal in English. It was the kind of essay that we express our opinions and feelings….I wrote about the Thai movie industry….It took me more than an hour to complete my journal….I should be able to write it faster than this…. I spent much time on it because I planned and wrote in Thai first. Then I translated it into English, which I could only do slowly. [DJ- W4D3]

Today I tried to change the way I write my essay. I just thought in Thai and sometimes in English and began to write my draft straight away in English. I could really do it faster. [DJ- W4D4]

While composing the first English draft, his focus was on ideas he wanted to express as planned. On some occasions (but not often), some new ideas emerged during writing the draft. In other words, generating of ideas recurred. Because he wanted to make the introduction and thesis statement of his essay clear, from the think-aloud protocols it appeared that he sometimes spent a lot of time writing and rewriting this part of an essay in his first English draft. While composing the body of his essay, he attempted to maintain the organization as originally planned. When he wrote a conclusion, he looked back to see how he could make it connect with the body and the thesis statement. The excerpt below illustrates how he worked on an introductory paragraph of an argumentative essay:
Protocol:

I’m going to write an essay about my opinion of e-mail. It’s an argumentative essay. First, I need to think about my ‘pros’ for using e-mail, and then I will give examples to support my ideas…. I will say that in my opinion, I agree with using e-mail. I think that e-mail is useful. …Then, let me think about how people might defend…. Then, how can I argue with those idea?….OK, now, I’ve finished my plan. Let me write my draft:

Benefit…what should I say…Ah…the benefit of using e-mail…This can be the title…OK I’ll begin with most people…ah…use e-mail…No…what should I begin with…OK, Most people use e-mail for several purposes [Repeat it in Thai.]…Is it OK?…Umm…It might be better to say Nowadays e-mail is popular for (said the word in Thai) many people…In this new world e-mail can communicate…what I should say next…communication network for many person…many people…. [TA-W3D4]

Tongchai reported three major constraints in writing drafts for his essays. First, his limited English language competency caused difficulties in composing the text. While making attempts to express his ideas in English, he was concerned that incorrect choices of words and ungrammatical sentences could mislead his meanings. Often his composing process was obstructed because he could not think of proper vocabulary and sentences. To solve this problem, Tongchai learned to use sentences in the reading passage as the grammatical models (e.g., tenses, sentence patterns) for the sentences he wrote in his essay. On some occasions, he even solved the problem by adopting sentences from the passage. For instance, in a discussion in Week 1, he revealed:

When writing an essay, I got some ideas from the [assigned] reading passage and I also look for examples of sentences to see how I can apply them in my work. Sometimes I could include some sentences from the passage. [Dis-W1D5]

Second, he found it hard to fit his ideas to the rhetorical structure especially when he was working on an essay type that was challenging to him (e.g. argumentative or persuasive essays). Consequently he felt that he spent a great deal of time composing his drafts in English -- especially the first version that derived from his L1 draft. However, Tongchai reflected that he
was generally satisfied with his drafts, and he was prepared to hear feedback from his teacher and peers for the revision. The daily journal entry below exemplifies his general attitude about his drafts:

Today I’ve done the second draft for my essay. I’m satisfied with it although it might not be very good. I had my classmates read my work so that I could make revisions on it. It let me know if they could understand my work. My classmates said it was easy to understand my vocabulary and sentences, but they suggested that I should write in more detail. [DJ- W3D5]

Converting knowledge into effective application. Although Tongchai was aware that the essence of writing drafts, especially the first draft, was to express ideas he wanted to convey to his readers, his limited English language proficiency appeared to hinder this translating process of thoughts. As an EFL writer with poor English language proficiency, Tongchai could not directly translate his L1 thoughts into written English. In addition, it appeared that his first draft in Thai did not seem to serve as a perfect bridge to connect his ideas to his English text due to difficulties in the process of translation. Because of this language limitation, it was hard for him to elaborate on his ideas in his English drafts and could ultimately produce only short essays.

However, considering that drafting is a strategic action and a process that connects a writer’s thoughts and a writing product that will be presented to the audience, Tongchai showed that he wrote his drafts with a good awareness of various important elements of writing. For instance, he thought whether his essay followed the goal and ideas he had planned to convey; whether his readers would understand his text; and whether his essay was well organized or suited the rhetorical convention. This understanding should be counted as a positive development in his drafting skill.

In sum, although Tongchai learned quite well how he should process his thinking strategically while writing a draft, he was still struggling in producing his work. His difficulty in
converting the awareness of drafting strategies into effective application was not caused by the lack of knowledge of the strategy. Instead, it was caused by his limited English language proficiency. As an EFL novice writer, while writing his drafts, he had to concentrate on both how to compose his ideas as well as how to maintain accuracy of the language in order to convey the right messages he wanted to the readers. It was evident in his case that despite a good awareness of the strategy use, the poor English language ability caused difficulties to the drafting process.

Reviewing Strategies

Reviewing strategies include revising, editing, and evaluating a draft for a writing task. These strategies took place along with planning and drafting strategies.

Awareness/ knowledge of strategies and context of application. With the knowledge that good composing skills developed from writing multiple drafts, Tongchai had a positive attitude about revising and editing his drafts. While his prior purpose when writing the first draft was to convey ideas, his prior concern was that the language he used might be incorrect and mislead the meanings. Thus, his prior focus on changes in his second draft was on making corrections to grammar and language usage. In addition, because he was aware that each essay type had its unique rhetorical structure, he also paid attention to adjusting the organization and coherence of the contents of his essay to suit its convention. His reflections in the excerpts from a daily journal and an interview below illustrate what he thought about the reviewing process:

Today I had a chance to have my teacher and classmate read my first draft. The teacher made some corrections on grammar for me, too…. I thought I did well in presenting the key ideas I wanted. What was still not good was grammar, which I needed to improve a lot….For my second draft, I will edit the grammar and adjust the order of ideas and events in my essay. [DJ- W2D5]

Teacher: When you wrote your second draft, what did you concentrate on more among adjusting contents, organization, or grammar?
Tongchai: First, I would check grammar. I did it by myself first and I might get about 60% correct. Then, I looked at the contents to make it smooth. Last, I adjusted the organizations of the paragraphs. I might make some elaborations in some paragraphs. [Int3- W5]

Since he perceived that grammatical accuracy of the text was an important factor for making his readers understand his messages, he expected the teacher, as his prior audience, to give him feedback and corrections. At the same time, he expected to learn whether his classmates understood his essays and what opinions they had on the ideas he presented. Nevertheless, his attention on language and organization refinements did not outweigh his concern about the contents of his essays. Tongchai said he tried to use his peers’ comments as the guidance for his extending of some ideas in his second draft. He expressed his attitude about expecting the prior feedback from the teacher and having opportunities for peer editing as follows:

Teacher: Do you think it is useful when you have revision sessions with your peers?
Tongchai: I asked them to give me comments about my work. I wanted to know if they could understand it….Sometimes they told me to write more…add some details. But I felt more confident when you read my work…I could also see how they did their work and what ideas they had. I think it was useful. [Int2- W3]

Converting knowledge into effective application. In conclusion, with his knowledge and belief that revising and editing strategies were useful for his writing process, Tongchai reflected his attention in applying these strategies and efforts to consistently improve his work from the first draft. Also, it was evident that although his sense of audience was limited to his classroom community, it had a great influence on the revisions of his work and the progress of his reviewing strategy use to a certain level. However, evidence from his written work showed that he composed fewer drafts than his peers, which might be due to his limited language proficiency and/ or his lesser efforts (as compared to the other participants). Thus, his reviewing strategies did not always yield substantial changes in the final draft of his essays.
Despite his limitation in English hindering his abilities to greatly improve his essays, his sense of self-monitoring and evaluation played an important role helping him develop his planning and drafting strategies. His own observations of his weaknesses and making comparisons between his performance and the standard he was aware that he should achieve. Eventually, he learned to control his writing process and was able to write at a higher level. He was satisfied with the progress he made in his writing skills in English.

Cross Case Analysis on EFL Writers’ Strategy Use

In the preceding sections, I have presented findings regarding the awareness/knowledge and application of writing strategy use and the metacognitive awareness during writing of the four EFL learners in this study. Based on findings regarding writing behaviors for each participant, and using cross-case analysis techniques suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), I developed further constructs for each case. Then, I reviewed these derived constructs across the four cases and identified similarities and differences among them. Despite the fact that each participant had her/his own unique style of writing, certain similarities of behaviors among the four participants and differences between the two proficiency groups could be identified. Additionally, the derived constructs are discussed in connection with relevant findings reported by theoretical concepts proposed by previous researchers.

It should be noted that the analyses of the four participants’ writing regarding their strategy use were mainly undertaken in relation to the cognitive process model of writing proposed by Hayes and Flower (1980 a). They assert that the organization of writing processes in this model allows us to see how a good or poor writer applies strategies during writing processes (Flower & Hayes, 1994). Within this framework of three writing processes, namely planning, translating, and reviewing, I derived constructs under three major themes. These themes reveal
the common phenomena among the four Thai EFL participants’ knowledge about writing processes and strategies and how they applied their knowledge to their English writing skill development. They are: (a) Thai EFL learners and their writing strategy use for the planning process, (b) Thai EFL learners and their writing strategy use for the drafting (or translating) process, and (c) Thai EFL learners and their writing strategy use for the reviewing process.

Thai EFL Learners and Their Writing Strategy Use for the Planning Process

Similar and differing perceptions, abilities, and constraints regarding writing strategy use among the learners with high and with low English language proficiencies were identified. This section presents and discusses findings in regard to their planning process in writing.

The Four Cases and Their Similar Strategy Use for the Planning Process

Hayes and Flower explain that the planning process in writing mainly consists of goal-setting, generating, and organizing sub-processes all of which require various cognitive skills (1979, 1980 a, 1980 b). For a student to learn how to produce a good piece of writing, he or she must know useful strategies to master these processes effectively. Harris and Graham (1996) suggest several strategies for planning such as setting a topic and a thesis sentence, thinking about the intended audience, using background knowledge and sources of information to help generate ideas, using a kind of webbing diagram to connect and organize the generated ideas, and structuring the text to suit the rhetorical conventions of a particular genre. In this study, there were similar aspects of awareness/ knowledge and applications of these strategies that the four participants shared when they performed their planning.

Because these four Thai EFL participants had not experienced a process-oriented approach to essay writing, the knowledge of the planning process and of strategies for writing was new to them; thus, it required a certain amount of time and practice was necessary to
develop it into effective application. Although Orawan and Uma had taken an English writing course before, they reported that they were mainly taught to follow writing models instead of learning how to write. Pailin and Tongchai had never taken an English writing course prior to this one; therefore, they rarely had the opportunity to write an essay in English. From the beginning of this course, useful planning strategies were introduced to students, and they were required to put their plans on paper to help them become conscious of how they could control this aspect of the writing process. Despite having a previous conception, or a “long-term memory” (Flower & Hayes, 1994, p. 934) about the nature of the writing process and how good writers undertake the planning process, the four participants needed considerable time and practice to develop their knowledge and skills to master their writing tasks.

In Week 1, all participants learned that before writing, they needed to think about a particular rhetorical situation for their essay, meaning they needed a clear purpose about what they wanted to communicate to their intended readers (Harris & Graham, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980 a). However, there was a period during which all of them experienced difficulties in mastering the strategy of goal-setting to accommodate the task environment. Flower and Hayes (1994) explain that while efficient writers should be able to “juggle all of these demands” (p. 932), in practice some writers may not be able to fully demonstrate complete representation of their thoughts to fulfill this rhetorical problem. In this study, even Orawan and Uma, who were the higher-proficiency English language learners, articulated certain constraints during the early weeks. Although it was not too hard for them to set a topic for their extended essay because they learned to make use of information from their reading passages and their background knowledge, they revealed that it took them quite some time to choose a topic of interest to them that also fitted with a given rhetorical problem. Additionally, they wanted to be certain that they could
write about it extensively in English. Pailin and Tongchai seemed to have more serious problems in applying this goal-setting strategy. Pailin especially did not enjoy being given the authority to select her own topic for an essay because she sometimes was unclear about what she wanted or would be able to write about. In addition, the translating of thoughts from Thai into writing in a second language to clearly represent the purpose about the chosen topic to the readers also appeared difficult for these participants. All of them had uncertainty about how to write a clear thesis statement in the introduction of an essay; thus, they spent a lot of time on it. In some tasks, to make her thoughts clear to herself, before Orawan wrote her thesis statement in English, she had tried it in Thai first. Difficulties in goal-setting seemed to have two basic causes. First, these students lacked experience in exercising such cognitive and linguistic skills; their previous writing habits did not include them. Composing a precise statement to include comprehensive ideas was a challenging skill. Thus, time for the procedural knowledge to develop into effective application was required. Second, different rhetorical conventions for written texts exist between their first language (Thai) and English. For example, an essay in Thai does not always need to include a thesis statement in its introduction. Thus L1 interference negatively affected their development of the goal-setting skill in English essay or composition writing.

Generating ideas was also a demanding skill for these EFL participants. When they began to practice generating ideas, they basically learned to make connections between the reading passages, their own background knowledge or personal experience, and the writing tasks. On some occasions, some of them searched for more information from other available sources. However, at the beginning of each task, all generally felt uncertain about the direction that they wanted to expand ideas for their topic. Also, these EFL writers were all concerned that they might not be able to convey all their generated ideas into written text because of their English
language limitations. The two high-proficiency participants tended to overcome these challenges and their concern decreased in a shorter period of time. However, Uma noted that in the early weeks she did not possess a good skill to connect her ideas; thus, she tended to have long but not clear notes of her planned ideas. Pailin occasionally would only select ideas she thought she could express in English in her plan for an essay. Apparently, for the same reason, Tongchai normally wrote only short essays. The students were required to submit the written plans; Pailin and Tongchai put their ideas on paper in Thai first and then translated them into English.

These four participants, especially the two low-proficiency learners, also demonstrated difficulties in organizing ideas to suit the purpose of the writing task and thus the rhetorical convention of a particular essay type. Although they learned the elements required for each genre, they generally had trouble to generating enough ideas and organizing them coherently to meet rhetorical demands of text, especially for those types whose rhetorical structures were challenging. For example, it was difficult for them to present and support their positions in a persuasive essay and to generate details for opposing arguments in an argumentative essay. I hypothesize two key factors in this challenge. First, these students were inexperienced in planning systematically for a writing task to fulfill a particular rhetorical problem. As they revealed in the first interviews prior to the beginning of this course, most of them seemed to be more familiar with practice of writer-based prose, in which writers tend not to adjust their knowledge about the topic to suit the rhetorical situation and the audience (as opposed to reader-based) (Flower & Hayes, 1994). Second, their second language constraints affected applications of these planning strategies. As a result, the strategy of using the first language came into play to enhance the planning process in the second language writing.
Having been introduced to the practice of beginning their writing task by thinking about its rhetorical situation, these EFL novice writers became aware that writing was a real means of communication, not just a classroom activity or assignment; however, this awareness still did not reach the optimal level. To illustrate, they began to gradually develop a sense of audience for their writing task. They had a purpose for the writing task and a major concern about whether the readers would be able to understand their messages. However, I hypothesize that because their previous experience did not insist on connecting their classroom writing to the real world, this prevented them from expanded conceptualizing a specific or real intended audience for their essays. Indeed, it may have been difficult for these students to imagine the existence of a possible audience in their Thai community who would be interested in reading their English essays. Generally, they had only a tentative idea about the possible readers (e.g. those of their age, female or male readers, children or adults, or even anyone). Among the four, Tongchai appeared to have the most limited imagination about the potentiality of his real audience. It did not go beyond the classroom community. He only considered his teacher and classmates as his audience. This trend coincided with Rorschach’s observation (1986) that ESL students generally write in English to a general audience rather than real or specific readers. In her case studies of three ESL college writers, Sopa, a Thai student, appeared to share a similar limited sense of audience with Tongchai.

Nevertheless, because students had opportunities to practice using the introduced strategies in their writing tasks regularly from the beginning of the course, in spite of their constraints, all of them appeared to develop these strategic planning skills over time. The requirement that students needed to put their plans on paper seemed to promote active applications of the learned strategies. It is interesting to note that regardless of their language
proficiency, these four participants appeared to make attempts to tackle problems they encountered in applying certain strategies with positive attitudes. They did not appear to only select certain strategies. Their extensive practice of strategy applications in turn fostered their increasing knowledge and awareness of how they could apply specific strategies more effectively. For instance, at the beginning of the course, Tongchai reflected his uncertain understanding of the introduced strategies in the mini-lessons, but he developed ‘a better feeling’ for these strategies when he began to try them in his writing tasks. As their strategic planning skills developed more effectively over time, they perceived the positive roles of these strategies to enhance the composing (drafting) process more purposefully. Sasaki (2000) similarly identify this perception of the positive role of planning as a major finding among Japanese college EFL writers.

High vs. Low Proficiency EFL Writers and Their Strategy Use for Planning Process in Writing

Findings from the phenomena of the four Thai EFL participants’ writing behaviors in this study indicated that the high-proficiency learners developed their strategic knowledge and applications for planning skills in writing in a more efficient manner than the low-proficiency learners. The following sections discuss the major aspects of the differences in writing skill development regarding planning strategy use among the four participants.

High proficiency EFL writers and their strategy use for planning process in writing. First, having opportunities to develop their writing skills through the process-oriented instructional approach, Orawan and Uma demonstrated two major aspects of writing awareness and abilities regarding planning process that indicated their potential of being good writers in their second language. During the five weeks, each developed a good sense of flexibility in regulating planning strategies, of making the authoritative decision in the planning process, and
of ownership of their writing. Among the four participants, Orawan appeared to be the most flexible in applying strategies and controlling her planning process (in relation to the drafting and reviewing processes). After setting a topic and a goal for her essay, she generally did not want to spend much time making a detailed or fixed plan for her drafts. Instead, she generated only major ideas during her preliminary planning process, but always prepared to generate more during writing her first and later drafts. Therefore, generating strategies were recursively applied throughout her writing process, not only at the start. In addition, on some occasions (e.g., when writing a dialogue journal), she decided to begin writing the first draft and generating ideas simultaneously since she considered that this type of writing task did not require much preliminary planning. In short, she perceived that it was not always necessary to process her writing in a linear manner. Her sense of flexibility and making her own decisions about performing her task indicated that her procedural and conditional knowledge developed effectively into application.

Uma also demonstrated a sense of flexibility and making authoritative decisions for her own writing tasks but in a different manner. While the other participants were more inclined to follow most of the suggestions from peer revision sessions or from the teacher regarding the content of their essays, Uma tended to make more judgments during planning to revise her work. In some tasks, she preferred to maintain her work as she originally planned or intended it to be. Also, she reflected that she liked to develop an essay in which she could feel more enthusiastic about the content. In short, her metacognitive skill of self-evaluation seemed to effectively foster her conditional knowledge of planning into applications.

Since these two participants developed a good sense of flexibility and of making authoritative decisions on how to apply the learned strategies to fit their own styles, they
therefore concurrently enjoyed the sense of ownership of their writing tasks and essays. Both of them asserted that creating a piece of work in which they could write about ideas and points of views they wanted to convey was more communicative, beneficial, and enjoyable than just writing to follow the given models as they had previously experienced. Similar metacognitive abilities of decision making and flexibility in writing strategy use, particularly during planning, were also demonstrated by skilled EFL writers in previous studies (e.g., Sasaki, 2000; Victori, 1999).

Second, despite sharing similar basic constraints in generating ideas to suit the rhetorical conventions of an essay with the other participants, these two participants developed this strategic planning skill more effectively. Their written work illustrated that they were more able to successfully generate and organize ideas to suit the rhetorical conventions of a particular genre than were their low-proficiency peers. As their procedural and conditional knowledge and skills of this aspect of planning developed along the continuum of their progress, they manifested their stronger perception that writing was an authentic means of communication. Orawan voiced this belief clearly when she wrote an argumentative essay and said she had a real feeling of communication with the readers. Uma also revealed that she always enjoyed expressing her views in her essays. The tendency that more skilled EFL writers demonstrated more effective planning regarding generating and organizing ideas and incorporating their views in their essays than the less-skilled writers was also reported by Bosher (1998), who studied the writing behaviors of three Southeast Asian ESL college students. (However, Bosher’s skilled writers did not specifically refer to all high-language proficiency learners.)

In conclusion, the strategic knowledge and skills of planning that the two high-proficiency EFL learners developed led them to acquire good perspectives needed for becoming
good writers. The writing behaviors of these two participants seemed to suggest two major factors that promoted their higher writing performance as compared to that developed by their peers: their linguistic abilities in English as well as their better metacognitive learning/reasoning skills. Basically, the latter was rooted in their learning styles in their first language. And clearly, when these EFL learners did not have critical linguistic problems that hampered their abilities to apply the learned strategies in their writing, it was possible for them to develop their higher-level metacognitive skills to effectively regulate their writing behaviors in their second language writing.

Low proficiency EFL writers and their strategy use for planning process in writing.

Although Pailin and Tongchai manifested planning skills during the five weeks, they still demonstrated various difficulties in this aspect of writing skill development. I perceived that this limitation resulted from their constraints regarding the linguistic, integrative knowledge, and rhetorical problems as identified by Hayes and Flower (1980 b). In contrast with Orawan and Uma, the two low-proficiency learners could not exercise their planning skills to a level where they could be flexible and authoritative about how to undertake and control them effectively. Pailin and Tongchai had more difficulties in generating ideas for their essays (even when they generated thoughts in their first language) and expressing them in English. The constraints they encountered during this process both cognitively and linguistically made them stick to the few original ideas they could come up with. In other words, such constraints did not allow them to be flexible or authoritative in adjusting their planning process. Therefore, the planning strategies, especially generating new ideas were applied less recursively during writing. In sum, this phenomenon demonstrated their inability to carry out efficient planning in which writing goals
should be further generated, developed, and even revised recursively throughout the whole writing process (Flower & Hayes, 1994).

An interesting phenomenon regarding difficulties in mastering the planning process that was observable in Pailin’s case was that she chose to look for and follow models of planning processes that other writers performed. She reflected that when reading a passage, she tried to identify how the author presented his or her idea; she tried to follow or adapt the teacher’s ways of planning ideas to suit the rhetorical pattern of an essay; or she even looked back to see how she could adapt ways of generating ideas from her own preceding tasks. I perceive these attempts as possible strategic behaviors that novice EFL writers may perform to help maintain their planning process to gain success in a writing task, and to improve their long-term planning skills. Despite the constraints in her linguistic and cognitive skills, Pailin had a good metacognitive awareness of problem-solving. In sum, this awareness led her to seek ways to develop her greater procedural and conditional knowledge of planning strategies and thus enabled her to improve her skills. This should also eventually enhance her acquisition of the higher-level skills of being authoritative and flexible in her planning process over time. Tongchai did not reflect about these kinds of attempts and even tended to feel that he did not have much trouble in generating ideas (in the later weeks). However, evidence showed that his essays normally included fewer ideas compared to those of his peers. This seemed to suggest that he could not yet self-evaluate his performance well, and consequently did not make great attempts to improve this aspect of his writing skill.
Thai EFL Learners and Their Writing Strategy Use for the Drafting Process

This section presents similar and differing phenomena of the drafting process that the four participants exhibited. Within these phenomena, I will report and discuss their perceptions, abilities, and constraints regarding their strategy use for this writing process.

The Four Cases and Their Similar Strategy Use for the Drafting Process

As mentioned, it was the first experience for the four participants to be exposed to writing in English through a process-oriented instructional and learning approach. Therefore, the knowledge of how to develop writing by working on multiple drafts in order to produce a good essay was new to them. During the five weeks they developed several aspects of awareness and skills in composing an essay, and similar behaviors among the four participants during this process were observable. First, they were aware that during the writing process, they should be able to effectively connect the planning, drafting, and reviewing processes. They learned to use their planning strategies more or less recursively to develop their essays through multiple drafts. Also, along the process of writing multiple drafts, they became aware of and applied reviewing strategies (e.g., revising contents and organization, editing for language accuracy, and evaluating their work).

It should be noted that among these four participants, the two high-proficiency learners had experience in composing essays in English prior to enrolling in this course. The other two had rarely written beyond paragraph level. Despite linguistic constraints they previously had (each in different degrees), with knowledge about how to use planning and reviewing strategies to enhance composing process through extensive practice of writing multiple drafts, all four participants were able to develop their composing skill in English over time, each to a different degree. No matter how effectively they planned for writing, all appeared to begin to produce
their drafts and tried to make maximum use of the planned ideas, organization, and sources of information (e.g., reading passages, background knowledge and personal experiences, or other available sources). As a consequence, their abilities to orchestrate planning and drafting processes developed positively to enhance their fluency in producing their texts. The phenomenon of this development partly supported Chenoweth and Hayes’ explanation (2001) that when the writer’s experience with the second language increases, the fluency of writing also increases.

Second, since the composing process required abilities in translating first language thoughts into second language written text, along the continuum of their progress in composing skill, these EFL novice writers appeared to develop the awareness that composing in a second language requires two major aspects of cognitive abilities: to maintain fluency and coherence of ideas and to maintain the accuracy of language. Regardless of their language abilities, the four participants shared the same perception that to be successful in English writing, they wanted and should be able to produce coherent and grammatical text in order to accurately represent the meanings they wanted to convey in their essays. With this perception, they gradually developed their awareness of the relationships between planning strategies (e.g., goal-setting, generating, organizing ideas, and conforming to rhetorical convention) and composing strategies (e.g., how to maintain, coherence, cohesion, and linguistic accuracy of the text) and made attempts to apply them in a related manner. While the prior attention during developing their first draft was to convey goals and ideas, their major concern was how they could maintain accuracy of the language in order for the readers to understand their messages. Hypothetically, these four participants shared a similar awareness of both the fluency and accuracy aspects of writing because all of them had the same opportunities to learn about how effective writing should be
conducted. This phenomenon contradicted findings from Spanish EFL writers in Victori’s study whose writing behaviors were examined without having been given intervention on writing strategic knowledge (1999). Victori reported that the better writers were more aware of matters regarding maintaining coherence of ideas while the poor writers focused more on grammar and vocabulary. These differences between the two studies’ findings regarding behaviors of low-proficiency writers suggest the positive role of metacognitively instructional intervention that promoted knowledge about effective writing.

Generally each participant produced two or three drafts for an essay. They spent more time on their first draft focusing on translating ideas into proper written text. While writing the first draft, the four participants reflected that they anticipated hearing comments from their immediate readers (peers and teacher) in order to develop more ideas. Besides, because they considered grammatical text important for effective communication, all of them reflected that they also spent time thinking about how to write grammatical sentences for their essays. However, when linguistic problems appeared to hinder their fluency in translating thoughts into written text, they used the strategy of composing in Thai first, each to a different degree. Chenoweth and Hayes (2001) also noted that this strategy of relying on the first language is a common behavior found among ESL writers in maintaining fluency while producing second language written text.

Third, during the drafting process, their awareness of these two aspects of the composing skill strengthened their sense of audience. It was obvious that the four participants shared a strong concern whether their readers would understand their texts. In other words, they became aware that writing was the process of making meaning for real communication. Also, through more and more practice of writing multiple drafts, they became more inclined to write to meet
the audiences’ expectations. In conclusion, through process-oriented writing practice, these EFL novice writers learned to apply writing strategies to enhance effective writing purposefully.

However, as EFL novice writers, no matter how fluent they were in English, all participants shared a perception that the second language constraints were a major hindering their English composing skill development and prevented them from achieving the possible highest performance. Even though they learned to process writing strategically, they could not develop their composing skill to an optimal level within approximately fifty hours of practice. Because of their language problems, they were generally concerned that their text might not completely represent their ideas they could envision in their first language writing. For example, during the early weeks, all were facing the issue of whether they had a clear thesis statement for their essays. During the five weeks, especially the low-proficiency participants regularly reflected difficulties in finding proper sentences to express ideas, and they sometimes could not write down all planned ideas in their essays. Overall, their composing problems due to language constraints in turn affected their applications of planning, especially generating and organizing strategies. The issue that second language proficiency brought limitations to the composing process was also noted by Sasaki (2000). In her study, novice Japanese EFL college writers (both skilled and unskilled) shared a feeling that “there was a gap between what they planned and what they could actually express” (p. 280). These findings support Flower and Hayes (1994)’s explanation regarding the cognitive operations during writing that if a writer needs to spend a great deal of her/his cognitive energy to cope with linguistic constraints during composing, her/his struggling composing process can interfere with the planning process.

However, other studies have reported contradicting phenomenon in which the planning process (by ESL writers) tended to be independent of second language proficiency (e.g., Bosher,
To my observation, the participants in those studies were ESL students who all lived in an English-speaking context; thus, it was very possible that their second language proficiency was much higher than that of EFL learners. Additionally, two of these studies only observed the writers’ behaviors on just one or one or a few writing tasks but did not concentrate on the continuing development of the participants’ writing behaviors over an extended period of time.

High vs. Low Proficiency EFL Writers and Their Strategy Use for Drafting Process.

Evidence from the written texts of the four participants in this study illustrated that the high-proficiency learners could produce better essays than could their peers. The reflections of the four participants regarding their drafting processes revealed different levels of this skill development that led to different degrees of success. The following sections discuss major aspects of their differences in strategy use for this process.

High proficiency EFL writers and their strategy use for drafting process. Despite the basic constraints as aforementioned, the high-proficiency learners appeared to have cognitive and linguistic advantages that enhanced their writing performances (as compared to the low-proficiency learners). The latter seemed to have a significant impact on their composing performance. Although Orawan and Uma voiced basic concerns about their abilities in expressing ideas in English, their written work did not demonstrate that they had much trouble in expressing their ideas as planned. Uma could write about all or most big ideas and details as planned and could expand on the ideas in some tasks while Orawan (who preferred to have just a rough plan for each task) could use extensive details to support the main ideas she had primarily generated. They each had a larger vocabulary and greater syntactic understanding than their low-proficiency peers. And they were both able to manipulate their known words and sentences to
convey meanings, as they wanted. As a consequence, both participants could generally produce a longer essay than the other two participants.

Their language advantages also enabled these two participants to conform to the rhetorical conventions more effectively than the low proficiency-learners could. Their plans showed good connections of ideas to suit required components of each essay type, and they were able to compose the text to fulfill those requirements. Although Orawan reflected that in the first week, she spent a lot of time composing her thesis statement and introduction, she did not feel she had this problem later on, and it was evident from her written work that she did it well. Similarly, even though Uma appeared to have difficulties in organizing ideas in her first draft in Week 1, her work from Week 2 showed good improvement of this skill. Although she reported that she spent a lot of time trying to fit her ideas to the rhetorical structure of a more difficult type of essay (e.g., argumentative), she could ultimately produce a good piece of work. She reflected that the knowledge about text structure she gained from reading helped promote a better perception of the rhetorical convention. Her written text also showed that she could use transitional words or connectors properly to build good organization and maintain coherence of ideas. In addition, their English language abilities allowed both writers to enjoy expressing their attitudes and feelings to augment the rhetoric of their essays in particular genres.

In sum, these two high-proficiency participants were able to master the aspect of fluency in translating ideas into written text in their English writing at a satisfactory level. It should be noted that they could produce multiple drafts for an essay without much need of a first language version prior to the English language drafts. However, they were always aware that their first draft certainly included some ungrammaticality that could lessen the clarity of their messages, and they prepared to edit it in the later drafts. After all, because they could write what they
wanted and were generally enthusiastic about their work, their sense of ownership and confidence developed increasingly along the continuum of their writing progress.

**Low proficiency EFL writers and their strategy use for the drafting process.** In contrast to the high proficiency learners, the low proficiency participants experienced greater difficulties in applying their knowledge of writing strategies to enhance the drafting process due to the constraints of their English language abilities. Because they had difficulties in generating ideas, they normally had only a few ideas to begin with in their first draft. Moreover, due to limitations of linguistic resources (e.g., the lack of vocabulary and knowledge of sentence patterns) they had difficulties to build discourse to expand details from main ideas they had generated to a great extent. As a result of such constraints, Tongchai always wrote short essays throughout the course. On some occasions, Pailin had to abandon some planned ideas since she could not compose them in English. Similar negative writing behaviors due to having limited strategic knowledge of writing and linguistic proficiency were observable in Victori’s study (1999). Such constraints caused poor EFL writers to compose their essays using inefficient strategies such as relying on their own “inspiration” or performing a task with a lesser degree of “commitment” (p. 550) to its quality.

Chenoweth and Hayes (2001) noted in their model of second language written production that for a second language learner “whose language has not been procedurized, writing can be effortful process” (p.82) since it requires a great deal of cognitive power to retrieve proper language from linguistic resources he or she has, leaving little working memory free to deal with higher-level skills necessary to generate more ideas for support details. They also speculate about the interactions between goal-setting and writers’ abilities of text production; when second
language writers have to produce text that is difficult for them, they may decide to change their planned messages to something less complex.

Even though the two low-proficient writers had the knowledge about what components a particular essay type required and were basically able to plan ideas to suit its rhetorical convention, they appeared to have difficulties to compose text to fulfill this purpose. This challenge in conforming to rhetorical conventions and accommodating the intended audience’s interests and expectations also occurred for ESL writers in Arndt’s study (1987). In this present study, Tongchai had neither adequate vocabulary nor enough knowledge of sentence patterns that he could use to express his positions or arguments strongly in persuasive and argumentative essays. Pailin occasionally reflected that she felt the need to know more connectors and transitional phrases in English to help maintain the cohesion of sentences in her paragraphs and coherence of overall ideas in her essay to suit the rhetorical structures of the particular genre she was working on. Their language constraints hindered their abilities to clearly connect the discourse of different components to meet the standards of the rhetorical conventions of the essays at an optimal level. These difficulties also forced them to spend a lot of time in composing their first drafts. Their difficulties finally led them to use their first language to enhance the composing process of the problematic parts in their drafts in order to maintain the fluency and coherence of ideas they wanted to transform into written English text. During the first three weeks, Tongchai reported writing the complete first draft in Thai and then translating it into English. However, writing in Thai first seemed to create another problem as he needed to spend a great deal of time in producing his first English draft from the Thai version. Similarly, poor ESL/EFL writers in some previous studies also used their L1 during the planning and composing processes when they failed to use their L2 (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Wang; 2003; Warner, 1998).
Warner (1998) reported that his ESL students felt that composing in the first language and then translating it was advantageous in that it could help maintain the fluency of ideas when they used this strategy during the writing of the first draft. However, it could cause trouble in subsequent drafts as they had increased to produce errors in meanings due to the “negative transfer” (p. 194).

The problems in producing text in English made them attempt to look for models of sentences, paragraphs, and discourse. Pailin focused her attention on adapting patterns of organizing ideas she found in the reading passages for her own texts. Tongchai even reported that he sometimes borrowed whole phrases or sentences from the reading passages to use in his essays. In Warner’s study (1998), ESL college writers similarly perceived the benefits of using models from reading materials to enhance their writing. Tsang (1996) looked at how extensive reading influenced the English writing performance of by secondary-level Cantonese speaking EFL learners. He concluded that students who were taught to develop writing skills concurrent with extensive practiced reading gained benefits from reading as it provided models of appropriate language and grammatical structures as well as sources of knowledge useful for developing content.

In conclusion, English language proficiency appeared to be an intervening variable of the success for these EFL writers in converting their strategic knowledge of writing to application when they wrote in a second language. Those who had higher degree of linguistic constraints could less effectively apply their knowledge of strategy use in writing to control their drafting process. This finding can be explained by the threshold hypothesis (Cummins, 1986) which holds that if one’s second (academic) language proficiency does not attain a threshold (the point at which a learner has enough linguistic knowledge in the target language), language proficiency can be an intervening variable in his or her cognitive learning performance.
Thai EFL Learners and Their Writing Strategy Use for the Reviewing Process

This section presents both the similar and the differing phenomena found in reviewing process in writing of the four participants. Within these phenomena, I will report and discuss the learners’ perceptions, abilities, and constraints regarding their strategy use for this writing process.

The Four Cases and Their Similar Strategy Use for the Reviewing Process

In a manner similar to their skill development in the planning and the drafting processes, from the beginning of the course, the four participants began to develop new perceptions about the reviewing process and strategies in writing. Based on their awareness/knowledge that good writing is affected by a process of modifying thoughts and written texts (resulting from those transformed thoughts) through composing multiple drafts, they simultaneously became aware of revising, editing, and evaluating strategies. In addition, this sense of reviewing developed together with the sense of audience. The awareness that their essays needed to be revised and modified began first during the planning stage and developed throughout the drafting process. In regard to generating ideas, Orawan and Uma were prepared to generate more or expand ideas either when they produced their first draft or after they could tell what their first draft was like. They would also modify it after learning what the readers (peers and teacher) expected from their work. Pailin and Tongchai hoped that their peers would help them expand more ideas for the later drafts. In addition to their own attempts to review and correct grammar, all expected to improve the accuracy of their text after receiving feedback and corrections from the teacher. In short, all participants shared the same expectation that feedback from readers would serve as guidance for revising ideas and editing language accuracy. With this expectation, they felt that their planning and drafting processes would be more effective through applications of reviewing
strategies. During the five weeks, their perception of the important roles of reviewing strategies and readers’ feedback was strengthened after they had had a revision session with their peers and a conference with the teacher for each writing task. Warner (1998) reported a similar positive perception revealed by his ESL college students regarding the important role of peer reviewers. They noted that peers could inform them whether their essays were clear and also give suggestions that helped to improve the content quality.

Their awareness and knowledge of the reviewing process turned into applications of revising, editing, and evaluating strategies to improve the quality of their essays. Their basic expectation was that these reviewing processes would help ensure the clarity of their final product to create effective communication with their audience; simply put, they wanted their readers to understand what they wanted to say. To maintain good fluency and accuracy in their composing skills in order to produce a good essay, they learned to monitor and evaluate their writing performance and attempted to revise (make adjustments and refinements of how to generate, organize, and compose ideas) and edit their work (make corrections for language accuracy). Although they hoped to improve both fluency and accuracy skills, their major concerns about their English language limitations seemed strongly influence the direction of their focus on editing after composing the first draft.

It should be noted that this aspect of their reviewing behavior seems contrary to previous research findings of the dichotomy of focus: advanced ESL writers tended to focus more on content while lower ability ESL writers were more inclined to focus on editing grammar (e.g., Zamel, 1983). The focus of the four participants in this study regarding the issue of revising content and editing grammar was a common one; they differed in their abilities to revise and edit
their texts, though. The fact that there was no significant difference in terms of awareness could be due to the role of metacognitively instructional approach.

Moreover, it is interesting to note that although all four participants made substantial reflections during the five weeks that they were prepared to revise ideas and improve the content of their text (e.g., add, expand, reorganize) in the later drafts, their written work did not generally demonstrate remarkable changes of ideas between different drafts per essay. Instead, they made more changes in the corrections of words and sentence structures. This phenomenon was also seen among three ESL college writers in Rorschach’s study (1986) who concluded that this demonstrated more of “perfunctory performances” (p. 213) in their second drafts. Thanks to peer revision sessions, the knowledge that readers could understand the first draft of their essay made them gain confidence in their writing on a basic level. They also reported that ideas from their peers and the teacher helped them to improve their drafts; however, only minimal modifications were evidenced in their written work.

Two reasons can be accountable for this phenomenon. First, they reported that the writers were basically satisfied with the ideas they had originally planned. This attitude seemed to reflect the influence of the latent cultural element from their previous L1 writing habits. To illustrate, Thai writers are generally inclined to produce a writer-based essay or composition. Thus, for these participants, their preference for their original ideas seemed to outweigh their intention to elaborate or modify their text to accommodate the reader’s interests. It is interesting to see conflicting phenomena between having a newly emerging perception of the reader-based writing (as they were developing their sense of audience) and clinging to their previous customary practice of the writer-based writing as their English writing skills progress.
Second, I hypothesize that although the learners wanted to make use of the ideas that they learned from their peers and the teacher, and they did try to use them to a certain degree, their limited language abilities prevented them from fulfilling their purpose to a larger extent. In conclusion, learning to apply reviewing strategies played a great positive role in developing their knowledge about effective writing. Nonetheless, in terms of productivity, this strategic knowledge still could not fully enhance their performance and promote their success at the optimal level.

**High vs. Low Proficiency EFL Writers and Their Strategy Uses for the Reviewing Process.**

Despite the fact that the four participants shared basic similarities in their awareness and applications of the reviewing strategies in writing, some differences in their perceptions and applications of these strategies could be identified. The following sections present and discuss the different phenomena of their strategy uses for this process.

**High proficiency EFL writers and their strategy use for reviewing process.** As EFL novice writers who gained new strategic knowledge to control different processes of their writing in English, Uma and Orawan appeared to actively monitor and evaluate their strategic performance during writing. From self-monitoring and evaluation, these two participants were able to identify the flaws of their performance, paid great attention, and were generally able to improve their writing skills even before they received feedback from their readers. However, these two participants used their monitoring and evaluation to make choices in developing and adjusting their writing process in different fashions. Such uniqueness of each individual writer’s style and habits are also described as common in the nature of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1994). For instance, In Week 1, Uma articulated that she had a weakness in an organizing skill, so later on she paid close attention to and spent much time on this aspect of writing beginning from the
first draft of each essay. Also, she constantly evaluated her work and began to revise (e.g. changing details) and edit the language even in her first draft.

Although Orawan did not want to edit or revise her work much in her first draft, she direct herself to the particular areas she wanted to polish later on or to seek feedback from her readers in order to develop the later drafts. Generally, she refined the text by changing word choice and sentence patterns to develop a stronger textual coherence. Also, she focused carefully on the grammatical usage in her sentences. In the later weeks, she began to pay more attention to modification of the content demonstrating her increased control of the writing process. Flower and Hayes also note that a characteristic of having a “greater conscious control” (1994, p. 940) over how to process one’s writing is more commonly found among good writers than poor counterparts.

Although these two participants perceived the benefits of hearing comments from their peers and the teacher, they appeared to make their own judgments of how they wanted to reshape or modify their work. In other words, similar to their developing control of the planning and drafting processes, they allowed themselves to be authoritative and flexible in their reviewing strategy applications. Thus, they seemed to maintain a balance between the teacher’s, their peers’ and their own opinions that would influence the development of their drafts to meet both their audience’s expectations and their own satisfaction. Because their reviewing process involved a high awareness of how to regulate their own writing performances, they eventually appeared to develop a great sense of ownership and achievement. Uma reflected that she was happy to learn how to write in a more systematic way, which should help her develop her expertise more independently in her long-term progress. Orawan even asserted that learning to write through this process-oriented and metacognitively learning approach enabled her to evaluate her own
performance, and not have to entirely rely on outside indicators such as a teacher’s evaluation or a grade. Previous research (e.g., Arndt, 1987; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Zamel, 1983) also revealed the high metacognitive abilities among ESL/EFL writers that brought them considerable success. In particular, a similar sense of confidence gained through metacognitive second language writing practice was found among the EFL advanced college writers in Sasaki and Hirose’s study (1996).

Low proficiency EFL writers and their strategy uses for the reviewing process. Because they were aware that their audience (peers and teacher) could help them to improve their written work, Pailin and Tongchai tended to have high expectations of their readers’ feedback and support. Generally, since they were able to generate few ideas for their essay, they expected to gain some new ideas from their classmates to help expand their texts’ content. Moreover, on some occasions, they even expected that their teacher and classmates would help correct their problematic sentences in their first drafts. Therefore, the adjustments or changes between drafts of their work were more influenced by others’ than their own decisions. In addition, though they learned to develop a sense of audience to a certain point, their previously held belief that the teacher was the most important judge in the classroom made them inclined to pay more attention to the teacher’s feedback than that of from their peers. This was obvious in Tongchai’s case as he asserted that he was more confident of the utility of the teacher’s comments. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) concluded that the extant literature suggests that while ESL writers enjoy collaborating with peers and perceive peers’ reader responses to be useful, they still consider the teacher’s feedback to be superior.

Even though the low-proficiency participants appeared to rely heavily on their peers’ and their teacher’s feedback and advice, their written work still demonstrated minor changes in
content. Their final drafts were similar to the preceding ones except that they included sentences whose corrected grammar had been identified or resolved mostly by the teacher. Raimes (1985) reported similar findings from unskilled ESL writers who produced later drafts which differed only slightly from the original. In this present study, Tongchai’s and Pailin’s limited abilities in modifying their texts seemed to suggest that their English language constraints might prevent them to maximizing the benefits of the comments they had received. Also, it should be noted that all participants except Tongchai wrote their third drafts after receiving advice on and corrections of grammar from the teacher. Thus, they benefited from this editing process. Tongchai, on the other hand, seemed to gain fewer benefits from the revising and editing processes than did his peers.

Last, similar to the high-proficiency participants, these two low-proficiency participants performed self-monitoring and evaluation during writing. They recognized their weaknesses and tried to improve them to a certain extent. Pailin’s metacognitive awareness of what she needed to strengthen was not less than that of Uma and Orawan, but her language constraints did not allow her to benefit from this sense of self-evaluation to the same level. I would say that because of this conflict, she appeared to worry about her progress most of the time, especially during the early weeks. However, when approaching the end of the course, she began to feel more positive about her overall progress. Also, while Tongchai demonstrated self-monitoring and evaluation, his metacognitive ability did not appear to be high enough to help him improve his writing performance to a great degree. Nevertheless, he could produce only short essays, he was not very worried about his limited performance. This could possibly be because he felt that he had already learned a great deal compared to his previous experience. At least, he increased a basic awareness about his writing skill development. In conclusion, these two low-proficiency
participants’ knowledge of reviewing strategies and abilities in applying them developed positively but not to a level that yielded enough improvement to allow them to enjoy a great sense of achievement in their performance.

**EFL Learners’ Perceptions and Applications of Knowledge about the Connections between Reading and Writing Strategies during Reading and Writing Processes**

Numerous studies have confirmed that when students had opportunities to learn reading and writing together, they were better able to perceive the connections of various aspects of these two literacy skills. Consequentially, these perceptions promoted their success in both reading and writing together to a greater extent than learning each skill separately (e.g., McGee & Richgels, 1990; Salvatori, 1985; Shanahan, 1990; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In this study, I explored which aspects of the connections between reading and writing strategies the four participants perceived as they were exposed to the learning approach and task environments in which reading and writing were practiced together. In addition, I explored how they used this knowledge to enhance their reading and writing processes. The following sections present and discuss the findings resulting from the two major aspects of exploration in order to answer the third research question of the study.

The analyses of the overall picture of the four participants’ perceptions and behaviors yielded two major themes of findings: (a) the EFL learners’ perceptions about connections between reading and writing strategies, and (b) the EFL learners’ application of knowledge about connections between reading and writing strategies.
EFL Learners’ Perceptions about Connections between Reading and Writing Strategies

Early in the first week of this course, I conducted the first interview with all fourteen students enrolling in this reading and writing class in order to get to know each as a reader and a writer. The four participants who I selected as my case studies revealed two preconceptions about the connections between reading and writing. Uma, Orawan, and Pailin (cases 1, 2, and 3) all had a general conception that a person who reads more should be able to write better. In other words, someone who does not read much would have more difficulties in writing. Only Tongchai reported that he had never previously thought about how reading and writing were connected.

During the five weeks of this course, all the students, including the four participants, were trained to think about how they could apply useful cognitive and metacognitive strategies to their reading and writing. (The findings from the four participants’ reading and writing strategic knowledge and applications are reported in the preceding sections.) Also, they were encouraged to think about how certain strategies might be applicable to both reading and writing processes and how these two skills benefited each other. Several instructional and learning activities such as class discussions during the mini-lessons, pair discussions, teacher-student conferences, and conversations in the three interviews focused on the awareness-raising of this aspect of literacy skills development.

The analyses revealed that the four participants generally perceived that various strategies could be applied in both reading and writing. First, as McGee and Richgels (1990) asserted, combining reading and writing activities together helps students acquire a good knowledge of text structure. In this study, most of them revealed that their knowledge of text structures, both the organizational and the rhetorical patterns of the reading passages they had learned, helped them gain better insight in developing the rhetorical structure to suit the
conventions of a particular genre of essay. In addition, Orawan also perceived that when she became more knowledgeable about how to develop the rhetorical structure of each essay type, that knowledge in turn helped her to identify the genre and organizational pattern of the reading passage with more ease. She even felt that this knowledge helped her make inferences of ideas more effectively.

Orawan and Tongchai also revealed that knowledge about identifying main ideas allowed them to perceive the similarity between reading and writing. Orawan emphasized the importance of this strategy as it not only made her understand reading passages more effectively but also be aware that in order to develop a good composition, she needed to make her main ideas clear to the readers. Tongchai also reflected that in reading he focused on finding main ideas first, and in writing he began with the main ideas and then moved on to add the details of the text.

In relation to their knowledge about main ideas, Uma and Orawan agreed that note-taking in reading and writing notes for planning ideas (e.g., brainstorming, outlining) for their essays were similar in terms of the thinking process. They added that while making notes when reading an article, they had to think about how the main ideas they had identified were connected, and knowing that connection made them understand the text. Similarly, in writing, they needed to think about which main ideas they wanted to include in their essays and how they would connect them to give the overall picture view of their messages. In addition, similar to the experiences of the students in Richgels and his colleagues’ study (1989), the four participants in this study also found that together with their knowledge of text structure, the technique of using a graphic organizer was useful for both note-taking when reading and for planning ideas when writing their extended essays.
Goal-setting and using background knowledge were also perceived as common strategies for both reading and writing. Orawan recounted her perception about the role of goal-setting in both reading and writing. She said she would have a purpose for what she wanted to know before reading a passage or a book. Similarly, she began her writing by setting a purpose for what she wanted her readers to learn from her essays. Uma revealed that the strategy of using background knowledge was useful in both reading and writing; however, she used this strategy more substantially in writing. (See the reports on the individual analysis for Uma’s case regarding her perceptions and applications of this strategy in reading and writing.) Although the other two participants did not make direct reflections of their perceptions about the connections between the two strategies, when they set goals for their essays, their goals also tended to connect with their knowledge, personal experience, and attitudes.

In summary, all four of these EFL learners believed that knowledge about several strategies was useful for both reading and writing. The next section will present and discuss how they used that knowledge about such connections of those strategies in their reading and writing.

EFL Learners’ Applications of Knowledge about Connections between Reading and Writing Strategies

As aforementioned, the four participants perceived that some strategies were applicable to both the reading and the writing processes. However, their applications of this knowledge were seen mostly in the direction that strategies they had learned from reading positively influenced their writing skill.

The four participants reflected that they had applied several aspects of knowledge from reading to enhance their performance in different processes when writing. First, because they mainly practiced extended writing in this course, all of them became aware that reading passages
could be sources from which they could develop topics for their own essay. Also, they could
draw relevant ideas from reading for their topic. So, knowledge from the reading passage served
them as primary information that led to goal-setting and generating ideas during the planning
process in writing. They considered their notes from the reading passage useful for generating
ideas in extended writing. Uma and Orawan even noted that they could extend the points on
which they agreed or disagreed with the shared or opposing views of an article’s author when
reading an article to further discuss in their essay. Their perception of this connection between
reading and writing also seemed to promote better awareness of the notion of using their
background knowledge strategy to connect old and new information between reading and
writing. This awareness of making a connection between reading and writing seems to be shared
by most learners across ages and native languages. In Many, Fyfe, Lewis, and Mitchell’s study
(2004), in which elementary school level ESL students in a school in Scotland performed their
research writing on self-selected topics from reading materials, one important finding was
revealed that the strategies of searching, finding, recording information for the topics, planning
ideas, and reviewing were recursively applied between the processes of reading and writing.

Second, two of the participants shared a perception that strategic knowledge gained from
reading enhanced their planning and composing processes. Orawan and Pailin observed how the
authors of the articles they had read generated and expanded ideas for their topics. This
knowledge provided them the clearer ways of improving their skills of generating ideas and
maintaining coherence in their essays. Pailin especially always looked for models of this thinking
process when she encountered difficulties in planning her essays. Also, because of her
difficulties in composing a text, while reading an article, she was also attentive when reading a
text to observe how the authors connected sentences to keep the text cohesive. As mentioned
earlier, most participants also perceived the benefits of having knowledge about the text structures, and this knowledge that derived from both reading and writing reinforced each other. Basically, all of the participants observed how the authors of the articles they had read organized the ideas of their texts to convey the messages to serve their purposes. Then, they applied this knowledge to improve their own skills in organizing ideas to fulfill the purpose and rhetorical convention of each essay type. In addition, as mentioned in Orawan’s case, this knowledge, when gained from writing, also enhanced her reading.

Because the four participants were mainly concerned that the ungrammatical sentences in their drafts might lessen the clarity of the messages they wanted to convey, all of them observed about the grammatical usage in the reading passages (e.g., tenses, connectors, transitional phrases, and sentence patterns). The low-proficiency participants tended to adapt some sentence patterns for the sentences they composed in their essays. Tongchai even copied some sentences to include in his essay. The high-proficiency participants tended to make observations of the style of writing different that authors used for different types of reading passages. In sum, they used the reading passages as models to help them monitor the accuracy of the language as well as to learn how to make their essays well written. A similar phenomenon was evidenced in Ruis-Funes’ study (1999) in which Michelle, a Spanish as a foreign language learner also used reading materials as sources for models of grammar and organization of text when composing her own essays.

As I described above, Orawan, whose performance in both reading and writing was higher than her other three peers, illustrated an advanced learner characteristic as she could articulate more aspects of the connections between these two skills. Furthermore, she recounted her higher-level views about the connecting natures between reading and writing. For instance,
she noted that when she tried writing down her interpretations (inferences) from what she understood from the text, it helped strengthen her understanding of the reading passage, and this enabled her to interact with the author’s views more effectively. In addition to her enjoyment of her analytical skill in reading, she also felt that a type of writing that allowed her to express more of her views seemed to fit her character. These connecting processes of meaning construction seemed to promote her sense of being an analytical reader and writer. In sum, Orawan began to connect herself, her reading, and her writing in a very efficient fashion. In a similar way, Ruis-Funes (1999) noted that Michelle liked to react to ideas presented in the stories she had read, and this skill enabled her to develop her opinions and express feelings in an effective manner when writing her responses to the stories.

With their perceptions about some aspects of the connections between reading and writing as described thus far, these four EFL participants revealed positive attitudes towards the learning approach in which they could develop these two skills together. In fact, Pailin especially stated clearly that when she had to write an essay with a topic related to what she had read, she was much more attentive in reading. This made her feel that her English reading was more purposeful than before (since it was not just reading to answer the given questions). At the same time, it also helped her writing to be more purposeful and effective. Even Tongchai reflected that in order to have something to write in his essay, he needed to understand something from the reading passage. This same aspect of awareness was also found among the college students in El-Hindi’s study (1997). She concluded that her students developed positive critical engagements with texts while reading and writing because the tasks (requiring students to read and write reflective journals) provided them with opportunities to become aware of the connections between the two skills. In a similar vein, Salvatori (1985) and Tierney (1990) argued that
learning activities that combine reading and writing together promote learners to become more reflective and evaluative.

It should be noted that even though all four participants had quite extensive perceptions about the connections between reading and writing (as seen in reflections in the interviews, peer discussions and daily journals), their consciousness of such connections did not always emerge while they were actually performing their reading or writing tasks (the think-aloud protocols did not provide much evidence of application). As a consequence, this strategic knowledge was not always consistently or systematically applied, as what Uma pointed out about her own performance. In general, the two high-proficiency learners (Orawan and Uma) seemed to relate their knowledge of given strategies and relevant aspects of reading and writing processes quite spontaneously. On the other hand, for the two low-proficiency learners, their perceptions about the connections between the two skills seemed to emerge only when they encountered difficulties during writing processes and thus made attempts to use the strategic knowledge they gained from reading to help solve their writing problems. Nevertheless, overall all four participants felt that practicing reading and writing together yielded positive impacts upon their overall literacy skill development.

Also, it is interesting to note that as EFL learners, there was a perception that their first language had a role in connecting their reading and writing in English. This view was voiced by Tongchai when he reported that both reading and writing in English ultimately required Thai as a fundamental medium for making meaning. He said “when we read English text, we need to translate it into Thai thoughts before we can understand it well. Similarly, when we write, we begin with our Thai thoughts and then translate them into English text.” Although the other participants did not state this, I hypothesize that they shared this view since they certainly
experienced these similar connecting processes of meaning construction when performing reading and writing in a second language.

In conclusion, as preceding researchers have found (e.g., El-Hindi, 1997; Many et al., 2004; McGee & Ricgels, 1990; Ruis-Funes, 1999; Tierney and Shanahan, 1991), through extensive practice of reading and writing together, these four EFL learners greatly developed their perceptions about the connections between the two literacy skills. Clearly, they could identify more specifically the aspects of connections they perceived (as compared to their general perception prior to their exposure of practicing the two skills together). More importantly, they were able to use this knowledge to enhance their engagement and performance in both skills. Overall, the findings in this study regarding their uses of strategic knowledge derived from the two skills support existing theoretical speculation that combining reading and writing together not only promotes more effective process of meaning construction in both skills, but it also “prompts learners to be more thoughtfully engaged in learning” (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991, p. 269) and creates a learner’s perception that reading and writing have the social function of enhancing more effective communication to the world.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe Thai EFL university students’ awareness/knowledge and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in English reading and writing during a five-week period of explicit instruction in strategy use. To answer the three research questions guiding this study, in the following sections I present (a) the major conclusions with their theoretical implications, and (b) relevant implications for practice.

Major Conclusions about EFL Learners’ Strategy Use for Reading and Writing

Various related findings in response to the first research question “What cognitive and metacognitive reading and writing strategies do adult Thai EFL learners report understanding and using?” can be concluded under the theme that follows:

EFL Learners’ Knowledge and Applications of Strategies in Reading and Writing

One important theoretical concept regarding literacy skill development is that when a learner has knowledge of cognition and is metacognitive about strategy use, he or she will have the potential to perform learning behaviors more successfully (e.g., Baker & Brown, 1984; Brown et al., 1994; Carrell et al., 2001; Dole et al., 1991; El-Hindi, 1997; Flower & Hayes, 1994; Harris & Graham, 1996; Hartman, 2001; Paris et al., 1994; Schraw, 2001; Storarek, 1994; Williams & Colomb, 1993). In this study, having been introduced to learning strategies that good readers apply to help foster effective reading processes (e.g., previewing, making predictions, skimming, identifying main ideas and details, using background knowledge, analyzing text structures, generating questions, note-taking, summarizing, making inferences and analyzing), the four EFL participants reported that they learned to use them for probing (to gain general understanding at the macro level) and elaborative reading. During the five weeks, they built up
their awareness/knowledge of the roles these individual strategies played in learning. They also understood how one strategy could enhance another and evidenced attempts to use a certain strategy or related strategies in tandem in a given context to augment their comprehension. Generally, all participants were able to describe how and when they chose to apply the learned strategies to gain the big picture of a reading passage or to elaborate the details and extend ideas from the text. Together with their knowledge of how they could read strategically, these EFL students also reported that they learned to monitor and evaluate how effectively they could apply the learned strategies and to what degree they were successful in comprehending the text. When they experienced difficulties during reading, they could generally identify their problems and attempted to use the repair strategies (e.g., context clues, rereading, skipping) to solve or alleviate the problems.

The four EFL participants also reported that they learned new concepts about planning, composing, and reviewing strategies for their English writing. They were aware of various strategies that good writers employ such as goal-setting, generating ideas, and organizing ideas for the planning process. They learned to compose through multiple drafting; they learned to revise, edit, and evaluate their writing performance and essays. They also learned to recognize rhetorical conventions for writing in a particular genre (i.e., persuasive, descriptive, argumentative, and journal writing). Consequently, they applied this strategic knowledge during their writing process. They were aware that planning and reviewing strategies enhanced the composing process.

In summary, this study indicated that strategic knowledge enhanced EFL learners’ proficiency in their English reading and writing. Through developing declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge of strategies, learners converted them into application. Through
continued applications, strategic knowledge was strengthened. As a result, they increased their strategic reading and writing skills over time. They also shared positive attitudes about the value of the strategic knowledge that improved their success in reading and writing in English.

Findings indicated a difference in strategic knowledge according to language proficiency. Learners with high-language proficiency vs. low-language proficiency had different levels of potential in applying the learned strategic knowledge in their reading and writing. Although all participants perceived they had and could continue to improve their reading and writing skills more effectively than before, the transformation process of turning knowledge into effective application depended upon various elements. First, transformation required time and practice to transform. However, the high-language proficiency learners were generally able to develop their knowledge of certain strategies into applications in a shorter period of time; thus, their strategic behaviors appeared more regularly across the five-week practice and more frequently within one task. Second, an effective strategic application of behavior required complete understanding of the three aspects (i.e., declarative, procedural, conditional) of knowledge about a certain strategy. Among these four EFL students, the high-proficiency learners exhibited abilities to regulate strategies or repair problems in a more efficient fashion. This phenomenon suggests that even with similar declarative knowledge (about ‘what’ strategies they could use), the less proficient learners, with their lower degrees of understanding of the procedural and conditional knowledge (‘how’, ‘when’ and ‘why’ to use certain strategies), performed strategic reading and writing less efficiently.

Findings regarding the development of strategic knowledge indicated some factors that could delay or hinder the process of converting knowledge into application. In reading, most students (especially the low-proficiency learners) experienced a period when they were uncertain
about the procedural and conditional knowledge of some strategies, especially those for elaborative reading. This resulted in less active and effective applications of strategies. Some strategies seemed to have less salient or more abstract features for these EFL learners, which made those strategies hard for them to acquire. For example, they were not certain about how and when they should generate questions to help elaborate ideas from the text. These learners revealed that although they had a general understanding of procedural elements from the teacher’s modeling, they could not determine how best to apply it when they performed their own reading. In the early weeks, their applications of making predictions appeared only at the start of reading but did not continue consistently throughout the reading process.

Second, some negative preconceived notions the learners had about certain strategies also prevented them from applying the strategies actively. Because Uma thought that when her background knowledge differed from that of the author, it might mislead her understanding of the text, she was sometimes reluctant to tap her prior knowledge related to a piece of text. Pailin felt that incorrect predictions would yield misunderstanding. Therefore, these learners were not confident about using these strategies for fear it could lead to misinterpretation, especially when the passage appeared difficult and the context of the text was not clear to them. When the knowledge and application of strategies was troublesome for learners, it negatively influenced the uses of higher-level strategies such as making inferences and analyzing.

The above issues suggest several related theoretical implications. First, it is very important that solid procedural and conditional knowledge be established before effective, independent application can occur. To accomplish this goal, learners need to understand that knowledge of cognition and metacognition are related (Scharw, 2001). That is, these two elements of strategic knowledge require a great deal of metacognitive awareness. Moreover, this
higher level of learning ability is not always available to every learner without training (Hartman, 2001). Also, by nature, students who have not been in environments that actively nurture cognitive and metacognitive learning skills development are not likely to spontaneously become thoughtful or mindful in their learning procedures (Sternberg, 2001). Therefore, it is essential to provide students with extensive and explicit training to develop the students’ knowledge about ways to execute the targeted cognitive strategic knowledge together with how to use metacognitive awareness to help regulate and control their strategic behaviors for optimum success. This study thus supports an instructional context where explicit teaching of strategies occurs as an effective approach to develop strategic knowledge in literacy learning.

According to Schraw (2001), research suggests that many students can improve their cognitive and metacognitive learning given the three conditions: they have opportunities to observe experts using the skills, they learn how experts make reflections on those skills, and they have adequate time for practice in applying the targeted skills. This study revealed the phenomenon that despite the fact that students had opportunities to see the teacher substantially modeling strategy use, mastering some strategies, especially those that were more abstract in their application (i.e., they required modification based on context, and typically were related to higher-order thinking) was still problematic for most of them. This confirms that all three conditions must be established. In addition to seeing examples from experts, the core of learning to read strategically is reading extensively which gives multiple opportunities to practice the target skills. Regarding procedural knowledge, Paris and his associates agree that in addition to direct instruction, this knowledge can be “induced from repeated experience” so that the learner can understand in detail the “idiosyncratic procedures” of certain strategies (1994, p.797). Through extensive opportunities to practice certain strategies, the increasing perception about
how a certain strategy works in uniquely different contexts should be promoted. At the same
time, to help students improve their ability to apply strategies that fit the demands of specific
learning tasks, explicit instruction in metacognitive thinking should occur. To illustrate, students
should be trained to have a clear task goal (e.g., why or what the value is of applying certain
strategies), to know how to apply strategies in a flexible manner (how and when to possibly use
strategies in different contexts), and to use monitoring and evaluation to guide their self-
regulation and to change their plans if needed. This metacognitive thinking will reinforce the
development of procedural and conditional knowledge as well as flexibility. When students
become knowledgeable of these aspects of strategy applications, they gain the “will” (p. 798) to
use strategies for their own purposes and not to comply only with a teacher’s request (Paris et al.,
1994).

One important factor that appeared to delay or hinder the process of converting strategic
knowledge into application in writing was difficulty negotiating differences between the
conventions of Thai and English writing. The phenomenon occurred with all students regardless
of their English language proficiency. (Detailed discussion on implications will be presented in
the following section regarding the role of a learner’s schema.) Again, however, again, it took a
shorter period of time for high-proficiency learners to adjust their writing style to suit English
writing conventions.

In addition to the two specific problems mentioned above, this study also revealed two
factors that commonly had negative impacts upon these four EFL students’ abilities in applying
both reading and writing strategies. First, all these EFL students considered their English
language constraints as the major factor that impeded their strategy applications and their
successful performance in the two skills. (Implications regarding the role of second language
Second, the students’ previous non-strategic reading and writing habits still prevailed. For example, in the early weeks, in reading, the low-proficiency learners still adhered to their former habit of reading most sentences during skimming of the text. Tongchai even wrote down his translations of the text at lexical and sentence levels into his native language before he constructed meanings at the paragraph or higher levels. Despite knowing about the existing useful strategies, these former habits prevented the learners from applying the newly learned strategies actively. In writing, with minimum prior experience in English process writing, the low-proficiency learners appeared to struggle in exercising strategic thinking during the different processes of writing. Nonetheless, these prior non-strategic habits seemed to decrease as the students became more skillful in their reading and writing with the newly developing strategic knowledge. It would seem, looking at progress over time, that when learners become increasingly strategic, the prevailing negative habits will decrease.

This study also revealed two factors that promoted strategic knowledge for reading and writing skills development among these EFL learners. First, all the participants perceived that the teacher’s explanations and modeling helped them gain insight into how, when, and why to apply certain strategies. Seeing how the teacher actually processed her thinking during reading and writing helped them compare their own performances with what they perceived as criteria for proper evaluation of the strategy. Also, having opportunities to discuss strategies with peers helped them gain better ideas of various ways to apply strategies. As previously mentioned, this finding corroborates the instructional construct that previous studies have proposed about the role of explicit teaching in promoting cognitive and metacognitive strategy learning (e.g., Brown...
& Palinscar, 1985; Brown et al., 1994; Hartman, 2001; Scharaw, 2001; Stolarek, 1994). In sum, explicit instruction aids students to gain a realization of the purpose, procedure, and appropriateness of strategy application in a certain situation. This will help them consciously develop their cognitive and metacognitive skills that should enhance their literacy performance to an optimum level.

Second, it appeared that extensive practice resulted in positive skills development. The students reported that with more practice of strategic behaviors, they began to abandon some previous negative habits. They also revealed their positive belief that in the long term, with their strategic knowledge, on-going practice, and more exposure to English reading and writing, they would become even more successful in the two skills. These students’ experiences and perceptions support the theoretical implications regarding the role of practice in learning. As various researchers have pointed out, it provides learners with direct sensory experience of the procedural knowledge. It also helps students maintain, transfer, and automatize their skills (e.g., Hartman, 2001; Manning, 1991; Paris et al., 1994). Schraw (2001) also emphasizes that through practice, if learners have opportunities to reflect on their success and failures, the practice will play a crucial role in promoting their metacognitive awareness. In conclusion, these two positive factors of expert modeling and extensive practice are accountable for the promotion of cognitive and metacognitive strategic knowledge for literacy learning.

In response to the second research question “How do they use the strategies during their reading and writing processes?,” I conclude major related findings and present their theoretical implications under the three themes: (a) EFL readers and comprehension processes, (b) EFL writers and writing processes, and (c) EFL learners’ metacognitive awareness and reading and writing skills development.
EFL Readers and Comprehension Processes

All four of the EFL students were able to use probing strategies to enhance their reading during macroprocessing. Even though the low-proficiency learners took a longer period of time to develop their strategic reading skills at this level, and performed the skills less effectively than the high-proficiency learners, their strategy applications were still sufficient to gain a general understanding of a passage. As a consequence of applying useful related strategies, all the students were able to see the big picture and summarize the content of every reading passage. Their awareness of their abilities in making an oral summary of a passage in Thai appeared to help them reassure themselves regarding their general comprehension of the texts. This ability and perception could be seen as an indicator of their successful comprehension at this level (Irwin, 1991). Moreover, their positive perception about the benefits of probing strategies appeared to reinforce even more active, and consequently more effective, applications over the five-week period. However, the evidence also revealed that the written summaries tended to provide a poor indication of the students’ actual level of comprehension. The implication here is that oral and written summarization are not equivalent processes, especially for EFL learners.

Applying elaborative strategies for higher-level reading appeared to be more challenging to most of these EFL students due to two main reasons. First, they had uncertain procedural and conditional knowledge about various strategies (e.g., making predictions, generating questions, making inferences). Second, they needed to have good English linguistic proficiency to cope with the text in detail and to interpret meanings beyond a literal level. Also, it is interesting to note that most students were more inclined to perceive that their comprehension difficulties were more attributable to their English proficiency level than to their strategic knowledge. However, with fewer linguistic constraints, the high-proficiency learners were able to become increasingly
knowledgeable about and skillful in applying most strategies. Over time, they successfully developed their overall performance in higher-level reading over time. When they perceived that they were able to apply higher-level elaborative strategies (e.g., making inferences and analyzing), they reported a great sense of achievement in their ultimate comprehension. This success also reinforced their perceptions of themselves as becoming an analytical reader. For the low proficiency learners, with a similar uncertain strategic knowledge but a greater level of linguistic constraints, success in applying elaborative strategies to master the higher-level reading was elusive. Although their overall reading skill increased over time, they neither demonstrated high performance nor reported a sense of achievement in elaborative reading.

Therefore, these findings suggest that in EFL reading, successful strategic reading performance at the macro level precedes that at the elaborative level. In addition, the fact that the high-proficiency learners could overcome the constraints and become more proficient in elaborative reading than the low-proficiency learners also suggests the significant role of English language proficiency in EFL reading. Irwin (1991), explaining a fundamental concept about how comprehension processes work insists that we must assume that different processes occur simultaneously to and interactively with one another. Thus, it is possible that one successful process can contribute to another. The findings in this study illustrate the notion that success at the macro level contributes to the reading at the higher level when the context of meaning construction is well facilitated by both learners’ adequate strategic knowledge in reading and their English language proficiency.

The relationship between learners’ English language proficiency and their abilities in strategy applications in reading can be explained by theoretical concepts regarding the automaticity of decoding fluency (Samuels, 1994) and the linguistic threshold or short-circuit
According to automaticity theory, comprehension necessitates not only the ability to decode the printed words, but also the ability to do so quickly in order to comprehend the decoded words. A fluent reader is able to decode the printed text automatically (without having to expend undue attention to this process). Thus, his or her attention will be available for cognitive processes necessary for meaning making. Unfortunately, the automatic decoding ability seems to be a great challenge for EFL readers (who generally do not have opportunities to perform extensive reading in English), especially when they have to deal with text containing unfamiliar vocabulary and/or sentence structures. As a result, they will have less attention available for applying the learned strategies (especially those that are difficult for them) to enhance the overall processes of meaning construction. The low-proficient participants in this study reflected their perceptions clearly about these kinds of experiences. These findings also support Cummins’ linguistic threshold hypothesis (also termed short-circuit hypothesis in the field of second language reading, e.g., Bernhardt and Kamil, 1995), which explains that to be successful in second language reading it is primarily necessary for the readers to attain an adequate level of second language proficiency. Inadequate L2 language proficiency seems to impede the transfer and application of reading skills from their first language to facilitate their second language reading.

**EFL Writers and Writing processes**

This study indicated that having opportunities to write in English through a process-writing approach and with metacognitive knowledge of writing strategies enabled EFL learners to become aware of how to connect the three major processes of writing and to apply the strategies they had learned to enhance these processes. Generally, they were able to apply and develop their skills in planning, composing (drafting), and reviewing strategies increasingly over
time. However, low-proficiency learners appeared to be less able to apply the learned strategies recursively and efficiently. Also, they did not demonstrate a sense of confidence in controlling their writing processes as the higher-proficiency learners did.

Writing behaviors that the four participants in this study demonstrated support the theoretical concept regarding three major constraints in writing; they all had difficulties in integrating knowledge, managing the rhetorical problem, and dealing with linguistic conventions (Hayes & Flower, 1980 b). As novice EFL writers, all four students clearly encountered these constraints, each to a different degree. The difficulties in managing the rhetorical problems were obvious due to the differences in rhetorical conventions between their first language and English. The issue regarding their English language proficiency was commonly considered as a major problem that hindered their abilities to manage English to maintain the fluency of ideas and accuracy of the language in their writing tasks.

In sum, the constraints appeared to cause the low-proficiency students to be able to develop planning, composing, and revising skills only at a very basic level. Because of their difficulties during planning and composing processes, they appeared to expect more helps from their teacher and peers for the revision of their tasks. As a result, their revising processes tended to be more influenced by ideas of others than by those of their own. In contrast, because the high-proficiency students had lower degrees of linguistic constraints, they appeared to have more cognitive capacity available to tackle the other two constraints. In other words, they were able to regulate the learned strategies for different writing processes and develop their overall writing performance more skillfully. Also, they tended to develop a broader sense of audience as well as a greater feeling of ownership of their tasks. They exercised more freedom and authority to decide how they wanted to develop their essays.
The fact that the low-proficiency learners struggled more and were less successful in overcoming the constraints and developing their strategic writing skill seems to suggest that linguistic constraints significantly negatively influenced the EFL writers’ efficiency in overcoming the other two constraints. This writing process implication can also be accounted for by the concept of the linguistic threshold/short-circuit hypothesis (Cummins, 1979, 1981; Bernhardt & Kamil 1995) in a similar way as it does for reading behavior.

**EFL Learners’ Metacognitive Awareness and Their Reading and Writing Strategy Applications**

This study indicated that having been trained to read and write through explicit strategy instruction, these EFL students became aware of knowledge of metacognition and used the introduced strategies of planning, self-monitoring and evaluation, and problem-solving to enhance their literacy skills development. As described in Chapter 4, they were able to tell how they began to learn the introduced reading and writing strategies and develop those strategic skills. At the end of the course, they evaluated their overall reading and writing skills development. Generally, they identified the skills they had successfully improved during the five weeks and those they perceived as their weaknesses. However, they generally did not explicitly report their metacognitive awareness at a level that allowed them to control or regulate their strategic behaviors to solve the learning problems they encountered. This problem was more commonly seen with the low-proficiency learners. Although their attempts to apply repair strategies appeared to enable them to continue their task, they did not lead to a strong positive impact on their performance. This shortcoming was especially noticeable in reading. I hypothesize that part of their inability to know how to solve problems was due to their insufficient procedural and conditional knowledge about strategies. Moreover, in some
situations, they were not completely aware of all possible causes of their problems, and thus they were more inclined to connect their failures to their limited language abilities. However, in situations where they could recognize their difficulties and monitored, evaluated, and attempted to solve problems quite consistently, these metacognitive strategies helped them overcome their problems and improve their skills a great deal. Pailin, as a low-proficiency learner, illustrated this phenomenon that despite her lower linguistic and cognitively strategic abilities in writing, her great awareness of her weaknesses and her attempts to solve problems satisfactorily helped improve her performance. This could also be one reason that allowed her to demonstrate higher performance than Tongchai, who appeared to have the lowest sense of metacognition of all the students.

In conclusion, these findings suggest various theoretical implications supporting the existing constructs regarding the role of metacognitive knowledge in enhancing the development of literacy strategy applications. First, the knowledge of metacognition is essential in promoting the success of EFL learners to ultimately develop their English literacy skills. Second, because the knowledge of cognition and metacognition are related, the training in strategies needs to include metacognitive awareness development. Third, because it requires a great deal of time for knowledge of metacognition to develop efficiently enough to guide the effective regulations of cognitive strategies, it can take a considerable period of time for EFL learners to develop their English reading and writing performance. Thus, adequate time and practice are as equally important as solid training for the ultimate achievement of the applications of these intertwining aspects of knowledge. (Please refer to the discussion about the how instruction should connect metacognitive awareness and knowledge of strategies in the part regarding the development of procedural and conditional knowledge – the answer to question 1.)
In the next section, major findings in response to the third research question “Having been exposed to explicit strategy instruction in a process-oriented reading and writing context, how do learners perceive the connections between reading and writing strategies and how do they use that knowledge in their reading and writing processes?” will be concluded, and implications will be discussed:

**Learning To Read and Write Together**

This study revealed three major findings in relation to this theme. First, having opportunities to practice reading and writing in English concurrently for five weeks, these four EFL students reported that they perceived that various aspects of the knowledge and strategies they had learned were applicable in both reading and writing (e.g., goal-setting and generating ideas, identifying main ideas, using background knowledge, using knowledge of text structures). This indicated a perception of the similarities between the processes of retrieving messages when performing reading and creating messages when performing writing. This finding supports the theoretical construct that reading and writing processes require similar cognitive and metacognitive skills, and if we combine learning to read and write together, it will promote effective meaning construction processes of the two skills (e.g., Irwin, 1991; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). These students demonstrated the phenomenon that when they had a perception about such cognitive connections, their awareness could enhance their strategic behaviors to relate the two skills to bring about better performances.

Second, in general, these students applied their strategic knowledge from reading to enhance their writing skills development. They realized that they could learn some strategies from reading, which would be useful in their writing. Also, this realization strengthened the value of their reading and promoted a sense of possible achievement in their writing. I
hypothesize two basic reasons for this finding. First, most of them had more experience in English reading than in writing prior to enrolling into this course because reading has been generally emphasized in Thai EFL instruction. Second, instructional and learning activities in this course moved from reading to extended writing. For the low-proficiency learners, combining reading and writing activities provided them with opportunities to learn how to use knowledge from reading to help solve their writing problems. In other words, the reading experience and materials served as models and resources for their strategic thinking in writing. However, for the high-proficiency learners (particularly Orawan), knowledge gained from writing also reinforced her reading skill development. Moreover, it appeared that not only did she consider the connection of reading and writing to help promote her success in the two skills, but she also connected them as a means of communication between her and the world. Clearly, the two findings above suggest that similar to English as a first or second language learners, EFL learners can greatly benefit from having opportunities to capitalize upon the reciprocal learning relationship between reading and writing through this instructional approach.

Third, it is interesting to note that despite the fact that learning to read and write together can enhance one’s abilities in the parallel skill, in this study, though students generally had this awareness, they did not always appear to consciously apply such knowledge while they were performing their reading or writing tasks.

In conclusion, these findings support the theoretical construct that combining reading and writing together is a useful learning and instructional approach that can promote effective literacy skills development holistically. It not only promotes effective processes of meaning construction in both skills, but it also “prompts [the] learners to be more thoughtfully engaged in learning” (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991, p. 269) and promotes their perception that reading and
writing has its social function for effective communication to the world. However, the finding that students may not consistently use their awareness of this relationship to enhance their reading and writing skills development seems to suggest that if the latent awareness can be brought out and refined through instruction, it should result in more systematic and effective application. For example, awareness raising activities such as discussions and modeling of how certain strategies can be related between the two skills before learners begin reading and writing tasks should be useful.

In relation to the findings that have been discussed, three important factors were identified as impacting upon EFL reading and writing performances: (a) English language proficiency, (b) learner’s schema, and (c) learner’s knowledge of text structures. The next section will discuss how these factors affected EFL reading and writing as experienced by the EFL learners in this study. Related theoretical implications will also be presented.

Roles of English Language Proficiency in EFL Reading and Writing

The phenomena of EFL students’ learning to read and write in this study provided findings in support of the theoretical view that second language proficiency plays an important role both in second language reading and in writing. In particular, this study suggests that English language proficiency significantly influences EFL learners’ development of their reading and writing strategy knowledge and application.

A common finding that second language reading requires a great deal of general linguistic proficiency has been presented and explained by previous researchers. The basic explanations include the fact that non-advanced second language learners have limited vocabulary and syntactic knowledge and skills that they can bring to their literacy learning tasks. Low proficiency at these levels also results in greater limitations at an interpretive level (Day &
Bamford, 1998). This fact is even truer for learners in the foreign language context who usually have less exposure to both oral and written English language input. Thus, they will normally have to spend much time and effort to identify linguistic cues necessary for their comprehension process, often they may not be able to make use of available contextual cues and strategies for higher-level thinking processes as they do in their first language (Devine, 1993). A common reading behavior of the second language is they struggle to use their knowledge of grammar and vocabulary in the target language to make sense of the reading text, but they may not be able to comprehend the genuine meaning (Bernhardt, 1991, p. 180). Also, other studies suggest the relationships between language abilities and the effectiveness of reading strategies are very important to be considered carefully in reading instruction (e.g., Adunyarittikun, 2005; Auerbach & Paxton, 1997; Devine, 1987; Mohktari, 2002; Wongpaisaj, 1995).

In this study, although all the EFL students were able to use their reading strategies to gain general understanding at the macro level, the high-proficiency learners were able to develop their knowledge of strategies into application in a shorter period of time, and they used the strategies more consistently and efficiently. It was obvious that only high-proficiency learners were consistently successful in elaborative reading, while the low-proficiency learners had limited success at this level. In sum, the better one’s command of English, the more likely that EFL students would apply reading strategies more efficiently. In order for these EFL students to apply various reading strategies efficiently (e.g., identifying importance vs. non-important information, skimming, analyzing text structure, and context clues, note-taking, summarizing, making references), they needed a good command of English. In addition, when they became uncertain of their comprehension because of the language problems, they tended to be reluctant to apply other useful strategies such as making predictions, using background knowledge,
generating questions, and analyzing. The low-proficiency learners especially pointed out that when they were struggling with language problems (in this study, the participants considered the vocabulary problems more serious than the syntactic problems), they could not think clearly about certain useful strategies for a given context, or they were not able to apply the learned strategies effectively.

The above findings suggest an important implication that although knowledge of strategies is important to promote effective reading, optimum success in strategic reading in a second language cannot be achieved if the readers do not have sufficient second language competency required for the text. Regarding the issue of how much linguistic knowledge is sufficient or what the real linguistic threshold in second language reading is, Cummins (1979, 1981, 2000) explains that the threshold varies from reading to reading (depending on text characteristics and what the reader brings to cope with the linguistic demands in a given task.) In other words, to promote effective second language reading, a reading task should provide elements that both enhance the development of strategy applications and are suitable with the learner’s language proficiency.

The issue of whether second language proficiency affects the writers’ strategic thinking behaviors during writing seems to be more controversial. Some studies (e.g., Cumming, 1989; Raimes, 1985, 1987) found no significant differences in strategy applications between low-proficiency ESL writers and their high-proficiency counterparts, and cite linguistic advantages as only additive factors versus explanatory factors. Similarly, Bosher (1998) noted that ESL students who have similar level of language proficiency may develop writing expertise with different strengths and weaknesses. On the other hand, various studies (especially those whose subjects were EFL learners) argue that low English language proficiency negatively affects poor
writers’ strategic behaviors. High-proficiency EFL writers performed more effectively in planning, paid more attention to overall organization of the text they produced, and wrote more fluently than did low-proficiency writers (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Sasaki, 2000; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). It is important to note that the studies with ESL learners recognized any evidence (regardless of quality) of strategy application; whereas, the EFL studies were more likely to evaluate strategy application based on effectiveness. Due to low English language proficiency, the low-proficiency learners often used their native language in their planning and composing processes and then translated into an English composition (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Wang, 2003). Sasaki and Hirose add support to the linguistic threshold hypothesis that students’ strategic writing abilities in their L1 enhance L2 writing when the students have reached a certain level of as second language proficiency.

In this study, English language proficiency evidenced its crucial role in the development of writing strategy application to enhance writing performance. Obviously, all EFL students in this study considered their English language constraints a major factor that brought difficulties to their writing and prevented them from achieving as high a performance in their L2 writing as they could do in their L1 writing. In accordance with their perceptions, the findings indicated that their English language constraints delayed or hindered the effective application of the learned strategies. Especially obvious among the low-proficiency learners, the language constraint also negatively influenced their possibility in integrating knowledge and regulating the rhetorical problems in a given task. It made them reluctant to generate and enrich ideas for their essays due to a lack of confidence in their abilities to express them in English. During composing, they also appeared to abandon some ideas they had generated earlier. With limited linguistic resources, it was difficult for them to conform to the rhetorical convention (e.g.,
rhetorical structure, writing style, cohesion and coherence) of a particular type of essay effectively. It was also difficult for them to express ideas as clearly as they could in their L1 written compositions. This caused the low-proficiency learners to barely expand ideas from what they had originally planned. This resulted in less recursive planning and revising.

To maintain the fluency of ideas, the four students appeared to use their native language during planning and composing, each to differing degrees. As expected, the low-proficiency learners relied much more on their L1 than did their high proficiency peers, and they then translated into English for both processes. Also, the fact that all were concerned that if their text was ungrammatically correct, readers might not understand it indicated their belief that good linguistic performance is a key for clarity in meaning. This concern generally influenced their decisions to concentrate on editing language rather than on revising ideas even though they were aware that good writing involves expanding ideas. Also, it appeared that despite their intention for revision, the written work did not illustrate substantial growth of ideas between drafts. This finding suggests that their language proficiency was not sufficient to promote this strategic behavior.

On the whole, the findings in this study add support to the theoretical view regarding the important role of second language proficiency in enhancing the development of strategic behaviors in second language reading and writing. The overall implication is although knowledge of strategies for those processes is crucial, it is equally important to realize that language proficiency also comes into play in learning to read and write in a second language. These two components together will eventually promote the optimum cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), which by its nature requires a considerable period of time to develop (Cummins, 2000). The implication for practice is the teaching/learning of effective
strategic reading and writing in a second language needs to go hand in hand with that for language ability development.

**EFL Learners’ Schema and Their Reading and Writing**

Schema theory emphasizes that readers and writers bring their prior knowledge to their reading and writing tasks. This network of their prior knowledge (e.g., linguistic, content and formal schemata) will enhance their cognitive abilities to interact with the text in reading and to create a proper written text. These phenomena are seen in both first and second language literacy learning (Anderson, 1994; Carrell & Eisterhold, 1988; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Hayes & Flower, 1980 b). However, whether the learners’ schema is adequate or appropriate to facilitate their learning depends on what they bring to their tasks. This issue seems especially important for learners in second language reading and writing. In second language reading, it is possible that learners can fail if they cannot access or do not possess appropriate existing schematic knowledge necessary to understand the text (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1988). In second language writing, learners’ schema about writing elements in the target language (e.g., knowledge about purposes, genres of texts and their rhetorical structures and conventions) affects their writing performance (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Also, as mentioned, the role of linguistic background knowledge is tremendously crucial.

This study revealed findings about the role schema plays in effective second language reading and writing performed by these four EFL learners. First, the four students’ primary concern about their language proficiency and their observable skills (as presented in the above section) suggest that EFL students generally possess prior linguistic knowledge required for the tasks at a level that may not help them read and write strategically with ease and optimum efficiency. The four participants considered vocabulary problems as primarily affecting their
reading; they considered that both knowledge about grammar (e.g., tenses, sentence structures, connectors) and vocabulary affected their writing.

Second, EFL students in this study brought quite limited meta-knowledge and knowledge of forms of structure to their English reading and writing tasks. I hypothesize that partly because they had previously been taught to English through a product-oriented approach, they appeared not to be highly aware of how to read and write strategically in English. For example, they had not been made adequately aware or knowledgeable of a sense of goal-setting, authorship, audience, monitoring and evaluating, rhetorical problems and convention, or text structures. Because of this limited schemata, it took them a considerable period of time to develop their new knowledge of relevant strategies into effective application. Also interestingly, the incompatibility between their prior knowledge about their first language rhetorical conventions and those of English appeared to add to the constraints for their reading and writing tasks. In reading, the unfamiliar style of writing partly caused incomplete comprehension. In writing, it took these EFL students (even the high-proficiency learners) quite some time to build up their knowledge and improve their skills in composing a good essay with appropriate English rhetoric. Kaplan (1966) explains that writing in each language is culturally unique; it appeared difficult for these EFL students to effectively conform to the English conventions (e.g., writing a clear introduction with a thesis statement, mastering different rhetorical structures for each genre, writing to meet the expectations of the audience). However, with the new strategic knowledge gained in this class, they eventually improved their skills.

Third, findings regarding these EFL students’ content schema (including their socio-cultural values and personal experience) revealed that it influenced their reading and writing strategy applications in two possible ways. Generally, the four students in this study were
spontaneously able to apply their relevant personal experience and knowledge from content-based subjects they had learned to enhance their reading and writing effectively, and they had a positive perception about its roles. They tended to apply this aspect of their schema actively in their writing especially. However, it is not surprising that these EFL students also had content schema, especially some socio-cultural beliefs and attitudes, which conflicted with the implicitly presupposed knowledge integral in the texts. This conflicting knowledge negatively affected their strategy use. In this study, there were situations in which some students obviously appeared reluctant to use their background knowledge to help interpret the text and analyze ideas, or they were uncertain of their comprehension because they felt the conflict.

In all, a conclusive implication of these findings is it is very likely that EFL language learners may often possess limited or incompatible schema useful for their literacy skills development. This limitation can be a very important factor that results in the failure of their development. The implication for practice is EFL reading and writing instruction needs to pay close attention to including an aspect of building relevant schemata for students. This study also suggests that explicit instruction about the knowledge of how to read and write through a process-oriented approach can effectively help build the students’ required schemata for their development.

Roles of Knowledge of Text Structures in EFL Reading and Writing

Research studies have demonstrated that knowledge of text structures enhances abilities in reading and writing. In expository reading, the knowledge about the different types of organizational patterns of the texts will help a reader identify the structure of a given passage. This knowledge will interact with the knowledge of content during the comprehension process. As a result, it will contribute to the reader’s success of comprehending effectively. In addition,
the ability to recognize the organizational pattern of a passage promotes the applications of other reading strategies (Goldman & Rakestraw, 1984; Kletzien, 1992; Meyer & Rice, 1984). Similarly, writers use the knowledge of organizational and rhetorical structures to maintain coherence of ideas and suit the conventions of each particular genre (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Hayes & Flower, 1980 b; McGee & Richgels, 1990). Thus, inadequate knowledge of text structures can cause constraints to their reading and writing processes.

As mentioned earlier, prior to this course, none of the four EFL students had possessed a good explicit knowledge of both organizational and rhetorical structures of English expository texts. Thus, the awareness of how to use this knowledge as a strategy to enhance English reading and writing was new to them. The study revealed several findings regarding how effectively the learners used this knowledge. First, having learned about the five organizational patterns of expository text through explicit instruction in this course, the four students could generally recognize the organizational type of a given passage in each reading task. However, when they found that the passage was difficult to decipher (primarily due to language problems), they tended to have difficulty in identifying the structure of the text. Generally, it took them longer to identify the passage organization, or they felt uncertain about it when they had difficulties in connecting main ideas and/ or understanding details in the paragraphs. (However, the situation in which each individual student encountered the difficulty varied.) This finding contradicts the results from some previous studies (e.g., Goldman & Rakestraw, 1984; Kletzien, 1992) which suggested that the knowledge of text structure would particularly help students when the content of the passage was difficult. In this study, the students began to recognize the pattern of the passage faster when they felt that the content was not difficult. However, when they were able to identify the text structure at an early stage of their reading, they could use this knowledge to
enhance other strategic behaviors such as, skimming, identifying main ideas, making predictions, using context clues, and note-taking. The high-proficiency learners even reported that this knowledge enabled them to make inferences and analyses of ideas more effectively. These findings suggest that the knowledge of text structures and other reading strategies are interrelated. In other words, success or failure in applying the former may influence the latter and vice versa.

Through writing practice of essays in different genres during the five weeks, these EFL students learned more about text structures. They applied knowledge of both organizational and rhetorical structures during planning, composing, and revising processes. They reported that the knowledge they had learned from reading also guided them in how to organize their own texts. Reading materials also served as models of well-organized essays. Being aware of the importance of the element of the organization and rhetoric of the text, they attempted to maintain coherence and to fulfill the components required by the rhetorical structures of each essay type. However, to answer the question of how successfully their awareness/knowledge of text structure enhanced their writing performance, the issue of English language proficiency came into play. Generally, the low-proficiency learners experienced greater difficulties in producing a text to fulfill the required rhetorical structure. Not surprisingly, the essays of the high-proficiency learners showed better rhetorical quality.

In conclusion, this study implies that overall in EFL reading and writing, the knowledge of text structure is very important to enhance other strategic behaviors that contribute to the success of overall performance. However, this strategic knowledge will be most effective when it is facilitated with the proper linguistic proficiency. Consequently, explicit strategy instruction is needed to promote effective applications of this strategic knowledge, and that the levels of
readability and elements that ensure the clarity of text organization of the reading materials need to be carefully considered. Similarly, the writing lessons should provide learners with both the knowledge of text structures and the linguistic knowledge that will facilitate the use of these strategies.

Implications for Practice

In relation to the theoretical implications of the major findings from this study, I present the following related implications for instructional practice of English reading and writing in EFL contexts.

It was evident that the four EFL learners in this study gained many benefits from having strategic knowledge to promote more effective reading and writing performance. Therefore, I recommend that in reading and writing classrooms, EFL students should have opportunities for explicit instruction in reading and writing strategies; they should learn how they could employ the strategies effectively.

In reading instruction, since the summarizing skill is the ultimate indicator for comprehension at the macro level (Irwin, 1991), in addition to raising students’ awareness of how effectively they can apply other useful strategies (e.g., previewing, making predictions, skimming, identifying main ideas, analyzing text structure, using background knowledge, note-taking) it is important to point out to students that knowing about their ability to make an oral summary (even in their first language) can help them evaluate their general understanding of the text. In other words, students should also be taught to have the metacognitive awareness to use this strategy as a tool for monitoring and self-checking comprehension. Students should also be taught to develop their skills in writing a summary, but they should not be misled with the concept that difficulty in writing a good summary of the text in English (as this will always
happen during the early period of their practice) indicates a complete failure in reading comprehension. Otherwise, their summary writing activities may lead them to develop a negative perception about their overall reading skill development. In other words, an oral summary can help self-evaluation of text comprehension, but the act of writing a summary demands additional cognitive skills that obscure the learners’ actual understanding of the text.

It is also important that teachers be aware that elaborative reading is the area in which students may need special guidance since it requires a great deal of strategic and linguistic ability to master this higher-level meaning construction process. Teachers should also realize that abstract features of various elaborative strategies (e.g., making predictions, generating questions, making inferences) can be factors that cause students to feel uncertain about the strategies and that hinder their strategic skills development. Thus, explicit instruction by providing substantial modeling of how to make these strategies work in their reading is important. (Please refer to the discussion on teacher’s modeling later in this chapter.) Additionally, guided tasks to help them develop these strategic skills should be strongly considered because they provide controlled discrete examples and can focus on specific features.

In EFL writing classrooms, in addition to explicitly introducing planning strategies, multiple draft writing, and reviewing strategies to students, I highly recommend that teachers pay attention to promoting the EFL student writers’ sense of rhetorical problems including goal-setting, sense of audience, and their own roles as writers (Hayes & Flower, 1980 b). This will help them feel that English writing is a communicative means that can connect them with the real world, not only a classroom exercise. From my observations in this research project, it was clear that when a writing task was not assigned with a specific rhetorical situation, students tended not to think seriously about their prospective readers. Thus, to require students to specify the
intended readers of their essays can be an effective way to help them become more conscious about this element in writing. When possible, providing learners with a forum in which they can publish their work to reach the community beyond the classroom can aid them to formulate a realistic perception about their audience. Promoting a sense of a wider audience for their work should also help decrease the EFL students’ attitude that the teacher is the only reader.

Findings from my study also revealed the phenomenon that the EFL students shifted their focus, early in the process of multiple draft writing, from paying attention to revising the contents to paying attention to editing the language; this tended to limit the growth of ideas in their essays. Thus, it is imperative for teachers to encourage students to be aware of the importance of making ideas grow in their writing. This can be done in several ways. For example, at the same time students are generally encouraged to exercise freedom in their writing, the task instruction may also specifically require them to add or make adjustments to their ideas between drafts. Guided or controlled revision activities (e.g., the SCAN strategy, peer revising strategy, and others suggested by Harris and Graham, 1996) should help students develop a more constructive sense in revising their work. However, teachers also have to be aware of the fact that language constraints may prevent learners from producing a well-revised draft and should be prepared to help them with this problem.

To further develop effective revising skills, EFL students should also be trained to have a clear conceptualization about how to benefit from readers’ feedback. That is, although the primary goal of having peer revision and editing sessions is to promote students’ sense that their writing should suit audience expectation, they should also be encouraged to maintain a good balance between their readers’ and their own interests. The latter will help promote the sense of
ownership of their work. (This kind of balance was exhibited only by the high-proficiency students in this study.)

Resources and proficiency concerns, there are several other aspects that teachers can consider for both reading and writing classrooms. First, findings in this study obviously suggest that English language constraints impeded the process of converting strategic knowledge into effective application, and this eventually resulted in the reduced quality of the students’ reading comprehension and written work. Therefore, teachers should be aware that it is not adequate only to introduce strategic knowledge. It is also crucial that EFL students need to have enough language competence for their reading and writing tasks. Providing constant access to and multiple sources and examples of English is a challenge in the limited EFL context. One important issue particular to the EFL instructional context is that EFL students need to be provided with rich resources of English language materials in both classroom instruction and beyond. For example, a school-wide program for extensive English reading can help students develop their linguistic and literacy skills simultaneously in a meaningful context and on a continually emerging basis. This is similar to Smith’s conceptualization that first language children learn to develop literacy skills through the “literacy club” (Smith, 1994, p. 217). Being immersed in a rich environment of written texts, EFL students’ language and literacy skills should emerge and evolve through their own hypothesis-testing process of learning. This environment should also help students engage in English literacy with enjoyment.

At the classroom level, providing relevant language learning activities to develop students’ linguistic knowledge and skills should be considered in accordance with the level of students’ literacy skills development. Along with other researchers, Smith (1994) explains that, similar to other domains of knowledge, linguistic knowledge can be taught concurrently with
reading skills; however, it is important for teachers to realize that readers need linguistic schema at a level appropriate to make reading understandable. The same concept of concurrence and schema is applicable to learning to write. Therefore, reading selections need to have readability levels that are suitable with students’ language proficiency. Also, teacher should anticipate possibilities of linguistic resources that students may need to help them produce their essays and plan to provide them with useful supplementary materials.

Second, in addition to the needs of adequate strategic knowledge and English language proficiency, it is obvious that EFL students (especially low-proficiency) need ample time and opportunities to develop their literacy skills in English. Thus, teachers should be well aware of this and provide learners with adequate time and practice to undertake the different processes of reading and writing (preferably at their own pace) so that they can develop their skills with a reflective awareness of their performances. In the long term, this will lead students to become eventually independent, strategic learners.

To promote effective literacy practice, especially in developing strategic thinking processes, the teacher’s modeling of how the different strategies or processes and their connections can be regulated effectively is useful for guiding students to gain more insight into how to transform their abstract concepts into concrete behaviors. This modeling should include both the cognitive and metacognitive aspects of behaviors (Hartman, 2001; Shraw, 2001). In short, teachers should be good role models and demonstrate being good readers and writers to their students. In addition, it is important to teach students to use their metacognitive strategies of self-monitoring and evaluation and of problem-solving to be able to regulate their strategic behaviors properly so that they can become independent learners. This study suggests that the low-proficient learners especially tended to need more coaching on this matter.
As was evidenced in this study, it took a certain period of time for the students to develop their strategic behaviors. It is important that the teachers also need to monitor and follow up closely how well their students can develop this strategic expertise. In all, when students can finally perceive that they can share and discuss about their progress as well as their problems with their teacher and their peers, and from this, gain insight in how they can improve their performance, they will have a positive attitude towards their learning community.

Third, teachers in the EFL context should realize that EFL students frequently have inadequate or different background knowledge for that which the authors bring to the texts or for what English writing rhetorical convention entails. In this study, when their schema (e.g., topical, textual, strategic, linguistic knowledge) was not compatible with the new information they were dealing with, the learners tended to have difficulties in their reading or writing tasks. Therefore, to prevent this problem, it is important for teachers to identify relevant knowledge useful for the task and introduce it prior to having students perform their tasks. For example, unfamiliar socio-cultural, content-based, and linguistic knowledge can be included in the pre-reading activities. Similarly, knowledge about different cultural aspects of writing between their first and second languages can be discussed.

Next, in reading instruction, in addition to introducing the text structure strategy, selecting materials with appropriate readability and clear structures will promote students’ better success in the strategy application and comprehension (Goldman & Rakestraw, 1984; Meyer & Rice, 1984). In writing instruction, teachers should help their EFL students gain a good concept of how they can apply their knowledge of text structures to develop their essays to conform to English rhetorical conventions. Providing them with opportunities to read multiple examples of a particular genre is one way to promote this. Also, teachers should be aware that different types of
essays require different degrees of English language abilities and thus they should prepare students with the adequate linguistic resources they need for their writing in each particular genre.

Lastly, since findings from this study suggest a great deal of benefit comes in combining reading and writing instruction for EFL students, I recommend this instructional practice for any EFL educational development program, especially for those academic institutions that allot only a small proportion of time in the overall academic program for English language education. At least, within such limited time, if students can be concurrently exposed to both reading and writing skills development, they should effectively become more holistically proficient in English literacy.

Recommendations for Future Studies

In this study, in relation to findings about how EFL students develop their knowledge and expertise in strategy uses in reading and writing, one important finding suggests that the level of English proficiency has a great influence in strategy learning. In this study, various phenomena and students’ views regarding how it affected their applications of strategies has been described and reported. However, a study that specifically examines the relationship between linguistic skills development and reading/ writing skills development among EFL learners should be very useful as it would help provide information from another angle, thus contributing to the larger picture of how literacy instruction should be conducted for EFL students.

This study reveals that the EFL students’ English language proficiency as well as the their limited prior knowledge in various aspects of reading hindered their processes of comprehension at both macro and elaborative levels. (Low-proficiency learners struggled at both levels, and high-proficiency learners still encountered some difficulties in elaborative reading.)
These findings suggest that the “interactive approach” combining the teaching of both the top-down process and the bottom-up process for reading skills development is suitable for EFL reading instruction. However, further exploration regarding to what extent the lower-level skills development and the higher-level skills development EFL learners need to be provided should provide useful information for further effective instructional implementations.

The EFL course in this study was designed specifically to build a context of learning to read and write concurrently. The findings reveal that students were aware of the benefits of practicing the two skills together. They also identified some of the connections they perceived between reading and writing strategy applications. From this point, various studies can be further developed. For instance, I am interested in questions such as “How systematically do students apply their knowledge of certain aspects of the connections they perceive?” and “Which certain aspects of connections between the two skills are more perceptible and which are less perceptible to students?” (A study with the latter question might have to be conducted with a considerable number of participants to see a general trend.) These aspects of knowledge should contribute to being able better to decide about how to combine the teaching/learning of the two skills effectively.
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INFORMATION LETTER
Title of Study
Exploring Thai EFL University Students' Awareness of Their Knowledge, Use, and Control of Strategies in Reading and Writing

Principal Investigator: Pataraporn Tapinta

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this research study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the questions “How do adult EFL learners use their knowledge of cognitive and metacognitive strategies during their reading and writing processes, and how do they see connections between reading and writing strategies?” The proposed study will be conducted between March, 2005 - May, 2005.

Description of the Study and the Procedures to be used

The researcher will conduct and observe instruction of English reading and writing for the research participants for 46-50 hours (Approx. 23-25 sessions of 2 hrs). During those sessions all participants’ learning behaviors will be observed and the field notes will be made. The students’ discussions/conferences about reading and writing tasks with their classmates and the teacher and their verbalized thoughts during the reading and writing processes while working on homework assignments will be recorded via audio-tape. Approximately three semi-structured interviews in Thai conducted with the students will be audio-recorded. Each interview will last approximately between twenty and thirty minutes. All audio-recorded data will be transcribed. In addition to the students’ written assignments, self-monitoring reports on checklists and daily journals, and pre-test and post-test will be collected as the data sources for further analysis.

Description of the foreseeable risks

No risks are anticipated in this study.

Benefits to the subjects or others

The participants will learn and become aware of the relationships of the strategy uses for English reading and writing processes to develop their proficiency in these two skills.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records

The participant anonymity will be maintained in all public presentations or publications resulting from the research. Data from observation field notes, transcripts, audio-tapes, and other sources of raw data and artifacts will be in the possession of and secured by the researcher. All tapes will be destroyed upon completion of this study.

Review for the Protection of Participants
This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 or sbourns@unt.edu with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Subject's Rights
I have read or have had read to me all of the above.

Miss Pataraporn Tapinta has explained the study to me and answered all of my questions. I have been told the risks and/or discomforts as well as the possible benefits of the study. I understand that I do not have to take part in this study and my refusal to participate or my decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop my participation at any time.

In case I have any questions about the study, I have been told I can contact Miss Pataraporn Tapinta at telephone number………………. or Dr. Alexandra Leavell, Department of Teacher Education and Administration, at telephone number………………

I understand my rights as a research subject and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. I understand what the study is about, how the study is conducted, and why it is being performed. I understand that I may keep this information letter for my record.

APPROVED BY THE UNT IRB

FROM 1/27/05 TO 1/26/06
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM
Research Participant’s Background Information Form

Name:...........................................................................................................

Year of Study:.................................................................................................

Age: ..............................................................................................................

Major Subject:.................................................................................................

English courses you took in the past:...........................................Grade........
...........................................................................................................Grade........
...........................................................................................................Grade........
...........................................................................................................Grade........
...........................................................................................................Grade........
...........................................................................................................Grade........

Telephone: (Home) ................................
...........................................................................................................

(Cell phone) ............................... .................................................................

E-mail Address: .................................................................
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MATERIALS FOR THE PRETESTS AND POSTTESTS
Test of Reading Strategies (Form A): Pre-test

Date: ___________  ID: _______  Beginning time: _________  Finishing time: _______

Directions: Read the provided passage. While reading, answer the following questions about each reading strategy.

1. Making prediction: When you see the topic “The Benefits of Multilingualism”:
   - What do you think the passage will be about? (You can answer in English or Thai.)
     ……………………………………………………………………………..
   - Are there any things that relate to your knowledge and experience (or the experience of some one you know)? What are they? (You can answer in English or Thai.)
     …………………………………………………………………………….

2. Previewing & Skimming:
   - Look quickly at the overall passage (using some cues you see on the pages) and tell what you think you will read about.
     ……………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………
   - Read through the passage quickly and tell about the general ideas you learn:
     ……………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………

3. Identifying main ideas of the following paragraphs:
   - Paragraph 1: ……………………………………………………………
   - Paragraph 2: ……………………………………………………………
   - Paragraph 3: ……………………………………………………………
   - Paragraph 4: ……………………………………………………………

4. Text structure strategy: You find that the organization of the passage is more:
   □ description  □ collection  □ comparison & contrast
   □ cause & effect  □ problem- solution

5. Making questions: Write 3-5 questions that you want to know the answers before, during, and/ or after you read the passage. (You can write in English or Thai.)
   5.1 ……………………………………………………………………………
   5.2 ……………………………………………………………………………
   5.3 ……………………………………………………………………………
   5.4 ……………………………………………………………………………
   5.5 ……………………………………………………………………………
6. Note-taking: While reading, take notes of the information that you think useful for your summary in number 7. (You may have your notes in a form of outline or concept map.)

7. Summarizing: Write a short summary from your notes. (Your summary should present the main ideas of the paragraphs in the passage and include important details related to those main ideas.)

8. Using context clues:
   - What does “They have made my career!” (paragraph 3): mean?
     ..................................................................................................................
   - What clue helps you guess the meaning?: ..........................................
     ..................................................................................................................

9. Analyzing & Making inferences: From the information presented in the passage, tell what you can interpret or think further about “language” in relation to “career”..........................................................................................................
    ..................................................................................................................
    Write down the clues that lead you to those ideas: ..............................
    ..................................................................................................................
    ..................................................................................................................
    ..................................................................................................................

10. With which of Patrick Alias’ ideas do you agree or disagree? Why?
    ..............................................................................................................
    ..............................................................................................................
    ..............................................................................................................
3. Making prediction: When you see the topic “The Benefits of Multilingualism”:
   - What do you think the passage will be about? (You can answer in English or Thai.)
   - Are there any things that relate to your knowledge and experience (or the experience of someone you know)? What are they? (You can answer in English or Thai.)

4. Previewing & Skimming:
   - Look quickly at the overall passage (using some cues you see on the pages) and tell what you think you will read about.
   - Read through the passage quickly and tell about the general ideas you learn:

3. Identifying main ideas of the following paragraphs:
   - Paragraph 1: .................................................................
   - Paragraph 2: .................................................................
   - Paragraph 3: .................................................................
   - Paragraph 4: .................................................................

4. Text structure strategy: You find that the organization of the passage is more:
   - [ ] description  [ ] collection  [ ] comparison & contrast
   - [ ] cause & effect  [ ] problem - solution

5. Making questions: Write 3-5 questions that you want to know the answers before, during, and after you read the passage. (You can write in English or Thai.)
   - 5.1 .................................................................
   - 5.2 .................................................................
   - 5.3 .................................................................
   - 5.4 .................................................................
   - 5.5 .................................................................
6. Note-taking: While reading, take notes of the information that you think useful for your summary in number 7. (You may have your notes in a form of outline or concept map.)

7. Summarizing: Write a short summary from your notes. (Your summary should present the main ideas of the paragraphs in the passage and include important details related to those main ideas.)

8. Using context clues:
   a. What does “They have opened doors.” (paragraph 3) mean?
      ………………………………………………………………………….
   b. What clue helps you guess the meaning?: …………………….
      ………………………………………………………………………….

9. Analyzing & Making inferences: From the information presented in the passage, tell what you can interpret or think further about “language” in relation to “career”………………………………………………………………………..
   ………………………………………………………………………….
   Write down the clues that lead you to those ideas: ………………….
      ………………………………………………………………………….
   ………………………………………………………………………….
   ………………………………………………………………………….

10. With which of Alison Howe’s ideas do you agree or disagree? Why?
     ………………………………………………………………………….
     ………………………………………………………………………….
Scoring Rubric for Test of Reading Strategies

Making prediction:
  a. Make a prediction that is well related to the topic = 2
  b. Make a prediction that is not well related to the topic = 1
  c. Not able to make a prediction = 0

Previewing & Skimming:
  d. Able to tell tentative ideas with all relevant information = 2
  e. Able to tell tentative ideas but with some irrelevant information = 1
  f. Not able to tell any ideas about the passage = 0

Identifying main ideas:
  g. Correct main idea = 1 (for each main idea)
  h. Incorrect main idea = 0

Text structure strategy:
  i. Correct type of passage = 1
  j. Incorrect type of passage = 0

Making questions:
  k. Question that relates to the topic, main ideas and details presented in the passage or connect the knowledge from the passage to the world = 1
     Question that is irrelevant to the information presented in the passage = 0

Note- taking:
  l. Notes that cover all main points and important details and present clear differences between main points from details = 3
  m. Notes that cover some main points and some important details and present clear differences between main points from details = 2
  n. Notes that present too limited information or redundant information = 1
  o. No notes = 0

Summarizing:
  p. A summary that includes clear statements of the main ideas, important details and logical connections of those ideas = 3
  q. A summary that presents relevant main ideas but lacks clarity, presents relevant important details but include too trivial or redundant information, and lacks consistency of good connections between ideas = 2
  r. A summary that presents incorrect main ideas, includes too trivial or redundant information, and lacks connection between ideas = 1

Using context clues:
  s. Correct meaning and correct clue(s) = 2
  t. Correct meaning but in correct clue(s) = 1
  u. Incorrect meaning = 0
Analyzing & Making inferences:
  v. Show relevance between clue(s) and interpretation(s) = 2
  w. Show partly relevance between clue(s) and interpretation(s) = 1
  x. Fail to make inferences = 0

Critical reading:
  y. Draw ideas and have arguments to support points of agreement(s) or disagreement(s) = 2
  z. Draw ideas but do not provide arguments to support points of agreement(s) or disagreement(s) = 1
  aa. Fail to draw any ideas = 0
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CHECKLISTS OF READING AND WRITING STRATEGIES
How did I read? : A checklist of reading strategies

Planning & Previewing:

____ I made predictions from (check all that apply) □ the topic □ topic sentences
□ headings □ introduction □ conclusion □ organization of the passage
□ I did not predict

____ I linked the topic and my predictions with my old knowledge/ experiences.

____ I asked some questions about the topic before I read.

____ I discussed with my classmates / teacher about the topic.

____ I previewed the whole passage to get some tentative ideas before I read.

____ I skimmed through the passage.

____ I asked myself some questions while I was skimming the text.

____ I learned the general ideas about the passage.

____ I could not tell what the passage was about.

____ I circled or underlined some words that I needed to know the meanings.

____ I used the text structure to predict the content.

Reviewing:

____ I tried to find the main idea of each paragraph.

____ I looked for connections between the main ideas.

____ I looked for supported information for each main idea.

____ I thought about the organization of the text.

  I found that it was (check all that apply) □ comparison □ causation
  □ description □ collection □ problem- solution
  □ The text structure was not clear to me.

____ I asked myself some questions while I was scanning the text.

____ I linked the text with my predictions and old knowledge/ experiences.

____ I made interpretations using the messages implied from the text I read.

____ I could answer some of my questions.

____ I tried to guess the meanings of some words from the context.

  □ I got them. □ I could not get them.

____ I took some notes (check all that apply): □ Some key words
  □ Outline of big ideas □ Using Graphic organizers
  I felt I was “talking” with the author while I was reading.

____ I made a summary.

____ I mostly □ agreed with some ideas.
  □ disagreed with some ideas.

____ I also did the following: ____________________________

_________________

_________________
Self- monitoring/ evaluating strategies in reading:

_____ I began this reading activity with a clear purpose in mind.

My purpose(s) is/ are …………………………………………………….

_____ I think I fulfilled my purpose (e.g. I learned new ideas from the selection; I know how this information is useful to me).

This passage helps me …………………………………………………….

_____ I think I understand □ most □ some □ little of the main ideas.

_____ I think I understand □ most □ some □ little of the details.

_____ I think I understand □ most □ some □ little of the implied messages.

_____ I learned □ a lot □ something □ a little from the discussion.

_____ When I had problems, I did the following _________________________

_____ I want to improve my skills / strategies in (check all that apply)

□ Making prediction □ Previewing □ Skimming □ Asking questions
□ Locating main ideas and making connections between them.
□ Making connections between main ideas and details.
□ Using old knowledge □ Using text structure □ Making inferences
□ Using context clues □ Note-taking □ Summarizing
□ Solving problems while reading

_____ I think I have improved my skills / strategies in

□ Making prediction □ Previewing □ Skimming □ Asking questions
□ Locating main ideas and making connections between them.
□ Making connections between main ideas and details.
□ Using old knowledge □ Using text structure □ Making inferences
□ Using context clues □ Note-taking □ Summarizing
□ Solving problems while reading

My thoughts about the reading today: (You can write in Thai.)
Your recall may include what you learned from the text, what strategies you used while reading, what you learned from the discussions, what you think about the reading and the discussion atmosphere today, your achievement, etc.
How did I write? : A checklist of writing strategies

Planning:
_____ I thought about the purpose of my writing.
_____ I thought about my readers.
_____ I used the questions who, what, why, how, when, where to help myself think about what to write in my first draft.
_____ I used my knowledge and experiences to create this essay.
_____ I collected some data before I wrote.
_____ I made a tentative organization of my ideas before I wrote.
   (e.g. list of ideas, webbing charge).
_____ I had a picture of my “story / essay” before I began my writing.

My first draft:
_____ I just wrote everything I thought about the topic.
_____ I had a tentative thesis statement for my essay.
_____ I got stuck: having problems with □ vocabulary □ sentence structures
   □ organizing ideas □ connecting ideas □ generating new ideas
_____ I jumped from one idea to another.
_____ I had something on my paper with a satisfactory □ content □ organization.
_____ I had something on my paper, but I wanted to refine □ some ideas.
   □ the organization.

Reviewing:
Conferencing
_____ I talked to someone about my first draft and listened to his/her opinions.
_____ I read and reread my draft.
_____ I regenerated and reorganized my ideas.
_____ I thought about my writing from the point of view of my audience.

Revising for the final draft: (You can have multiple drafts through this process.)
_____ I underlined some words and made connections between those ideas.
_____ I reorganized a paragraph.
_____ I refined my thesis statement.
_____ I wrote a topic sentence in each paragraph. I rewrote some of them.
_____ I thought about how to add new ideas, change some ideas, cut out some ideas.
_____ I made choices of words/ phrases, etc.
_____ I adjusted the length of some paragraphs.
_____ I shifted the order of some paragraphs to fit the sequence of my ideas.
_____ I thought I had an “introduction”, a “body” and a “conclusion” in my work.
_____ I had a clear picture of the organization of my ideas.
_____ I read my work again, and (if possible) I had someone read my work again.

Editing: I checked the grammar and spelling of my work. I read it aloud.
Self-monitoring/ evaluating strategies in writing:

_____ I am satisfied with my writing. I fulfilled my purpose.
I write this essay/ composition because I want to………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………..

_____ I need to think more about

☐ setting goals ☐ generating ideas before writing a draft
☐ my audience ☐ connecting my writing with my experience/ knowledge
☐ planning an organization of ideas
☐ choices of words and sentences ☐ grammar

_____ I have improved in

☐ setting goals ☐ generating ideas before writing a draft
☐ my audience ☐ connecting my writing with my experience/ knowledge
☐ planning an organization of ideas
☐ choices of words and sentences ☐ grammar

My thoughts about the writing (& reading/ writing connection) today:
(You can write in Thai.)

Your recall may include what you learned about writing, what strategies you used while writing, what you learned from the discussions, what you perceived about the connections between reading and writing, your achievement, etc.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Guided questions for the first interview

Student’s background in reading (in Thai and English):
1. In general, how do you feel about reading in Thai/ in English? Tell about reading for “pleasure” and “assigned reading”.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
2. How do you consider the importance of reading to your life?
   a) Not important  b) Important  c) Very important
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
3. Do you consider yourself as a/an below average, average, or above average reader?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
4. What kind of books/ essays or articles do you like to read?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
5. How do you read in Thai/ in English? How much do you spend time reading a selection of approximately 750- 1,000 words?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
6. Do you have any difficulties in reading texts in Thai/ in English? If any, tell about those difficulties.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
7. How much were you aware of reading strategies in the past?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
8. What do you expect to learn and practice about reading in this class?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Student’s background in writing (in Thai and English):
1. How do you feel about writing in Thai/ in English?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
2. How do you consider the importance of writing for your life?
   a) Not important  b) Important  c) Very important
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
3. Do you consider yourself as a/an below average, average, or above average writer?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
4. Do you practice much in writing in Thai / in English?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
5. What kinds of stories or topics do you like to write in Thai/ in English? What kind of stories do you write most?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
6. Describe what you usually do when you write in Thai/ in English.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
7. Who do you like to write for? In general, who do you write for?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
8. Do you have any difficulties in writing in Thai/ English? Tell about the difficulties.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
9. How much were you aware of writing strategies in the past?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
10. What do you expect to learn and practice about writing in this class?
(First interview)

Student’s awareness of the relationships between reading and writing:
1. Do you write anything about what you read or learned before (in both languages -- Give some examples)?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Do you do anything similar or related in reading and writing? What are they?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Do you find anything different between reading and writing? What are they?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Do you use your reading to help your writing and vice versa? How?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
Guided questions for the second interview:

- Awareness of strategies for reading and writing processes

  1. How frequently do you have a plan or select some strategies before you read and write? Tell about your plan and the strategies you think about.

  2. From what you have learned about different strategies for reading and writing in English, (from both your past experience and from this class), what strategies have you ______
     - Why?
       - used most often? - When do you use them?
       - used less? - How do you use them?
       - never used?

  3. What are the new strategies you know about, but you do not know how to apply them as effectively as you might like?
     **Writing**: planning, organizing, drafting, using my background knowledge/ experiences, conferencing, revising/reorganizing, editing
     **Reading**: predicting, previewing, skimming, asking questions, finding main ideas and details, using background knowledge, using knowledge of text structure, drawing inferences, analyzing the author’s ideas, note-taking, summarizing

  4. What difficulties do you still have in reading/in writing in English? (**)

  5. When you get stuck in reading or writing, what do you generally do?

  6. Can you identify the causes of the problems?

  7. When you face a problem during your reading or writing processes, do you apply some strategies to solve the problems? How?

  8. What strategies do you find useful for reading and writing processes and you can use them well in your reading/writing? (**)

  9. How do you spend time for your reading/writing (in English) using strategies in different processes to achieve your tasks?
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(Second interview)

- Awareness of reading and writing connections
  
  1. Do you see relationships between reading and writing strategies? What are they?
  
  2. What similarities or differences do you find between certain reading and writing strategies?
  
  3. Do you do anything similar or related in reading and writing? What are they?
  
  4. Do you use your reading to help your writing and vice versa? How?
  
  5. Do you write anything about what you read or learned before (in both languages -- Give examples)?
  
  6. When you read and write in Thai, do you think of your author or your audience? What do you do in English reading and writing? What kinds of things do you think about?

- Awareness of self-monitoring and evaluating strategies
  
  1. How frequently do you have a purpose and a plan when you read or write?
  
  2. Do you monitor yourself when reading or writing? Do you evaluate your work? When and how do you do it?
  
  3. In writing, when do you revise your work? How? Why?
  
  4. How satisfied are you with your reading and writing in English now?
     - Very much    - Much    - Fairly    - Little
Guided questions for the third interview:

- Awareness of strategies for reading and writing processes

  1. How frequently do you have a plan or select some strategies before you read and write? Tell about your plan and the strategies you think about.

  2. Do you feel that you have learned and can apply more strategies for reading and writing in English than in the past? What strategies have you used most often? Why? Used less? When do you use them? Never used? How do you use them?

  3. How well have you improved in applying the following strategies to achieve your comprehension and writing tasks? Little = 1, Fairly = 2, Much = 3, Very much = 4

   **Reading:**
   - predicting,
   - previewing,
   - skimming,
   - asking questions
   - finding main ideas/details,
   - using prior knowledge,
   - using knowledge of text organization,
   - drawing inferences,
   - analyzing the author’s ideas,
   - note-taking,
   - summarizing

   **Writing:**
   - planning,
   - organizing,
   - drafting,
   - using my background knowledge/experiences,
   - conferencing,
   - revising/reorganizing,
   - editing

  4. List the strategies you think you still need to improve: .........................

   Reading: .................................................................

   Writing: .................................................................

  5. When you face a problem during your reading or writing processes, describe how you apply strategies to solve the problems. Do you think you can use those strategies more efficiently than in the past?

  6. What strategies do you find useful for reading and writing processes? Describe how you apply them to enhance your comprehension and your writing. Do you think you can use those strategies more efficiently than in the past?
(Third interview)

- **Awareness of reading and writing connections**
  1. What kind of relationships do you see between reading and writing strategies?
  2. What reading and writing strategies do you find serve similar purposes?
  3. Do you use your reading to help your writing and vice versa? How?
  4. Do you think of your author or your audience?

- **Awareness of self-monitoring and evaluating strategies**
  1. Do you have a purpose and a plan every time you read or write?
  2. Do you monitor yourself when reading or writing more efficiently? Do you evaluate your work with clearer criteria? When and how do you do it?
  3. Can you solve the problems in your reading and writing more efficiently? How?
  4. What do you think can help you improve your reading and writing skills in English?
  5. How much are you satisfied with your reading and writing in English now?
  6. In approximately which week did you feel you began to improve in applying strategies in reading and writing?
  7. Does the practice and what you have learned about strategy use in reading and writing from this class fulfill your goals? How?
  8. What is your opinion about the teacher’s explanation and modeling of strategies?
  9. What is your opinion about the discussions about strategies with peers and the teacher?
  10. So far, do you consider yourself better in reading than writing or vice versa or equally good at both skills?
APPENDIX F

PILOT STUDY
Pilot Study

Prior to this study, I had conducted two pilot studies. The first study was aimed at exploring how EFL Thai college students applied cognitive and metacognitive strategies in their reading in English. It was conducted in Thailand in mid 2003. Eight students voluntarily participated in the reading class conducted for the research study for twenty-two hours (11 sessions) over six weeks. Of these students, two were selected as the case studies.

In addition to finding answers to my inquiry, I had two main purposes in conducting this pilot study. First, as a novice researcher, I wanted to become familiar with the processes of conducting a case study, especially with the situation in which the researcher also had the role of the teacher. I wanted to experience any possible problems that might occur so that I could be prepared to prevent those kinds of problems in future studies. Second, I wanted to “pilot” or test out the instruments and methods of data collections such as using a student checklist for reading strategies, asking interview questions, and having students write a daily journal.

I conducted the second pilot study in spring, 2004. It was aimed at expanding the inquiry from the previous study to explore how an adult EFL Thai student who was attending an intensive English program at the IELI at the university of North Texas used strategies in both reading and writing in English, and whether he connected his knowledge of strategies in reading and writing. As part of the project, I wanted to develop my expertise in performing data analysis for a case study. Also, I wanted to retest the instruments that I revised from the first study to gain information about the learners’ reading strategy applications and to pilot the new instruments to gain information about learners’ writing strategy applications.
The experiences of conducting the two pilot studies helped me to gain a better understanding of the nature of classroom activities in which students were required to express their thoughts about their learning behaviors. In these studies, I learned that although the student discussion was a very useful learning/instructional activity as well as an effective method of data collection for a research study, students generally found it difficult to talk about their strategic learning behaviors, especially at the very beginning of the project. Thus, in this present study, I provided students with written guidelines of some basic ideas about what they could discuss in relation to their strategy applications in reading and writing.

The results of piloting the instruments led me to make some adjustments for this study. First, the statements in the checklists of reading and writing strategies were refined for clarity. Second, some interview questions were modified. Questions that had not drawn informative answers were dropped and some inquiries that were developed based on analytic memos from the two pilot studies were incorporated.

In conclusion, the two pilots studies served to form this present study in three aspects. First, they helped ensure credibility by using instruments that had been piloted with similar groups of learners and adjusted to eliminate their weaknesses. Second, they enabled me to anticipate possible problems that might take place during the fieldwork, data collecting, and analyzing processes. And finally, over all, I gained better insight into conducting a case study which increased my confidence in taking on the dual roles of researcher and teacher.
Course Syllabus

Course name: English for Social Sciences
Course code: 355224

Objectives: Teaching and learning activities in this course are designed to enhance students to develop their comprehending and composing skills in English through reading and writing practices of expository texts. Students will also learn different patterns of organization of the expository texts and have opportunities to expand their knowledge base in the field of social sciences from reading and writing materials and tasks on the related topics.

Instructional strategies include explicit teaching (introducing useful strategies, modeling thinking process in applying different strategies, having discussions and evaluations with students on the learned strategies) to raise students’ awareness of existing strategies employed by good readers and writers. Students are aimed to use the learned strategies to apply effectively in their reading and writing processes and become aware of the relationships between certain reading and writing strategies and eventually develop their literacy skills in English holistically. Ultimately, students should be able to develop themselves as independent strategic readers and writers.

Teaching/learning materials and activities will be covered in a one-week unit of reading and writing connection lessons.

Unit 1:
Reading passage: Compare & contrast
1. Oh, Sweet Revenge: Dunkin’ Donuts faces two high-end rivals
2. Gender Gap in Cyberspace
3. What Sex Is Your Brain (H)

Reading strategies:
- Making prediction; using background knowledge
- Previewing; Skimming;
- Locating main ideas & details
- Using text structure knowledge (compare & contrast)

Writing strategies: Planning (goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, collecting data), drafting, revising, editing

Writing activities: 1 extended essay in class; 1 (extended) persuasive essay as homework (2 tasks)

Metacognitive strategies: Planning, self-monitoring, problem-solving, self-evaluation

Unit 2:

Reading passage: Description

1. Superstitions
2. My Friend, Albert Einstein
3. What Makes a Hero? (H)
Reading strategies:
- Relevant learned strategies will be revisited
- Using Text structure knowledge (description)
- Locating main ideas & details
- Context clues
- Note-taking
Writing strategies: Planning (goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, collecting data), drafting, revising, editing
Writing activities: 1 descriptive essay in class;
1 descriptive essay as homework (2 tasks)
Metacognitive strategies: planning, self-monitoring, problem-solving, self-evaluation

Unit 3:
Reading passage: Cause & effect
1. 3 examples of cause-effect paragraphs
2. Playing at Chess
3. Talk to Me (H)
Reading strategies:
- Relevant learned strategies will be revisited
- Using Text structure knowledge (cause & effect)
- Generating questions; analyzing (e.g. making inferences)
- Note-taking
- Summarizing
Writing strategies: Planning (goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, collecting data), drafting, revising, editing
Writing activities: 1 summary (in the reading session);
1 argumentative essay as homework (2 tasks)
Metacognitive strategies: Planning, self-monitoring, problem-solving, self-evaluation

Unit 4:
Reading passage: Problem-solution
1. Too Many Mouths To Feed
2. Care of the Elderly: A Family Matter
3. Elderly Support in Thailand (H)
Reading strategies:
- Relevant learned strategies will be revisited
- Using text structure knowledge (problem-solution)
- Generating questions; analyzing (e.g. making inferences)
- Note-taking
Writing strategies: Planning (goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, collecting data), drafting, revising, editing
Writing activities: Writing from different perspectives:1 journal in class;
1 journal as homework (2 tasks)
Metacognitive strategies: Planning, self-monitoring, problem-solving, self-evaluation
Unit 5:
Reading passage: Collection
1. The Grand Canyon; 2. Crack Down on Computer Crime
3. Music’s Surprising Power To Heal
4. Kissing Your Way around the World (H)

Reading strategies:
- Relevant learned strategies will be revisited
- Using Text structure knowledge (collection)
- Note-taking
- Summarizing

Writing strategies: Planning (goal setting, generating and organizing ideas, collecting data), drafting, revising, editing

Writing activities: 1 summary (in the reading session);
1 note-taking & 1 summary as homework (2 tasks)

Assessment: on-going and co-operative assessments between the teacher and students on the students’ development of reading and writing performance will be conducted throughout the semester.

1) Class participation and activities 25%
- In-class assignments
- Individual reading
- Pair and class discussions
- Peer editing
- ST- T conferences
- Completing a daily checklist of employed reading & writing strategies
- Completing a daily diary on learning activities.

2) Weekly assignments (homework) 40%
- Persuasive essay
- Descriptive essay
- Argumentative essay
- Dialogue journal

3) Four tasks on final test papers 35%
(The tasks for the final test should be completed in the last two sessions of this class.)
- Reading passage 1 and note-taking & writing a summary
- Reading passage 2 and writing an extended descriptive essay
- Reading passage 3 and writing an extended persuasive essay
APPENDIX H

A LIST OF TITLES OF READING SELECTIONS
Titles of the Reading Selections

Unit 1:
1. Oh, Sweet Revenge


2. Gender Gap in the Cyberspace


3. What Sex Is Your Brain?


Unit 2:
1. Superstitions


2. My Friend: Albert Einstein


3. What Makes a Hero?: The researcher’s essay

Unit 3:
1. Three examples of paragraphs on cause and effect


2. Playing At Chess


3. Talk To Me

Unit 4:

1. Too many Mouths To Feed


2. Care of the Elderly: A Family Matter


3. Family Support and Living Arrangement of Thai Elderly


Unit V:

1. The Grand Canyon


2. Cracking Down on the Computer Crime


3. Music’s Surprising Power to Heal


4. Kissing Your Way around the World

APPENDIX I

GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSIONS ON STRATEGY USE
Guidelines for the Discussion on Reading Strategies: (To be used on Day 2)

- While you are reading the passage, try to take notes of important ideas. You can use them for your summary or other writing tasks later.

- Talk in detail with your partner what you understand about the passage and how you came up with those ideas and what strategies you applied while reading.

- The following guidelines may help your discussion:

  1. What did you think when you saw the title or topic of your selection?
     - What interested you?
     - What purposes did you have in reading the passage?
     - What plan(s) did you make?
     - What predictions did you make?

  2. When you previewed, what helped you know or predict about the content of the passage?

  3. How did you skim? While skimming:
     - What questions did you ask?
     - What else did you do (e.g. underlying and connecting key words)?
     - What general ideas did you get?
     - What difficulties did you have? How did you try to solve your problems?

  4. When you review different paragraphs in the passage:
     - What strategies did you use to help you understand the paragraph?
     - What main ideas did you get?
     - What details did you get?
     - What inferences could you make from the text?
     - What further questions did you make? What analysis did you make?
     - What difficulties did you have? How did you try to solve your problems?

  5. What new ideas did you get from the selection?

  6. What do you think the author wants to convey to the readers? What did you mostly agree or mostly disagree?

  7. What ideas do you think relate to your life?

  8. What are your notes like? Show and compare your notes with your partner’s.
Guidelines for the Discussion on Writing Strategies: (To be used on Day 4)

Now you have the first draft of your writing from Day 3. Share your draft with your partner. The discussion with your partner will be in two parts:

Part I: Describe how you wrote your essay (or summary, or journal).

The following guidelines may help your discussion:

1. What did you write and who did you write it for? (Your audience)
2. What did you think and do before you wrote it?
3. While you were writing your draft, what did you think and do?
4. What difficulties did you have while writing your draft?
5. How long did it take you to write your draft?
6. What do you think you might want to revise?

Part II: Ask your partner about his/ her opinions of your draft.

The following guidelines may help your discussion:

1. Ask whether he/ she understands what you wrote.
2. What does he/ she like in your draft? Why?
3. What does he/ she not like in your draft? Why?
4. What kinds of changes does he/ she think might help to make your work better?
   (e. g., ideas, organization, word choices, sentence pattern, style)
APPENDIX J

FRAMEWORK OF INVESTIGATION

AND PRELIMINARY CATEGORIES OF STRATEGIES
Framework of Investigation

Knowledge of Strategy Use
For Reading Process

Categories of Strategies

Declarative Knowledge

Procedural Knowledge

Conditional Knowledge

PW
SK
P
BKN
M & D
STR
Q
CT
NT
SR & SYN
INF
ANL

Did the learner report understanding and using?

How frequently was the strategy applied?

When & why was the strategy applied?

Emerging questions;
Emerging categories

Metacognitive

RD Strategies

PL
MON & EVL
PRS

Did the learner perceive s/he use the strategy effectively? How?

Did s/he apply the strategy effectively? How?

Emerging questions:
Emerging categories

When?
Why?
(context)
Framework of Investigation

Knowledge of Strategy Use
For Writing Process

Strategies

- Declarative Knowledge
  - What did the learner report understanding and using?

- Procedural Knowledge
  - How frequently was the strategy applied?

- Conditional Knowledge
  - When & why was the strategy applied?

PL:
- G
- GEN
- I
- BKN
- AUD
- O
- D

REV
- Revise
- Edit
- MON & EVL

Emerging questions; Emerging categories

Did the learner perceive s/he use the strategy effectively? How?

Did s/he apply the strategy effectively? How?

Emerging questions; Emerging categories

Mon & EVL
Categories / Subcategories of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies:

Cognitive Reading Strategies and Codes:

1) Previewing (PW): Surveying the text before reading, using the title/ topic, headings, and other textual and non-textual cues

2) Making prediction (P): Before reading (from the title/ topic), while reading, after reading

3) Skimming (SK): Reading that focuses on important ideas to gain the big picture

4) Using background knowledge (BKN): Connecting text with personal experience, related content areas, knowledge of the world, and other previous texts or sources of relevant information

5) Identifying importance (M) vs. non-importance (D): Identifying main ideas vs. details; identifying thesis, theme, topics, and topic sentences, locating key words/ phrases, and making connections of important ideas between paragraphs

6) Using context clues (CT): lexical, syntactic, semantic, and contextual clues (including non-textual clues)

7) Using text structure strategy (STR): Identifying the organizational and rhetorical pattern of the text (e.g., type of passage, genre), using the knowledge of text structure to help fostering comprehension

8) Generating questions (Q): forming questions (and finding answers) before and while reading, seeking clarifications

9) Summarizing & synthesizing (SR & SYN): Connecting main ideas, synthesizing, organizing, and/ or reorganizing to form a well-organized order of important information to represent the original ideas presented in the text.

10) Making inferences (INF): Reading between the lines, making further interpretation, expanding ideas to create one’s own meaning (s) of the text.

11) Analyzing (ANL): Critical reading and interacting with ideas derived from the text and the author’s view(s)

12) Note-taking (NT): Taking/ making notes of important ideas and some supporting details, using a graphic organizer (e. g., concept map) or an outline
Metacognitive Reading Strategies and Codes:

1) Planning (PL): Goal setting, identifying one’s own interest, and making decisions about strategy use before reading

2) Comprehension monitoring and self-evaluation (MON & EVL): Being aware of the need to monitor one’s own understanding; having intention to check, evaluate his/ her understanding and regulate his/ her performance

3) Problem-solving (repair strategies) -- (PRS): Detecting one’s own problems and finding strategies to regain or improve their understanding
Categories/ Sub Categories of Cognitive and Metacognitive Writing Strategies and codes:

1) Planning strategies (PL):
   - Goal setting (G): Identifying the purpose of the writing the task
   - Making sense of the potential audience (AUD)
   - Generating ideas (GEN)
   - Using background knowledge (BKN) & collecting information (I)
   - Making organization of ideas & deciding the rhetorical structure of the text (O)

2) Drafting (D): Composing the text in multiple drafts

3) Reviewing strategies (REV):
   - Revising the draft(s): reading & rereading, making changes of content (e.g., adding, deleting), maintaining coherence (e. g., organizing & reorganizing) to suit the rhetorical structure and convention; having conferences with peers and the teacher
   - Editing: checking and correcting accuracy of the language
   - Monitoring & evaluating writing performance and the product (MON & EVL)
Other Suggested Categories and Codes regarding the students’ background information (to be used (mostly) with the scripts of Interview I)

1) Attitudes: e.g., love reading / writing; recognizing the value of reading/ writing
   a. Positive attitudes (RD ATT+; WR ATT+)
   b. Negative attitudes (RD ATT-; WR ATT-)

2) Amount of the read text (RT -- Fair; RT -- Little)

3) Previous experience in reading/ writing practice (Pre EXP/ RD -- Fair, Little)
   (Pre EXP / WR -- Fair, Little)

4) Pervious knowledge of reading/ writing strategies (Pre- strategy -- Fair, Little)

5) Awareness of reading and writing connection (RD & WR – Fair, Little)

6) Self monitoring/ evaluation (MON/ EVL – Fair, Little)
APPENDIX K

EXAMPLES OF STUDENTS’ WRITTEN WORK
- Case Study 1: Uma's written work
  - Descriptive essay (week 2)
  - An argumentative essay (week 3)
  - A summary (week 5)

Note-taking
(From the reading passage)

1. responsible in his duties
2. protect his people from poverty
3. prevents any disaster
4. be a good leader
5. lives peacefulness
6. take a good care of other lives and minds
7. listens to others' ideas and respects

Everybody can train themselves to become a good man. It is not necessary to be popular; just be a good man. Take a good care of our world.

You are a valuable person in society.
The Plan: Character: You are my hero forever. My grandpa.

Goal: Describe the characteristics of my hero.

My ideas:
- My grandpa was a good dad and a good leader.
- My grandpa was also a good role model for my family.
- My grandpa was responsible and listened to others' ideas and opinions.
- My grandpa was always kind and respectful.
- My grandpa taught me to read and write.

My thoughts:
- My grandpa was a very hardworking person who put in a lot of effort.
- My grandpa was always willing to help others.
- My grandpa was very confident and always believed in himself.

So, he taught me to read and write the letter.
Grandfather: You are my hero forever.

Here is someone whom people admire. Everyday, has a hero in their minds. His hero is a model in their life. Someone's heroes are popular persons in society. They are leaders, responsible persons or intelligent persons. Someone is a good singer and handsome to people. Keep him to be their hero. However, my hero wasn't famous person or clever man. He was just a simple man who I love too much. He worked after me since I was a child. He was kind. And he was a model in my life. He was my grandfather.

My grandfather was tall and slim. He liked to wear trousers and shirt. When he stayed at home, he wore shorts and shirt. Each shirts weren't the same. He didn't like a new shirt because it wasn't all right. He liked old shirt so much. When I was 9, my grandpa took a bicycle [around] my village every evening. Surely, I loved to sit behind him and talked to him all the time. We talked about dinner, discussed the weather, his experiences, many stories and a lot of fables. Grand-dad told a fable everyday. I listened (with) happily.

In addition, my grandfather was a wise person who teaches me to write a letter. When he stayed in other province for a long time, I sent a letter to him. My letter was full of missing. I wanted him come back quickly. Reading and writing
The letters made me improve my Thai writing skill extremely.

Moreover, my grandfather was the first person who taught me to write. He was a talkative person. He liked to talk with neighbors.

One day, a poor man walked past my house. He stopped in front of the gate and told my grand-dad he wanted some money. My grand-dad gave him a little. He wasn't friendly. He taught me to help people who were trouble. Surprisingly, he didn't like to go to the temple and donated some money in the temple because it wasn't the point of merit. As he said it was a good merit. If we had a positive thinking, we will receive a good thing some day. We shouldn't give cause we received more than we gave.

I can remember he used to teach me that we can do everything successfully except we don't attempt. I have kept this quotation to be my concept in my life all the time. That quotation indicated that my grand-dad was self-confident.

Although he wasn't alive with me because he was dead, he said was my hero forever. Now a day, for somebody whose grandfather and grandmother are alive, I think you should take a good care of them like you love them. For someone whose hero is, please, keep his teaching in your mind because...
the teaching of the old men and their experiences, all of life of round.

Vicent Lol said learning from somebody else's experience can lead you to do the great thing. I think so. Therefore, I will remember my great hero's teaching and do the great things forever!
Welcome to my world

Grandfather: You are my hero forever.

A hero is someone whom people admire. Everybody has a hero in their mind. Someone's hero is a popular person in society. A hero can be a leader or someone responsible.

Grandfather is an intelligent person. Someone is a good singer and handsome.

So people keep him to be their hero. However, my hero isn't a famous or clever man. He was just a simple man whom I love very much. He looked after me when I was a child. And he has been a model in my life.

He was my grandfather.

My grandfather was tall and slim. He liked to wear trousers and shirt. When he stayed at home, he wore shorts and shirt. Each shirt wasn't the same. He didn't like a new shirt because it wasn't all right. Sometimes it did not fit him perfectly.

He liked old shirt very much. When I was 4, my grand-dad rode a bicycle around the village every evening. Surely, I loved to sit behind him and talked with him all the time. We talked about dinner, his experiences.
many stories, a lot of tables and forecasts for weather. My grand-dad told

"a table everyday. I listened happily."

In addition, my grandfather was a first person who taught me to write

a letter. When he stayed in another province for a long time, I sent a letter to
telling that I missed him so much.

My letter was full of missing. I wanted him to come back quickly.

Reading and writing the letters made me improve my Thai writing skill

extremely."

Moreover, my grandfather was a friendly person. He liked to talk with

the neighbors. One day a poor man passed my house. He stopped

in front of the gate and told my grand-dad that he wanted some money.

My grand-dad gave him a little. He didn't despise him. He taught me to

help people who were in trouble. Surprisingly, he didn't like to go to the temple

at

and donated some money to the temple because it wasn't necessary.

We just purified our minds, he said it was a good merit. We would receive
Welcome to my world

many good things whenever we had positive thinking.

I can remember, of my grand-dad's teaching. He used to teach me that we can do everything successfully except that we don't attempt. I have kept this quotation to be my concept in my life all the time. It's surprising that my grand-dad was self-confident. Nowadays he didn't live with me because he was dead but he always be my hero forever.

For somebody whose grand-father and grandmother are alive, I think you should take good care of them and love them like they love you. For someone whose love is grand-father like me, please keep his teaching in your mind because the teaching of the old man is the "10 experiences all of his life. Vincent Lat said learning from somebody else's experience can lead you to do the great things. I think so. Therefore, I will remember my great hero's teaching and do the great things forever.
Your essay is well-organized, maintaining a clear main idea. Each paragraph has a clear connection to the one before and after it. Each paragraph is well connected. You've successfully developed your ideas, making the essay strong. All paragraphs are well connected, and you've expressed your feelings clearly. You've improved your writing skills a lot. I think your main message becomes clear.
A hero is someone whom people admire. Everybody has a hero in mind.

Someone's hero is a popular person in the society. Someone's can be a leader or a responsible and intelligent person. Someone's can be a good singer and handsome, so people keep him as their hero. However, my hero isn't a famous person.

He was just a simple man whom I love very much. He looked after me when I was a child. And he has been a model in my life. He was my grandfather.

My grandfather was tall and slim. He liked to wear trousers and shirt. When he stayed at home, he wore shorts and shirt. Each shirt wasn't the same style. He didn't like a new shirt because sometimes it did not fit him perfectly.

He liked an old shirt very much. When I was 5, my grand-dad rode a bicycle around the village every evening. Surely, I loved to sit behind him and talked with him all the time. We talked about dinner, his experiences, many stories, a lot of fables and the weather forecast. My grand-dad told me a fable everyday. I listened happily.

In addition, my grandfather was a first person who taught me
to write a letter when he stayed in another province, I sent a letter to him telling that I missed him so much. I wanted him to come back quickly.

Reading and writing the letters made me improve my Thai writing skill extremely.

Moreover, my grandfather was a friendly and generous person. He liked to talk with the neighbors. One day a poor man walked past my house. He stopped in front of his gate and told my grand-dad that he wanted some money. My grand-dad gave him a little. He didn’t despise him. He taught me to help people who were in trouble. Surprisingly, he didn’t like to go to the temple and donated some money at the temple because it wasn’t worthwhile. We just purified our minds. He said it was a good merit. We would receive many good things whenever we had the positive thinking.

I can remember my grand-dad’s teaching. He used to teach me that we can do everything successfully except we don’t put our efforts. I always learned from his teaching. His saying indicated that my grand-dad was self-confident. Nowadays he doesn’t live with me.
because he was dead but he will always be my hero forever.

For somebody whose grandfather and grandmother are alive, I think you should take good care of them and love them like they love you. For someone whose hero is grandfather like me, please keep his teaching in your mind because the teaching of the old man is filled with his experiences he gained all of his life. Vincent said learning from somebody else’s experience can lead you to do the great things. I agree with this idea. Therefore, I will remember my great hero’s teaching and do the great things forever.
An argumentative essay (Week 3)

The Plan:

- Intro
  - lead to thesis
  - it's with your head

- Body
  - theme
  - sensitive in small
    - 2 arguments

- Conclude
  - close your book
  - open your mind
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Planning!

Date:

Thesis: to convey the audience that chatting and sending e-mail are both beneficial things and bad things.

General Ideas:

1. Sending e-mail is a skill which you should learn because it is important in the world today.
2. Chatting too much in the internet makes people feel isolate.

2 Arguments:

1. Chatting too much makes people feel isolate.
   - You spend all day all night and sit in front of computer.
   - You don’t interact with your parents or your friends.
   - Computer doesn’t have life and mind. You’re alone.
   - These make your health is bad. Sitting all time serious.

Opp/Argu - Chatting make us relax after work.
   - You forget in short time. You focus on the computer, your finger type and your brain think all the time. It makes you mental sickness and bad for your health in the future.

2. Sending e-mail is a good way communication. That not bad it isn’t good in your private life.
   - Talking face to face is better.
   - Opp/Argu - Friends don’t have time to meet together.
     So sending e-mail is comfortable.

You can do that, but you don’t receive your friend’s feeling’s eye contact and your friend’s voice.
Emails or letters

Communications is very important for everyone today.

Contacting with people by sending email is one of the favorite methods. They are very convenient way to contact together even at a long distance. Anyhow, however, they are harmful when you are often in contact with them.
Chatting too much makes people feel isolate. Especially when you are not able to chat with someone all day all night. They spend time chatting and playing games. Maybe it's not a good thing for your mind. Really good activities, I don't think it's a good way to relax after work or study. But don't forget that if you sit in front of computer for a long time, you don't interact with your parents or your friends sometimes. You forget computer doesn't mean the mind. For example, I was out of dinner, drink water or don't sleep. In my experience, my sister chatted with her friend until 4 am. She didn't sleep. She told me she felt sleepy but she slept until 3 am. I think chatting too much makes your body bad. But if you sit in front of computer all the time, focus on your own work, focus on your fingers type and your hands think. Most make you more serious work. I think instead of red acting, you need to understand. It really bad for your health in the future. Sometimes you have to wake up in the early morning in order to work.
My friend's friend

She said she received many e-mails in one day, if any.

For sending e-mail, I think it's a good way of communication.

I can talk with my friends quickly. I can send as many documents to my friends quickly. Sometimes I can save my money very much.

In the world today, we can contact with sending e-mail. The world today is small. We can contact together probably just a minute even though it is so far away. We live in all countries in the world. But it isn't really good to use e-mail to send about your feeling in the private life. If you miss someone, you should telephone or talk with them face to face. If it's better. Even though you don't agree with your friend, you can't receive how much you miss them. You have to communicate your expression, your voice, your manner, your expression of your face, and so on.
Those are my point that sending e-mail and chatting is both good and harmful thing. I believe it seriously and don't see them to yourself. Don't use it too much. You should keep your health and good relationship with other. It's really good to greatest thing for you and your friends. Someone whom you know.

Close your computer just a few minute and open your mind and talk with positive and face together with smiles. If together!
Close your computer, talk with smile together.

Communication is very important for everybody. Contacting with people by sending e-mail and chatting are favorite, which they are very with. It's convenient way to contact together even each person live in so long distance.

However, they are harmful when you don't use them carefully. Spending too much time chatting in the cyberspace too much makes people feel isolate. Especially teenagers, they love to chat with someone all day and all night. They spend too much time to chat and play games. These aren't really good activities.

You should do something that good for your health and mind such as reading, playing sports or playing music. I don't deny that it's a way to relax after work but don't forget that if you sit in front of computer for a long time, you don't interaction with your parents or friends. Computer don't have life and mind.

Certainly, you are alone. I think chatting too much makes your health bad. Sometimes you forgot to eat dinner, drink water or even sleep. You sit in front of the

$$\text{make obj } V_{ij}^t \frac{\text{adj}}{adj}$$
Focus on your monitor: your fingers type and your brain thinks all the time. They make you seem serious instead of relaxing. Your health will end caused by these.

For sending e-mail, it is a good way communication. I can send many documents or papers to a lot of friends quickly. I can save my money very much.

In the world today, sending e-mail makes the world is small. We can contact to many country just a minute even though we live in all directions. But it isn't really good to use e-mail to send your feeling in your private life. If you miss someone, you should call them or talk with them face to face. If you use e-mail, I believe that your friends can not feel how much you miss them.

They don't hear your voice, your manner, your expression of an eye. Furthermore, a printing type can't touch your friends' heart.

Someone says their friends don't have time to meet and talk face to face. Therefore sending e-mail is more comfortable. In my opinion,
These are my point that sending e-mail and chatting is both a good and harmful thing. Use them carefully and don't let yourself to play them too much. You should keep your good health and good relationship with others. It's really great for you and everybody who is around you.

Close your computer just a minute and talk with smile together!
Close your computer and talk with a smile... together!

Communication is very important for everybody in the present days.

Contacting with people by sending e-mails and chatting are favourite habits for everyone. They are very convenient ways to contact with people who live a far distance. However, when you don't use them carefully, they are harmful.

Spending too much time chatting in the cyberspace makes people feel isolated.

Especially teenagers love to chat with someone all day and all night. They spend a lot of time to play games. These aren't really good activities. You should do something that is good for your health and mind such as reading, playing sports or playing music. I don't deny that chatting is a way to relax after work. However, don't forget that if you sit in front of the computer for a long time, you will lose interactions with your parents or friends. Computers don't have life and mind. Certainly you are alone.

I think chatting too much spending a time chatting makes your health bad. (Sometimes)

...
You forget to eat dinner, drink water, or sleep. You sit in front of the computer and focus on your monitor, your fingers type and your brain thinks all the time.

These make you more serious, instead of relaxed. Grown by these, your health will get in the future.

I cannot deny that [for sending e-mail, it is a good way of communication]. It can send many documents or papers to a lot of friends quickly. I can save my money, too.

In the world today, sending e-mail makes the world small. We can contact with many countries just a minute even though we live in different places of the world. Nevertheless, it isn't really good to use e-mail to send your feelings or your private life. Someone says, if friends don't have time to meet and talk face to face. Therefore, sending e-mail is more comfortable.

In my opinion, if you use e-mail, e-mail to express your feelings to let your friends know how much you miss him or her. They don't hear your voice, your manner, your expression of your eyes.
Furthermore, a printing type can't touch your friends' heart.

Here are my point that sending e-mail and chatting have both good and bad disadvantages.

When communicating via email carefully and don't allow yourself to play them with it's sending and chatting via e-mail or spend too much time. 

You should keep your good health and good relationships with others. It's really great thing for you and everybody who is around you. Close your computer just a minute, open your mind and talk with smile.

24
Connecting with people by sending e-mail and chatting are favorite habits of everyone. They are very convenient ways to contact with people who live a far distance. However, when you don't use them carefully, they are harmful.

Spending too much time chatting in the cyberspace makes people feel so especially, teenagers love to chat with someone all day and all night. They also play games. These aren't really good activities. You should do something that is good for your health and mind such as reading, playing or playing music. I don't deny that chatting is a way to relax after work. However, don't forget that if you sit in front of the computer for a long time, you will lose interactions with your parents or friends. Computer don't have life and mind. Certainly, you are alone.

I think spending too much time chatting makes your health bad. Sometimes you forget to eat dinner, drink water, or sleep. You sit in front of the computer and focus on your monitor; your fingers type, and go
My father, the hero

The word "father" for most of people sounds special as he gives birth to them. But for me, "father" is much more than that. My father isn't just give birth to me, but he is also my hero. You may wonder why he is my hero. The reason is simple, because he has the greatest influence on my life and he loves me more than anyone.

He has the greatest influence on my life. When I was younger, my mother had to go abroad, so my father had to take care of me by himself. It was not easy for him to do that, but he did a pretty good job. One thing that he impressed me was that he learned to make a profit for me. He is a very responsible person. He loves playing sports, so he wants me to love it too. He always took me to play sports such as badminton, softball, basketball. That makes me more healthy and stronger than most of girls of my age. Moreover, he is a courageous man. He told me since I was young that I shouldn't afraid of anything, but it's the right thing. That's something I never forget, and always do that. That became my outstanding personality, I have a lot of confidence.

My father teaches me that I'm very stubborn.

I don't think anyone could love me as much as him. For example, when I was
Use them carefully and don’t allow yourself to play them or spend too much time with it. You should keep your good health and good relationships with others.

This is more important for you and everybody who is around you. Close your computer for just a minute, open your mind, and talk to each other with a smile!
Kissing Your Way Around The World.
Note-taking (from the reading passage)

1. "Hello"
   - Europe + South America.
   - Men vs men (Belgium).
   - on business - shake hands.
   - people may exchange...  

2. "Japanese" (Eskybo + Africa + Pacific islands)
   - rub their noses together.
   - Malay vs sniff.

3. "French"
   - legend about the knights and the lord.
   - about first.
   - xxxx e.g. /the lord kiss to promise
   - now xxxx mean kiss

4. "Respect"
   - country.
   - king + queen.
   - flag / statues

5. "Beautiful" (food)
   - kiss fingertips (EU+LA)
   - fresher + great smell

6. "Good by"
   - kiss fingertips.
   - blow kiss. No kiss away

"It's magic power"
   - make the fingers which pour well (Eskybo)
   - for good luck (?)

Apeesuda 15080872
According to Leslie Denby, kissing is a lot of meaning. There are different meanings of kissing in several countries. Therefore, people may confuse when they kiss for greeting anyone in several countries because it isn't the same act and meaning. We can send a meanings by kiss anyone. Kissing shows your loved, greeting, promise and respectability. People can kiss their fingertips when they see some great things, such as a beautiful car. Kissing can make anyone knows that you will go. It is a sign of saying good bye. Moreover people believe that kissing can reduce their pain. It is a sign of good luck.

Kissing is important sign for people for a long time. There are many legends which told us about magic of kissing such as a story of sleeping beauty and a story of the knights and the lord pointed out the magic of the promise. Kissing will live with people even meaning of it may change when the time forward like the mistletoe.
Draft 2.
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According to Leslie Dendy, kissing has a lot of meanings. There are different meanings of kissing in several countries. Therefore, people are confused. When they kiss, the same act has different meanings in each country because it is not the same act and purpose. See my experiences.

There are seven different meanings of kissing. First, kissing shows love. But in some places like Japan, the Aii people of Japan always bite their lover’s cheek instead. Second, kissing means greeting to someone. For example, people in Europe and South America like to kiss for saying “Hello” with two kisses. But people in Belgium and Paris prefer none. Third, it is a good way to promise to kiss someone. The legends of the knights and the lord say they kissed to promise and keep promise about the fighting. Forth, kissing has meaning of respect. For example, people kiss the ground of the country and kiss their king’s footprints. Fifth, kissing means “I love beautiful it is.” When people see a beautiful thing, they kiss their fingertips. Sixth, good bye kissing is very common.
In Europe and Latin America, people always kiss their fingertips and send it their kiss in the air. In some cultures, people believe that kissing has a magic power. Some people believe kissing can reduce pain when they kiss their pain. And kissing is a sign of good luck when they kiss their cards in gambling. Kissing will be with humans for a long time and meaning of it may change.
We all have an image for a HERO but can still find universal qualities:

**KING**

- Responsible (e.g., poverty, disaster)
- Great care, kindness, concern
- Great leader (e.g., with reasons)
- Humble (e.g., listens to one's ideas, respect)
- Proud peacefulness
- Teaches us to take good care of mind/lives/fellow

These qualities are not culturally bound and not found of to any person...

---

**Functional & Emotional**

We harmonize them all.
Planning

My father the hero

Purpose - เพื่อแสดงถึงคุณค่าของคนที่เป็นสื่อสารของ

มาแต่กำเนิดจนถึงวันนี้และทำความให้เข้าใจในตัวเองและคนอื่น (สื่อสารเป็นความรู้)

Generating Ideas - He loves me more than anybody, or when I'm at

- He teaches me a lot of things like

  sports, subjects, life

- He's kind to, fully trust me.

- I'll do anything for him.

- He has bad habits but for me he still

  be my greatest dad.

Organization

Thesis - My father is my hero. No one loves me much more than him and he has a great influence on me.

Introduction - For me, father is not just give birth to me but he still my hero because he loves me more

  than anyone else and he has great influence on me.

Body - Influence on me as

  loves me.

Conclusion - Even though he is a little man to anybody,

  He is my greatest dad.
My father the hero

Although the word "father" for most of people is sounds-special (term used), but as he gives birth to them, for me, "father" is much more than that. My father isn't just give birth to me but he is also my hero. Because he has the greatest influence on my life and he loves me more than anyone.

He has the greatest influence on my life. As when I was young, my mother had to go abroad so my father had to take care of me by himself. It was not easy for men to do that but he did a pretty good job. He taught me many things. One thing that he impressed me was that he think it is one of my personality. For sports, he love playing sports very much and he love it too. We always go to play sports together such as badminton, softball, basketball, golf.

That makes me more healthy and stronger than most of girls on my age. For lifes, he taught me since I was young that he is very intelligent.
I shouldn't be afraid of anything if what I did was a good thing. That's something I never forgot and always do that.

This becomes my personality. I have a lot of confidence, but my father teases me that I'm stubborn.

I don't think anyone could love me as much as him. For example, when I was younger, I used to heart break because of boy (Can you believe it?) I was very sad. I wasn't speak to anybody including my father. He seems so sad. I think sadder than me. I realized he loves me much more than the boy who hurting me. Just I wasn't talk to him. He was very sad.

So I never be like that again. Moreover, --

Even my father is still a normal man to anybody. He is always my greatest father, and my greatest hero.

Some day if I have a child, I would taught him like my father used to do that for me.
Second Draft

By: Peter Lee

The word "father" for most people sounds special as he gives birth to them. But for me, "father" is much more than that. My father isn't just the one who gave birth to me, but he is also my hero. You may wonder why he is my hero. The reason is simple. Because he has the greatest influence on my life and he loves me more than anyone.

He has the greatest influence on my life. When I was young, my mother had to go abroad so my father had to take care of me by himself. It was not easy for him to do that, but he did a pretty good job. One thing that he impressed me was that he learned to make a plan for me. He is a very influential person. He loves playing sports, so he wanted me to love it too. He always takes me to play sports such as badminton, softball, and basketball. That makes me more healthy and stronger than most girls of my age. Moreover, he is an adventurous man. He has taught me since I was young that I shouldn't be afraid of anything if it's the right thing. That's something I never forget and always do. This becomes my outstanding personality. I have a lot of confidence.

My father loves me. That I am very stubborn.

I don't think anyone could love me as much as him. For example, when I was
I'm a teenager. I used to think I was the same because of my past. (Can you believe that?) I was very unhappy. I wasn't speaking to anybody including my father. He sees me so sad I think he looks sad too. I realized he loves me much more than the boy who hurt me. So I never be like that again. Moreover, he gives fully trusted in me. He never look on my things such as wallet, mobile phone, diary or anything. Almost every evening he calls me and asks me where I am to show his care before he hang up the phone, he always said "I love you." 

Even though my father is still a normal man to anybody, he is always my greatest father and hero. Someday, if I have a child, I will teach him just like my father used to do that for me.

"I'm successful in your building of language. It's great!"

See how I put punctuation marks in some sentences (e.g. commas) well connected.

- Is anyone + Ving + continue
- dash does not + V + Present Simple
My father the hero

The word "father" for most of people sounds special as he gives birth to them. But for me, father is much more than that. My father isn't just give birth to me, but he is also my hero. You may wonder why he is my hero. The reason is simple. He has the greatest influence on my life and he loves me more than anyone.

He has the greatest influence on my life. When I was young, my mother had to go abroad so my father had to take care of me by himself. It was not easy for the man to do that, but he did a pretty good job. One thing that he impressed me was that he learned to make a meal for me. He is a very enthusiastic person. He loves playing sports, so he wants me to love it too. He always takes me to play sports such as badminton, softball, basketball, and golf. That makes me more healthy and stronger than most of the girls of my age. Moreover, he is a courageous man. He has taught me since I was young that I shouldn't be afraid of anything if it's the right thing. That's something I never forget and always do that. This becomes my outstanding personality. I have a lot of confidence.

My father teases me that I'm very stubborn.

I don't think anyone could love me as much as he does. For example, when I was a teenager, I experienced having broken heart because of one boy. (Can you believe that?) I was very sad. I didn't speak to anybody including my father. He seemed so sad. I think he looked sadder than me. I realize that he loves me much more than the boy who hurt me. So I will never be like that again. Moreover, he trusts me greatly. He never looks on my things such as wallet, mobile phone, diary or anything. Almost every evening he calls me and asks me where I am to show his care. Before he hang up the phone, he always said "I love you."

Even though my father is still a normal man to anybody, he is always my greatest father and hero. Someday, if I have a child, I will teach him just like my father does to me.
Planning

Introduction: In the present day, using e-mail is all over the world. Most of people think it makes their lives more convenient. Yet e-mail has changed them into the worse life style.

Body: 1. Argument: D It makes people has less creativity. Opp.: It's faster & easier. Pro.: It doesn't show your intention.

It's just one way communication. Opp.: It saves your time (not to wait.) Pro.: It's an excuse to confront each other.

Conclusion: It's not because of e-mail that ruins our life and makes our idea. Because of ourselves. I still think talking to a real person is much more fun than talking with computer.
In the present age, e-mail is expanded all over the world. Most of people thinks it make their life more convenient, yet they don't realise that it has deteriorated their lifestyle.

E-mail makes people feel lack of sentiment from my own experiences. When I got a postcard or a letter from my friends, I feel better than I got just an e-mail. Some may think using an e-mail is faster and easier, it doesn't show your intention. Because just thinking when someone wants to contact you by writing a postcard or a letter, he has to do so many things. First, he has to buy postcard, express his feelings by his handwriting and then send it at a post office or a post box. Compare to using e-mail. You just go to internet cafe then send an e-mail, which maybe isn't just only you shall get this message. After all you prefer which one to keep in your memory?
And another point, e-mail makes only one-way communication. You can't see who you're talking to. You have to guess from the text message. It's difficult to tell what they're thinking. Maybe good or bad thinking. Some offices say e-mail saves your time, you don't have to wait until that person is free. I want to say that is an excuse for someone not to confront each other. For example, when you do the mistake, you avoid to meet that person. Now I think sending an e-mail to apologize is it the best way? I have been taught to accept what I do.

E-mail is one of the greatest human's invention. I believe it is intended to make our life more comfortable. Not to block us in creating our way of life such as poems, arts, etc. or to ruin people's relationship. But once we use it, that's the way to hurt ourselves. Just simple, I think talk to and easier real person is much more fun than talk to computer screen.
In the present days, e-mail is expected all over the world. Most of people think it makes their life more convenient; yet, they don't realize that it has deteriorated their life style.

Firstly, e-mail makes people lack of sentiments. From my own experiences, when I got a postcard or a letter from my friends, I feel better than I got just e-mail.

Imagine when someone wants to contact you by writing a postcard or a letter, he has to do many steps. First, he has to buy a postcard or the paper. Secondly, express his feelings.

And then send it at the post office or the post box. Some may think using email is faster and easier. You just go to the internet connection, send e-mail. True, it's faster and easier for me. But it doesn't show your intention. When I received e-mail, I saw lists of people that I think people won't feel that you have put much effort sending messages by using email.

Did you ever change the same e-mail as me? After all you prefer which one to keep in your memory?

In addition, e-mail destroys some fascinating way human nature such as laugh or denumanize us! It makes only the one-way communication. You can't see or hear who you're talking to. You have to guess from the text message. It's too
difficult to say what they're thinking. Maybe it's good or bad thinking. Some other
say e-mail saves your time. You don't have to wait until the person is free. I want

say that is an excuse for someone not to communicate with you. For example, when

you make a mistake, you avoid to meet that person by sending e-mail to apologize.

Is it the best way? I have been taught to accept what I do by face-to-face communication.

E-mail is one of the greatest human's invention. I believe it is invented

However, we should create

to make our life more comfortable, not to distract ourselves from reality of life.

Moreover, we should not use it too much, which can ruin people's relationship. For me, I think talking

a lot. Face-to-face is much more fun and easier than talking on the computer screen.

Nothing can replace it.
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It dehumanizes us!

In the present days, e-mail is widely used all over the world. Most of people think it makes their life more convenient; yet, they don’t realize that it has deteriorated their life styles.

Firstly, e-mail makes people lack of sentiments. From my own experience, when I got a postcard or a letter from my friends, I feel better than I got just an e-mail. Imagine, when someone wants to contact you by writing a postcard or a letter, he has to do many steps. First, he has to buy a postcard or the paper. Second, he needs to find words to express his feelings. Then, he needs to go to the post office or find the post box to send it. Some may think using e-mail is faster and easier. You just go to the internet café, and then, send e-mail. True, it’s faster and easier, but I think people won’t feel much of your intention to do it that you don’t have to put much efforts sending messages by using e-mail. When I receive an e-mail, I see lists of people that get the same e-mail as me. After all, who do you prefer to keep in your memory?

In addition, e-mail destroys some fascinating life of human such as eye contact, body languages, etc. It makes only the one-way communication. You can’t see or hear who you’re talking to. You have to guess from the text message. It’s too difficult to tell what they’re thinking. Maybe it’s good or bad, thinking. Some other say e-mail saves your time. You don’t have to wait until that person is free. I want to say that is an excuse for someone who don’t dare to confront by person. For example, when you make a mistake, you tend to avoid to meet that person by sending e-mail to apologize. Is it the best way? I have been taught to accept what I do by having face-to-face conversation.

E-mail is one of the greatest human’s invention. I believe it is invented to make our life more comfortable. However, we should not over use it to deteriorate our creative way of life and spiritual inventions such as poems, arts etc. Moreover, we should not ruin our human relationship. For me, I think talking to a real person face to face is much more fun and easier than talking to the computer screen. Nothing can replace it. 
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Kissing may have different meanings:

1. Means love (in many countries) but not always. European, some people, Neapolitan tribes sniffing instead.
2. For saying hello. Ex: Eu, business.
4. Kisses = Belgium.
5. Has been happen for long time ago.
6. People kissed a lot.
7. Sealing a promise. Ex: the lord & the knights.
8. Has symbol = XXXXX in letter.
9. Show respect to lands, kings, queens, teachers.

Furthermore, animals can kiss. Dog & chimpanzee, dogs, fish.

Conclusion: kissing will be around for long time, yet it may keep changing its meaning.
According to Lessie Bondy, kissing has many different meanings for each country. A kiss doesn’t mean “I love you” everywhere; some places kissing is as common as sniffing such as Malay tribes; some countries kissing is good for greeting people e.g., Europe, South America, etc. Kissing has been happening long time ago. People kiss each other all the time with It also means to promise to do something. For example, the lord and the more knights making promise by kissing. Moreover, kisses can show their respect such as for land, for their kings, Queens, or their on their figures teachers. Sometimes people use kissing when they saw interesting things or they want to say goodbye. English people think kisses have miracle, so they use for luck. Human aren’t only creatures who can kiss. Chimpanzees, dogs, and fish can kiss too. Kissing will be lasting with people for long time, but it may change its meaning.
In addition to these basic kissing ways, people in different countries have different kissing habits. For example, Austrian people believe in kissing as a mark of affection. On the other hand, people in the Middle East believe kissing is not appropriate to show respect. Furthermore, European people kiss the young to show respect, while in many countries kissing is seen as a way of expressing affection.

Another interesting point is that kissing is a way to do something for example, in ancient times, kissing was a way to demonstrate love and devotion. Today, kissing is a way to express love and affection, and it is a way to connect with people on a personal level.
the kissing in many fairy tales such as sleeping beauty. Even kissing is not only among human beings, animals also kiss. Animals don't believe in magic of kissing; they can kiss too such as chimpanzees, dogs, and fish. In summary, kissing will be lasting with (people) for a long time, but we may keep changing its purpose.
The plan: A persuasive essay (Week 1)

My goal: To convince everybody to know that there are differences between men & women in each stage of age.

Summary: Everybody should understand differences between sexes.

In each stage of age:

- Child
- Teenage
- Adult

Notes: From the reading passage:
- Research is searching for an answer.
- Men & women are different.
- Men & women can picture objects, shapes, positions, and proportions accurately in the minds' eye.
- Women speak in longer, more complex sentences than men.

Organization:

Introduction: In the recent research, the concept of gender has always been seen equal in many ways.

Content: How do you think about stage of age? Child, teenage, adult?

Conclusion: How societal changes are very fast.

Men and women should learn and understand each other. Everybody can live in society without conflicts.
In the present most people interested in sexes. You can see science is searching on answer about difference between sexes. Researchers have a research in many ways such as quiz or interviews. Now you can see men and women to be equal in a many ways. In field of polities you can see women are a representation of people to take care of people's problem. That's a good thing. However, in fact, a woman can't be like a man.

Generally men and women have different interests. Everybody has changed all the time since we were children. Girls grow up very quick than boys but boys is body were strong than girls. Maybe because boys like to exercise with friends such as play football, basketball or tennis. On other hand, girls like to talk with friends. In teens that "age of learn," you can see a different activity between boys and girls. Most of boys are interested in sports, technology and music but most of girls are interested in beauty, fashion and health. It's show a specialize skills in men and women. In ages of adult you can see men can work hard such as engineers, soldiers or pilot. In a part of women you can see women can work a job communication better than men such as air-hostess, receptionist or nurse. So I think man and woman can't same in body's size, ability and mind. To know the nature of other.

So both man and women should learn and understand together because it's make everybody know how to pay attention to the opposite sex and everybody can live in social without a conflict.
The nature of men and women

In the present day, most people are interested in issues about sexes.

You can see that science is searching for an answer about the difference between sexes.

Researchers have done research in many ways such as tests or interviews.

[And it's often research of sex research.]

Now you can see that men and women are equal in many ways.

In a field of politics, you can see women as representatives of people to take care of people's problems. I think that's a good thing. However,

In fact, a woman can't be like a man. They grow differently at different ages.

Generally, men and women have different interests. Everybody has changed all the time since we were children. Girls grow up very quickly than boys.

But boys' bodies are stronger than girls. Maybe because boys like to exercise with friends, such as playing football, basketball, or tennis. On the other hand, girls like to talk with friends. In teens, that's the age of leaving you can see a different activity between boys and girls. Most of boys are interested in sports, technology, and music. But most of girls are interested in beauty, fashion, and health. Men and women show different skills.
They can choose their own careers. For instance, you can see how men can work hard such as engineers, soldiers, or pilots. Impact of women, you can see women can work better in the field. They are good in communication, better than men such as air hostesses, receptionists, or nurses. So I think men and women can’t come in body’s size.

Differences in minds.

Nowadays social are changing very fast. Different between men are important. Both men and women need to know the nature of each other. Good understanding will make everybody know how to pay attention to the opposite sex and everybody can live in social without having this conflicts.

Generally, you have connected points in the body of your essay with your thesis quite well.

However, you can make your thesis statement more complete. (To cover the points you mention in the essay.) Try to avoid to mention the points that you don’t come in your essay.

Grammar:

• Part of speech: different forms of adjective
• That + Noun clause.
The different natures of men and women

In the present days, most people are interested in issues about sexes. You can see that science is searching for an answer about the difference between sexes. Researchers have done research in many ways such as giving quizzes or conducting interviews. And findings from research reveal that men and women are equal in many ways, for example, in the field of politics, you can see women are representatives of people to take care of people's problems. I think that's a good thing. However, in fact, a woman can't be like a man. Good understanding of their different natures is important. They grow differently at different ages.

Generally men and women have different interests. Everybody has changed all the time since we were children. Girls grow up very quickly. Boys, on the other hand, are so strong then girls. Maybe because boys like to exercise with friends. They play football, basketball or tennis. On other hand, girls like to talk with friends. In some, their age of learning, you can see different activities between boys and girls. Most of boys are interested in sports, technology and music but most of girls are interested in beauty, fashion and health. This shows that men and women have specialize skills. At the age that they can choose their own career, you can see that men can work hard such as being engineers, soldiers or pilots. For women, you can see that women can work better in the field of communication. They are good as being air-hostess, receptionists or nurses. So I think men and women can't be the same. They are different in body's size, abilities and minds.

Nowadays, social values are changing very fast. Different natures between sexes are important. So it is very important for both men and women to learn to know the natures of each other. Good understanding will make everybody know how to pay attention to the opposite sex and everybody can live in this social situation without being conflicts.
An Argumentative Essay

Talk to me

(Week 3)

Note-taking (from the reading passage)

- the use of e-mail
- sending correspondence from computer to computer
- priced to let fingers do the talking
- convenient
- the message can simply be left for the recipient doesn't even have to be at the receiving end
- why fast
- can connect a lot of people at one time - cheap

7.8 Disadvantages of using e-mail

- typing more writing
- eliminates face to face conversation
- loses body language
- loses tone, audio and visual cues to personalities
- can be any sense of self
- isolate the people, discouraging them from looking one another in the eye
- useful
- moral is low
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Plan 1, p.

Technology is coming in everyone's life. It's made us have a new way to communicate and know a new event. "E-mail" is one thing.

Email may look like a bad thing, but it's also a good thing. It's a new way of communication.

2 Arguments:

+ E-mail

- Lack of relationship with other people, less talk face to face.

Arguments: The time has been changed by technology. E-mail is very useful for business and communication. E-mail is a good tool to become an important part of the communication because it's fast and cheap.

Email: But this way is not always good, feel...

In general, I think with most people, E-mail will be used with friends or colleagues, not in a really big way.

Email: spend a lot of time to play e-mail.

Maybe it's a good thing to think more...

Is your world.

Arguments: It's fast and方便. We spend a lot of time.

Let us know everything we want to know around the world. You only click, and you know.

Friend: Maybe it's not true. Or is E-mail the way we communicate?

Decline: Because this thing.
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Conclusion: We can’t stop using e-mail, but we can make our relationship better by having more face-to-face conversation. We might talk to each other and see their face; you can tell what they are thinking.

In general, I think most people who use e-mail see e-mail as a method that can make intimate persons such as friends, brothers or family members, work or business partners, talk to each other as we used to be before.
At present, technology is very important in our life. Computer is a necessary tool to connect everything in the world. The past required that people easily communicate with others. This thing is electronic mail (e-mail). E-mail is also a part of life. We can see them everywhere in businesses and universities. But email can cause a lot of trouble sometimes.

Nowadays, we can see a lot of people play internet or e-mail. In my opinion, most people who play internet most always check their e-mail. E-mail allows people to send and receive any message they want. In front of their computer all day. Some people may think it's a waste of time, but I think there is some truth to what you said. Although we spend a lot of time with computer but we can know everything that we want to know around the world. I can't argue this point, but I think something that you know, maybe it's not true or save e-mail that you received it's not good. Society can be like this thing.

Furthermore, e-mail can make people lose talk face to face. I can pull a longer way that it means met, talk or anything that human do in specially not in conversational. But other people may say someone need to communicate other people. He is in another country. E-mail becomes an important part of communication. Because it is fast and cheap. But generally, I think we can’t stop high technology. We can choose a good thing from these technology and we can use benefit to mix with everyday life. Because, it makes us more open-minded.
Planning: Technology have come in everyone life. It make we have a note and know a new real. E-mail is one thing that important for communication.

Thesis: Electronic mail is also a part of life. We can see from any. But e-mail can cause a lot of problems.

Generating Ideas:

From notes: e-mail is useful to communicate. To a lot of people at the same time
- It eliminates face to face conversation
- Vocal is low.
- Isolate people from each other.

Introduction: At present, technology is very important in our life. One part of computer that makes easily to communicate with other. This thing is e-mail. But e-mail can cause a lot of probl.

Content: 1. Most people who play internet must always check their e-mail. These people will spend a lot of time to play internet.
Opp: We spend a lot of time but we can know everything that we want to know around the world.
Defend: Something that you know maybe it's not true or some E-mail that you received it's not good.

2. E-mail can make people less talkface to face communication.
Opp: Someone need to communicate other people who is in other country with e-mail.
Defend: most people who use e-mail.
At present, computers are very important in our lives. Internet goes all around the world. Email is becoming a part of our life. People in our field use it because it's convenient. Email can cause a lot of problems as well.

Nowadays, we can see a lot of people connecting the Internet all the time. In my opinion, most people who play the Internet must check their email always. Where it is come from which new emails is happening. So these people will spend a lot of time to play the Internet. They can sit in front of their computer all day.

Some people may think it's true. Although we spend a lot of time with computers, we can know anything that we want to know around the world. From this point, I think some story from your computer. It's not always true. And some email that you receive is useless and nonsense such as porn or junk mail. So these emails make people lack of morals.

Furthermore, email can make people easily see face-to-face conversation such as meeting, talking or anything. Email can change real people.
In society, not in cyberspace. But other people may say they need to communicate with other people in another country. E-mail becomes an important part of the communication because it's faster and cheaper. Yes, that's true. But in general, I think most people use e-mail between intimate persons such as friends, colleagues, or family members. Spending too much time with computers may weaken the relationship. We become worse. We don't talk to each other as we should.

Even though it is hard to quit using e-mail completely, we can make our relationship better by having more face-to-face conversation. Instead of spending time together in front of computer screens, we should talk to each other and see their faces to tell what they are thinking. Our conversations should lose it sound more fascinating. Yes, if only... You can give points to support your position.
At present, computer is a very important thing in our lives. Internet gives us the connection around the world. E-mail becomes a part of our life. People in any field of work use it because it is convenient. However, e-mail can cause a lot of problems as well.

Nowadays, we can see that a lot of people use the Internet everywhere. In my opinion, first most people who use the Internet always check their e-mail and new events. So these people will spend a lot of time to play the Internet. They can sit in front of their computer all day. Some people may think it’s true because we spend a lot of time with computer. We can know anything that we want to know around the world. I can’t against this point. However, I think it’s not always true. And some e-mail that you received is useless such as porn or junk mail. So these e-mail messages make people lack of resources.

Furthermore, e-mail can make people lack interpersonal skills in having face-to-face conversations such as meeting, talking or anything that real people do in the society, not in cyberspace. It dehumanize us. But other people may say they need to communicate with other people in another country. E-mail becomes an important part of the communications because it’s faster and cheaper. Yes, that’s true. But in general, I think most people use e-mail between intimate person such as friends, colleagues or family members. However, spending too much time with computer make our relationship become worse. We don’t talk to each other as we should.

Even though it is hard to quit using e-mail completely, we can make our relationship better by having more face-to-face conversations. Instead of spending time together in front of computer screens, we should talk to each other so that we see faces to tell what our conversations are thinking about us. Does it sound more fascinating?
Week 5:

Kissing our way around the world

Note-taking (From the reading passage)

- Kissing in each country has a different meaning.

1. A kiss means "I love you" in many countries, but not everywhere.
   - Europe - someone you hear at kissing
     - Asia - bite lover's cheeks
     - Eskimos - rub nose
     - African tribes
     - Pacific islanders
     - Malays - pat nose, close lips, face, & sniff
     - Egyptians

2. Kisses mean saying hello across Europe or to business meeting in South America

   Traveling from C -> D, there are local rules for greeting
   - Europe: van say hello two or three
     - Belgium: less
     - Paris: more
e   - Brazil: van cheek kiss together & as the air

3. Kisses - ancient time
   - Hebrews, Christians, Greeks, Romans across 889
   - Kisses mean a promise, knights, lords
   - A kiss of xoxoxox at - kisses
   - Kisses show respect: king & queen
   - Kisses - a country

4. Kisses - see silk interesting
   - European & Latin "beautiful" kissing fingers tips

5. Good bye
Notes: p.2

- Kisses - never magic
  - Eng. hurt finger, not better
  - French - kiss (good luck
  - Fairy tales - prince & princess

Human - believe magic, but not only animal who kiss

Animal
  - Chimpanzees
  - dogs
  - fish

Kissing will probably still be around a thousand years from now.
Even the rules may keep changing.
Weeks 5: A summary: Draft 1

According to Leslie Dendy, kissing in each country has a different meaning. She discusses kissing can replace some words. In many countries, people use kissing instead of saying "I love you". But in many languages, the word for "kiss" means "sweet". So kissing has various styles. For example, the Ainu people of Japan liked to bite their lover's cheeks, or Eskimos rubbed their noses together. Correcting can use kissing instead. When you meet relatives, you can kiss them. So kissing is soon as shaking hands. In many countries, there is a custom of kissing. You should know these customs in each country in order to do the right way because it can make you a polite person. Kissing happened for a long time. The Hebrews, Christians, Greeks and Romans kissed many people when they met. They can kiss on the hand, the cheek or the mouth. Kissing can show a promise and the esteem. People can kiss the feet, or people can kiss the head where they born. Many people believe in kissing. It will make something better. For example, while you gamble with anyone, you can kiss your cards. You will get a good luck. Kissing is not happen in only human, but it happen in animal, too such as fish, dog, monkey.
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Week 5: A summary (Draft 2)

Summary Kissing has been around the world.

According to Leslie Denny, kissing in different countries has different meanings. She discusses three different purposes of kissing:

First, kissing can replace some words. In many countries, if kissing instead of saying "I love you" but in many languages the word for "kiss" means "smell".

Secongly, kissing can be used for greeting. For example, some tribes will put noses close to show love. Some tribes may use a kiss to smell. However, some tribes may use kissing instead of the kiss. The Amur people in Japan use their noses to smell.

Third, kissing has been used in human beings for centuries. People kiss to show love. In some cultures, kissing is a way of expressing love to family, friends, and acquaintances. It is also used to make a promise. For example, when the knights and the lord used to make a promise, they used kissing.
Fifth, kissing can also show respect. For example, when people went away from their home town, if they return, they kiss the ground to show respect to their homeland.

Fifth, Europeans and Latin Americans kiss on their fingertips when they see the fascinating things, such as a beautiful girl, or an awesome car. Sometimes they kiss for saying good bye.

Finally, people believe in a humble blessing. For example, French people kiss on their cheeks when they play the gentle.

In conclusion, although the meaning of kissing was keeping changing, the kissing will remain with people around the world.
Week 2: Note taking - What makes my king a "hero" for Thai people? -
(From the reading passage) - Descriptive Passage
- We can still find some universal qualities for being a hero regardless of cultural identity.
- (Can see many heroic qualities in my king, the greatest hero for Thai people.)
  - King is very responsible in his duties
  - He is a great leader
  - He loves "peacefulness"
  - He does his duties with great care, kindness, and concern for his people's welfare and happiness.
  - He does not only do his duties just because he is the king, but also dedicates his life for his people because he is a "good man."

Case Study 1: Tongchai's written work
- A descriptive essay (Week 2)
- An argumentative essay (Week 3)
- A summary (Week 5)
The Plan: He is my hero (writing)

- hero is my father
- He is the greatest father
- He is a good leader of family
- He teaches me every thing
- He always inspires me
- I love him very much
- I would like to be a good man like him

It might be more helpful if you can tell which
helpful can be included
If you can include
Note in the introduction
conclusion
Descriptive: 1st Draft. Who is my hero?

If you ask me, do you have a hero in your heart? I will say 'yes'.

And ask me who is him. I will tell 'He is my father'. He is the complete perfect father and the greatest man.

The first I would like to introduce my father to the reader. My name is Virat Pradeep. His nickname is Ravi. He is 44 years old and he is a machinist.

When I was young, he always takes care and teaches me about speaking, writing, studying, habits. He hits me when I do missing or steal his money.

At the age of 10, he teaches me about his career. I excite and ready to

learning about it.

I learned that we could earn money by working. Work makes me known it not easy to get money. It makes me

known value of money. My father tells we must diligent in work for

succeed in life. He teaches me about saving money. And now day I

can keep a lot money.

He is a good leader in family. He never drink, smoking, lady's man.

He loves family, love child and I will do follow him and obey him.
First draft, P2.

Today, although I study in university, which is far away from my house 100 kilometers, I still call him regularly every December to show my love. I would like to greet him and tell everyone, my father is a hero in my mind.
Descriptive Essay: Draft page 1

He is my hero.

If you ask me, "do you have a hero in your heart?" I will say "yes." He is my father, who loves me very much. I think he is the greatest man because he does everything for me. Good health.

My father lives in Boe province. His name is Virut and he is 44 years old. He is a mechanic. When I was young, he always took care and taught me writing, speaking, behavior, study, and habit. He hits me when I do missing or steal his money.

When I was ten years old, he taught me about his career. I was excited and ready to learn it. I learned that we could earn money by working. It made me know the value of money. My father tells me that I must be hard to succeed in life. He taught me to save money.

He is a good leader in family. He never drinks or smokes. He is not a playboy. He loves family and children. I think that I will follow him and obey him.

Today, although I study at university which is away from my house, I will...
(Descriptive) Draft 2, p. 2.

850 kilometers, I still call him regularly. On every December 5th every year I would like to greet him at house, then he to congratulate me. I visit him in my hometown. He is always glad to see me on that day. And lastly, I can tell every one my father is a hero in my mind.

I respect and love him greatly.

[Handwritten notes and scribbles on the page]
Weeks:

Talk to me < note taking > from the reading passage

E-mail has become an important part of the communications network for many office and universities. Someone not comfortable from contact by e-mail because they want to meet face to face instead.

- The computer can chat and use e-mail which are very large network.
- They can communicate via computer while both of them are sitting near.
- An e-mail can contact for help.
- In the e-mail, we can send emotions. It informs feeling from sender.
- An e-mail can send Gee. It is tone of voice from sender.
- People who isolate at their desk will feel cut off from group.

However there are the reasons that the writer said against using e-mail as well.
The Plan: (Argumentative) The benefit of using e-mail

Thesis statement: Many people use e-mail for communication between office and between person. E-mail is useful in modern world. You can use e-mail for sending messages, files, pictures etc.

Argumentative: E-mail can send messages, files, pictures, apply for a job
- It is convenient than call telephone.
- Using e-mail can save you money because it cheap.
- It make you one fashionable men.

Opposite argument: People feel isolated from their friends.
- If not comfortable
- feel face to face is more comfortable
- It is difficult to use.

Defense opinion: People use e-mail only two hours a day
- It is basic of conversational before you meet face to face.
- You can read manual before use and it easy to use.
The benefit of using e-mail

In this modern world, e-mail is very useful. The email is used in many people in the world to communicate, network for many offices and communicate network for many people. You can use e-mail for send messages, pictures, files or apply for a job.

In my opinion, I think e-mail is useful for everyone. There are many reasons that I like to use e-mail. First, e-mail can send your message, emotion, your voice on file to recipient. Second, we can use e-mail to apply for a job. Third, we can show attitude or your opinion to reader by sending e-mail. Fourth, we can contact other office or contact other person who is using internet.

But someone may think e-mail can make users feel isolated from their group. They have to sit on the chair and have to play internet all day. I think this idea may not right. People who use e-mail should spend time only two hours per day. Someone may think they meet face to face more comfortable than chatting by e-mail. I think this idea is not reasonable, chatting e-mail is basic of conversation before you meet face to face.
Someone may think using e-mail is difficult because they must know basics of computer and have to read manuals carefully. I think this idea is not correct. The computer is easy to use and you can understand quickly after read manual.

Communication by e-mail can help you get convenience and be useful. So, let's learn how to use e-mail.
The benefit of using e-mail

In this modern world, many people use e-mail. They use e-mail network to communicate between offices for their personal business. You can use e-mail for sending messages, pictures, files or applying for a job. In fact, e-mail becomes important in our society.

In my opinion, e-mail is useful for everyone. There are many reasons that I like to use e-mail. First, I can send your messages and voice or files to recipients. Second, you can use e-mail to apply for a job. Third, you can send good attitudes or your opinions to readers by e-mail. Last, you can contact other offices or other people who are using Internet.

But some people may think that e-mail can make users feel isolated from their friends. They sit on the chair and play internet all day. I think this idea may not be right. People who use e-mail will spend only two hours a day using e-mail.

Someone may argue that it is more comfortable to meet face to face than to chat by e-mail. I think this idea is not reasonable. Chatting by e-mail can be the basis of the conversational skill before you meet face to face.
someone may say that using e-mail is difficult because they must know the basics of computer and have to read manuals carefully. I think this idea is not correct. The computer is easy to use and you can understand quickly after reading manuals.

In conclusion, communication by e-mail is convenient and useful. So let's learn how to use e-mail.
Weeks: Kissing Your Way Around the World

A summary

Paragraph: Notes from the reading passage.

1. There are many meanings about kissing.
2. A kiss means "I love you." 
3. A kiss means "smell".
4. Kissing are also good for saying hello.
5. Kissing means say hello, but some societies may not like that.
6. When ladies meet, they put their cheeks together and kiss the air.
7. They often put a perfume such as myrrh in their mouths to make the kiss more pleasant.
8. Kissing were good for in older times, was for sealing a promise.
9. The xxxxxx xxx in the letter mean kiss.
10. Kissing can also show respect.
11. They say "beautiful" by kissing their fingertips.
12. People used to think kisses had magic power.
13. Animals can greet by kissing.
14. The meaning of kissing may change in the future, but kissing will still be with human beings. Always.
A summary: Kissing Your Way around the World

According to Leslie Deady, many people are different meaning about kissing. Kissing can instead word "I Love you".

Many people kiss by use their noses close to lover's cheek and smell. Kissing use for meeting or mean say 'hello'.

Many country are different about import kissing such as Europeans say hello with two kisses. Some greeting by four kisses. Women in Brazil use their cheeks for kisses. In history, they spit germs at their mouths for increase freshness. Kissing mean promise.

A woman respect their king and will fight for king. In Spain in the letter that means kisses. Kissing use for respect between people who was convergence. In Europe and Latin Americans say 'beautiful' and 'good-bye' by kissing their fingertips.
Asuncion Kissing Your Way around the World

Draft 2:

There are many purposes for kissing. Leslie Denny says kissing mean "I love you" and mean "smell". In the olden time kissing mean promise. Nowadays kissing mean for saying hello, such as kissing for "greeting".

Even for the same purpose, people kiss in different ways. For example, in
European, people greet by having two kisses. In Belgium they greet by having three kisses and Paris like four kisses. Kissing on the lips shows respect. For example, people kiss the ground when coming to their home. Roman students kiss their teacher's hands to show respect.

People have different symbols for kissing. For example, "xxxxx" in the
letter mean kissing. Kissing their fingertips to say beautiful.

It's not only humans can kiss. The animals can kiss too. For example, the dogs in prairie kiss a family members. Chimpanzees kisses by pecking.

Kissing still be (human) in their society although the meanings
may change.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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