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Chapter Six

DISCUSSION

6.0 Introduction

The aim of this study is to provide a detailed description of the strategies used by fifteen above average EFL readers in comprehending texts written in English. Findings on these readers' comprehension strategies have been presented in the previous chapter. This chapter will examine these findings in the light of theories and results from previous studies. As knowledge about the strategies used by these EFL readers in comprehending texts in English is intended to improve the future teaching of reading in Indonesia, the discussion will put a greater emphasis on attempts these readers made to make sense of the texts.

It has been mentioned in Chapter Two (Section 2.3) that the term strategy adopted in the present study is not merely reactive but also proactive or anticipative in nature. The term includes long-range "planning" to avoid problems, and "modification of interaction" to solve problems when they occur (Long, 1983:131-2). It also covers "moves", responses that reflect what the reader is doing at a given time to comprehend, and "strategies", patterns of moves used to solve a particular problem with comprehension (Meyers, Lytle, Palladino, Devenpeck & Green, 1990), as reading is considered a problem-solving activity (Thorndike, 1917). To discern these "moves" and "strategies", it is necessary to refer to the research questions formulated in this study.

In response to the five research questions posed in Chapter One, this chapter will further discuss (1) the strategies the above average EFL readers used in comprehending texts written in English, (2) the comprehension problems encountered and their solutions, (3) the frequencies and patterns of the strategy use, (4) the relations between the strategy use and results of comprehension measures,
and (5) range of strategies used by different readers and the relation between strategy use and text types.

It can be seen from the strategy profiles and findings in Chapter Five that comprehension strategies are interrelated with comprehension problems. Therefore, answers to the first and the second research questions will be taken up simultaneously in Section 6.1. The third, the fourth, and the fifth research questions will be discussed in Sections 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4, respectively. Section 6.5 will present a brief review on how the methods of data collection and analysis worked to achieve the purpose of this study.

6.1 Comprehension problems encountered and strategies and modes of response used by the readers

It was mentioned in the summary of Chapter Five that there were six patterns of strategy use. From the point of view of success in achieving comprehension, it may be said that Patterns 1, 2, 3, and 5 resulted in appropriate comprehension of the texts, while Patterns 4 and 6 ended in confusion. It was mentioned that the choice of a pattern was determined by the level of difficulty of the task involved, according to the individual reader’s judgment. For example, Lia used Pattern 2 in reading Text 2 and Pattern 3 in reading Text 1, while a number of readers (Eki, Yan, Eba, Sur, and Sil) used the same pattern (Pattern 3) for both texts. Despite the different patterns they used, all the readers were aware of their reading goal. As Taylor and Taylor (1983:116) point out, a reader of any script has the same goal, that is, to comprehend the text content and retain the gist.

Section 5.6 of Chapter Five has shown that in comprehending the given texts the readers encountered linguistic as well as non-linguistic problems. While the linguistic problems concerned vocabulary and grammatical constructions, the non-linguistic problems were mostly related to the readers’ beliefs, prior knowledge and experience.
From the point of view of the scope, the problems were classified into local and global problems.

6.1.1 Linguistic problems: vocabulary

In regard to linguistic problems, the readers in the present study generally considered problems of vocabulary a major obstacle. This is in line with the claim made by Bouvet (2000:77), Sugirin (1997:58), and Suharto (1985:82) that foreign language readers perceive lexical difficulties as the major impediment to reading comprehension. Suharto's (1985) study found that vocabulary mastery was the most important determinant factor for comprehension ability.

Chapter Five has shown that, in regard to Text 1, lexical items such as “desperately”, “sentiment”, “superintendent”, “initiated”, “instituted”, and “extended” posed comprehension problems to a number of readers. Similarly, in regard to Text 2, a number of readers found items such as “furring-up”, “epidemic”, “five-fold”, “death certification”, and “responsible” problematic.

As these problematic items generated different levels of difficulty and importance to different readers, their attempts to solve the problems varied. For example, Eki, Eba, Sur, and Tin questioned the meaning of the word “desperately”, but ignored the word because they could still obtain the gist of the text without knowing the exact meaning of the word. As the goal of reading is to comprehend the content and to retain the gist (Taylor and Taylor, 1983:116), the more proficient readers seemed to have a more meaning-based approach and did not worry about the meaning of individual words if they could extract the gist of the sentence (Block, 1992:334). Likewise, Lia was satisfied with her impression that something was wrong with the educational system in America, without understanding exactly what the problem was. Meanwhile, Gio read and reread the sentence and vocalised the word “desperately”, but finally inferred that the presence of the word was meant to emphasise the need for reform.
Yan, Yun, and Tam also considered the word unfamiliar but, based on the context, Tam managed to infer that the word might mean “very much”, while Yan and Yun proposed “badly” or “greatly” to be the equivalent. Tam admitted that her inference was tentative, as she did not know much about the American educational system. In this instance, these readers solved the problem by looking at the context in which the word was used. This is in line with Koda’s (1994:7) suggestion that, as a consequence of limited linguistic knowledge, L2 readers use compensatory devices to solve comprehension problems. This is supported by Oxford’s (1989:236) claim that good language learners overcome knowledge limitations through compensatory strategies, such as guessing meanings intelligently. Based on this claim, it may be said that most readers of the present study were good language learners and, hence, good readers. Guessing meanings based on the context was very often the readers’ last resort to interpret the text. As persistent effort leading to interpretation was a characteristic of productive strategy use (see Section 5.9 of Chapter Five), guessing meanings based on context was also a characteristic of productive strategy use.

In regard to the word “sentiment”, the readers’ solutions to the problem varied. Gio was bothered by this word, but he was unable to solve the problem. He incorrectly inferred that the word might mean “dendam” (hatred). Min and Tin shared the same inference, as they associated the word with a non-cognate word “sentimen” which means “ill-feeling” or “strong dislike” in Indonesian or Javanese, and which also means “attitude” in Indonesian. Apparently, these readers associated the word with “ill-feeling” or “strong dislike”. As Grabe (1991) suggests, on a very basic level, transfer effects caused by false cognates or near cognates can influence vocabulary recognition. While Min and Gio stopped at this stage, Tin further associated the gist with the Indonesian context so that she appeared to capture the sense of the word. Similarly, looking at its context of use, Fer and Sur correctly interpreted the word as “pendapat” (opinion). Eki and Sil attempted to obtain the gist of the whole sentence rather than focusing on the word “sentiment”. Meanwhile Yan did not see the individual word as being problematic, but he questioned the phrase “in the face of this
public sentiment” in “It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task”. He solved the problem by considering the phrase as the reason for starting the reform rather than trying to find its exact meaning. Except for Min and Gio, the readers who considered the word “sentiment” problematic managed to infer the meaning based on the context, or to see the sense of the whole sentence rather than worrying about the meaning of the unfamiliar word. Min and Gio maintained their non-cognate association without considering an alternative based on the context of its use. They seemed to feel that their interpretation did not fit the context, but they did not and could not do anything to revise it. This is in line with a finding in Block’s study that even when the less proficient readers expressed a problem with understanding, they did not seem to know what to do next (Block, 1992:335). Meanwhile Dan, Lat, Tam, Eba, and Aci, made an accurate guess at the meaning of the word “sentiment” as soon as they saw it. This was also supported by their correct answer to Question 3 of the Multiple-Choice Test. In Bosser’s (1992:188) words, first language readers are quick and accurate in their guesses. In this instance, Dan, Lat, Tam, Eba, and Aci possess a quality of comprehension like that of first language readers.

In relation to the word “superintendent”, Gio did not comprehend its essence, but he did not seem concerned. Fer was the only reader who was over-concerned with the word from the beginning to the end of the think-aloud session of Text 1. His general understanding of the text was good, but his wish to know the meaning of all the words did not reflect the characteristic of an efficient reader. A good reader does not expect to know all the words, but selects the minimum cues to comprehend the text. Hudson (1998:47) suggests that according to top-down approaches to reading, efficient reading results from skill in choosing the minimum cues necessary to produce correct guesses. As Anderson (1994:185) points out, when accuracy is overemphasised, fluency is impeded. However, Fer was ultimately satisfied with his inference that the word meant “an important person in the Department of Education”. Other readers, such as Eba, Yun, Aci, Sur, Tin, and Sil, shared an interpretation
similar to the one Fer proposed. In order to arrive at the interpretation, they inferred the meaning of the word based on the context of its use. Despite a suggestion that guessing meaning based on the context is not a characteristic of a good L1 reader (Bossers, 1992), a number of authors (Koda, 1994; Oxford, 1989) consider it a common strategy to compensate for deficits in knowledge of the language.

An interesting solution to a lexical problem was Yun’s strategy in interpreting the word “initiated” in the fifth sentence of Text 1. Her association of the word with the word “initial” (“beginning”) she learned in her Phonetics class, which made her conclude that the word “initiated” meant “began” or “started”, was an interesting process of deduction, which also represented transfer of learning.

Other interesting phenomena are how various readers interpreted or arrived at the meanings of the words “furring-up” and “five-fold”. A number of readers who were not familiar with coronary heart disease found the phrase “furring-up of arteries” problematic. Unable to obtain the exact meaning of the words “furring-up”, Yan, Lia, Fer, Aci, and Sur merely inferred the gist that “furring-up of arteries” was the basic cause of coronary conditions, which was also found in animals. Meanwhile, Tin’s solution to this problematic phrase during the discussion of test answers was an interesting one. She noticed that the word “furring” was derived from the word “fur”. Semantically, she put the word “fur” in the same group (noun) as the word “fibre”, and interpreted the word “fur” as “something like fibres.” Hence, she successfully interpreted “furring-up of arteries” as “fibres that block arteries”. This was a brilliant strategy use involving word analysis and synthesis, probably aided by the presence of the phrase “blocking-up of arteries” as one of the options following Question 12.

Meanwhile, in regard to the words “five-fold” in Sentence 9 of Text 2, Yan, Tam, Fer, and Yun had to relate the figures 18,000 and 102,000, concluding that the latter was about “five times” the former. Hence, “five-fold” meant “five times”. This was a
productive strategy use, but the process was slow. As Grabe (1991:378) suggests that a description of reading should account for the notion that fluent reading is rapid, for the reader needs to maintain the flow of the information at a sufficient rate to make connections and inferences vital to comprehension, then most readers in the present study would be classified as poor readers. However, their problem solutions, such as Tin’s process of interpreting the term “furring-up of arteries” and Yan’s, Tam’s, Fer’s, and Yun’s way of arriving at the meaning of “five-fold”, should qualify them as good EFL readers. As Bossers (1992:186) points out, even advanced L2 learners were unable to perform reading tasks as easily or as quickly in their L2 as in their L1.

In relation to the problematic term “death certification”, no reader was sure about its meaning. One reader (Min) expressed doubt if there was such a thing in Indonesia. In solving this vocabulary problem some readers interpreted the term as a letter stating that somebody had died, some others merely translated it into Indonesian, while the rest used the term without bothering about its exact meaning. What is more important to note is not the term itself, but its role as one of the factors responsible for the rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate. As the sub-section on the non-linguistic problems will show, the term caused a problem of logic to a number of readers, especially those who caught the sense of the phrase “responsible for”.

In addition to these problems, for some reason, a number of readers (Eba, Tin, Sil, and Yun) still had problems with the recognition of words they already knew. For example, Eba, Tin, and Sil mistook the word “months” for “years” in interpreting the sentence “He extended the school year from five to six months.” These readers interpreted it as “He extended the length of compulsory schooling from five to six years.” Apparently they associated the sentence with the Indonesian context, in which the Indonesian government changed the compulsory education from six to nine years of schooling. A different example was that Yun mistook simple numbers, such as five, six, and seven. She interpreted “five to six months” as “enam sampai tujuh bulan” (six to seven months). While the former example was due to a faulty
association with prior knowledge, the latter indicated that Yun’s recognition of words such as simple numbers was still far from being automatic. This confirmed Bialystok & Ryan’s (1985:231) claim that non-native speakers in their reading process are mostly at an accurate non-automatic level, due to the absence of fully elaborated analysed knowledge of the second language.

While Eba and Tin included “the extension of the school year” in the retelling of the text, Yun and Sil did not. Unfortunately, despite the time given to reread the text before the retelling, Eba and Tin were unaware of having mistaken the word “months” for “years”. Perhaps they felt that their interpretation made sense and retained this impression even after rereading the text. This indicates how strong the influence of background knowledge is on text interpretation. These readers might have ignored the word, feeling that their interpretation made sense, or they could have revisited the word, but their preconception of the word overrode their sight. In other words, they looked at it but did not see it. This confirmed Smith’s (1985:35) contention that reading depends more on what is behind the eyes - on nonvisual information - than on the visual information in front of them.

It may be summarised that the problems of vocabulary the readers faced were due to: (1) not knowing the meaning of the word, (2) mistaking the word for a false cognate, (3) assigning meaning without proper consideration of the context in which the word was used, and (4) non-visual information overriding visual information. From the readers’ problem solutions, it may be inferred that most of the readers in this study solved vocabulary problems by inferring meaning based on the context. When meaning could not be inferred from a single sentence, readers analysed the problematic word(s) and/or related the problematic part to other parts (phrases, clauses, and sentences) in order to make sense of the text.
6.1.2 Linguistic problems: grammatical constructions

Other than problems of vocabulary, as Chapter Five has shown, a number of readers also encountered problems related to grammatical constructions. These problems were mostly due to the complexity of the sentence construction. A number of readers had difficulty identifying the subject of the sentence and the relation between the chunks enclosed by commas or a comma and a period. For example, Lia initially had difficulty identifying the antecedent to which the pronoun “it” in the fifth sentence of Text 2 referred. Similarly, Eki also complained about the length of the sentences of Text 2. The presence of several commas within Sentences 5 and 10 of Text 2 confused her. Meanwhile, in regard to Sentence 5 of Text 2, Yun incorrectly assumed that the presence of the word “Although” would be followed by the word “but”. As it was not the case, she failed to see the gist — “what appeared to be on the increase.” Tin had difficulty identifying the main clause of the third sentence of Text 2, “Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle aged and, in some cases the young.” The presence of the word “Primarily” at the beginning of the sentence confused her in identifying the subject of the main clause. In solving the problem she reread the sentence over and over, and identified some cues related to age — advancing age, middle aged, and the young. Disregarding the word “Primarily”, she inferred that the disease attacked these three age groups. This made sense, but incompletely, because she did not see the relation between the word “Primarily” and the phrase “the disease of advancing age”, which tells that this particular age group (advancing age) is more vulnerable than the other two age groups (the middle-aged and the young). Gio even had a problem with a very basic sentence pattern. He questioned the appropriateness of the sentence starting with “There can be ...” at the beginning of Text 2. While Eki and Lia solved the problem by rereading the sentence over and over, analysing it, and relating it to the following sentence, Gio considered this common sentence construction unconventional. Eki’s, Lia’s, Yun’s and Gio’s problems support Grabe’s (1991:387) claim that word order variation, relative clause formation, complex noun phrase structures, and other complex structural differences between languages can mislead EFL readers, particularly at the beginning stages.
Grammatical problems the readers of the present study faced may support the finding in Cojocaru’s (1977) study with Hebrew-speakers, which concluded that, due to poor knowledge of syntax, the readers had problems comprehending the text. Cojocaru’s (1977) finding and Grabe’s (1991) claim imply that, particularly in regard to these grammatical problems, Eki’s, Lia’s and Gio’s problems commonly belong to readers at the beginning stage. These readers’ problems seem to support Bosser’s (1992:186) finding in his study that, although his informants were competent readers in their native language (English), they seemed to be “bound to print” while reading the second language. The evidence that foreign language readers focus on language forms is in line with Vanniarajan’s (1994:20) claim that L2 readers devote much attention to bottom-up processing (form-orientedness).

Vanniarajan’s (1994) claim may be true for Eki, Lia and Gio at some points of the text processing, but these very readers also processed another way of the text, which demonstrated their proficiency as readers. For example, as indicated in Graph 4.3.1, despite occasional involvement of other (intervening) processes, Eki’s comprehension of the text was basically achieved through the processes of sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating - processes which characterise a top-down (meaning-oriented) approach to the text (Hudson, 1998). Summarising the gist of the top-down approaches to the reading process, Hudson (1998:47) suggests that readers make guesses about the meaning of the text and sample the print to confirm or disconfirm. As Goodman, Watson and Burke (1996:9) claim, sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating – always resulting in a personal construction of meaning – are the key operations or natural strategies within the reading process. However, as the data in this study have shown, readers used both top-down and bottom-up processes. When a local problem occurred they used the bottom-up approach, but when their prior knowledge did not conflict with attempts to make sense of the text, they used the top-down/meaning-based approach. There was an interaction between these approaches, depending on the level of difficulty the readers were facing. These readers used an interactive approach to the given texts.
Meanwhile, reviewing Rayner, Carlson and Frazier’s (1983) and Ulijn’s (1981) studies, Bosser’s (1992:65) infers that, in regard to L1 readers, it seems that the interpretation of sentences is aided rather than determined by syntactic cues. Similarly, L2 reading is mainly conceptually and less syntactically guided. From these two studies Bosser’s (1992:65) concludes that, although there is a positive relation between syntax knowledge and comprehension, the impact of syntax nevertheless seems to be limited to specific interpretation problems at a local level. Bosser’s conclusion seems to match the data of the present study. For example, readers such as Eki and Lia had problems with the fifth and the tenth sentences of Text 2, but they were able to obtain the gist of the other sentences so that they managed to obtain the gist of the whole text. These two sentences also generated different levels of difficulty. While the problem of Sentence 5 was purely grammatical, Sentence 10, which involved the readers’ logic or knowledge of the world, was more difficult to solve.

6.1.3 Non-linguistic problems

In regard to Text 1, a number of readers had difficulty with the concept of “school year extension.” While readers such as Tam, Fer, Tin and Yan had no problem translating the clause “He extended the school year from five to six months ...” into Indonesian, they could not imagine how this school year extension was put into practice. This claim was realistic in the Indonesian socio-cultural context, because extending the school year was normally beyond the concern of the public in general. Up to the moment the research data of this study were collected (1997-1998), ordinary people, including students, were expected to implement the government’s policy but were not usually involved in making such a decision. Only recently have the public, to some extent, been invited to give input for such policy-making. Therefore, it was logical that readers such as Fer, Tin and Sil associated the extension of the school year with compulsory education in Indonesia, which requires children to go to school for nine years or up to the third year of junior high school.
To some extent, most readers in the present study had difficulty comprehending the last sentence of Text 2. To a number of readers, this sentence posed problems of vocabulary (e.g. the term “death certification”) and grammatical construction (e.g. the presence of several clauses marked by commas). However, once they solved these problems, they faced further problems related to a lack of background knowledge and experience. For instance, most readers accepted population increases as a factor causing the rise in the death rate from coronary heart disease. However, they claimed that improved life expectancy and more accurate diagnosis would decrease, not increase, death rate. In their opinion, any improvement related to life would decrease the death rate. The limited knowledge about coronary heart disease and medical issues in general made it impossible for many of the readers to imagine that improved life expectancy would cause a rise in the number of the aged, for example, who would be vulnerable to the disease. The only readers who truly understood the author’s message and provided an appropriate illustration to confirm their understanding were Lat and Eba. This supports the existing theory that background knowledge plays a crucial role in understanding language (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1988; Dechant, 1991; Silberstein, 1994; Smith, 1994; Vanniarajan, 1994). Garner (1980:55), Goodman, Smith, Meredith and Goodman (1987:210), Irwin and Baker (1989:8) and Meyer and Keefe (1990:6-7) claim that background knowledge and experience related to the text are so important that without them no comprehension will occur.

However, as Chapter Five has shown, prior knowledge could also distort the reader’s correct interpretation. For example, in the think-aloud session Gio correctly interpreted “authorities” as “doctors” or “medical staff.” Unfortunately, the presence of the option “government officials” in the Multiple-Choice Test made him change his interpretation into “government officials”. This option seemed to have reminded him of his bitter experience with “the Indonesian authorities” (government officials or security officers) who arrested him in early 1997. Hence, he considered “government
officials” to be the option closest in meaning to the word “authorities.” In this instance, personal experience probably overrode common-sense knowledge in the process of making sense of the text.

In dealing with these problems, readers took various measures, ranging from successful ones to ones ending in confusion and failure. For instance, concluding the think-aloud session, Eba merely paraphrased the last sentence as containing reasons for a sharp increase in coronary heart disease death rate. In the retelling, after rereading the whole text, she provided an illustration that, in the old days, the diagnosis was not accurate so that coronary heart disease might have been diagnosed as another disease, and there might have been some deaths that were not recorded or certified. With advancement in technology, diagnosis and death certification were more accurate, and all deaths due to coronary heart disease were accurately recorded. Consequently, the disease death rate seemed to be on the increase. Similarly, despite her confusing inference of the last sentence of Text 2 during the think-aloud session, Lat managed to revise the inference of the sentence in her retelling and provide an illustration demonstrating her understanding of the gist.

While Lat and Eba managed to improve their comprehension of the text after rereading it for the purpose of the retelling, Tin did not seem to use the rereading time effectively. During the think-aloud session Tin paid close attention to the print and came close to a correct interpretation of Text 2, but in the retelling, her impression of the print was heavily influenced by her belief. As a result, she claimed that factors such as population increases and more accurate diagnosis caused a decrease, not an increase, in coronary heart disease death rate. Likewise, most probably for a similar reason, Sil concluded the retelling of Text 2 by saying that inaccurate diagnosis methods and death certification were two of the four causes of the death rate increase.

Meanwhile, after rereading the text, Yun, rather than maintaining her belief that improved life expectancy would decrease death rate, switched her strategy of looking
at the issue and assumed that the text was concluded with problem solution. Therefore, she incorrectly inferred that improvement in life expectancy and accurate diagnosis were needed as a method to overcome the problem (the rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate). As this inference seemed to make sense to her, she maintained this interpretation in her retelling, even after rereading the whole text. Perhaps because it made sense to her, Yun failed to check whether it was based on the information provided in the text. Goodman (1996) claims that comprehending a text means making sense of the text. Readers are not likely to change their existing knowledge unless they recognise and are dissatisfied with the fact that it no longer provides an adequate account of their everyday experiences.

Unfortunately, despite their efforts, a number of readers, such as Gio and Min, failed to comprehend the main idea of Text 2. Despite their confusion due to limited knowledge of the subject, however, these readers did not seem to give up. With all their limitations, they attempted to provide an interpretation of every text (sentence) assigned. In this regard, Goodman (1996:115) suggests that when readers fail in using their plans and tactics, the comprehension process gets short-circuited. Short-circuits in the comprehension process can happen if readers try to read a text to which they bring insufficient background knowledge. As a result, readers often produce an oral interpretation of the text that sounds as if they understand it, even though they do not.

For Gio, the problems seemed to be more complicated. Other than those related to general knowledge, his problems were also related to his bitter experience as a young citizen and his personal belief and attitude towards a foreign culture. For example, a mere use of the term “super-powers” in Text 1 became a target of his criticism because, in his belief, only God deserves that attribute. That Horace Mann was a famous reformer was considered invalid, as Gio had never read any book Mann had written. This apathetic attitude seemed to have made it difficult for him to see the information in the text with a clear mind.
Supporting Tickoo’s (1995:261) observation with particular emphasis on the EFL setting, Gio’s personal problems seem to be in line with the contention that reading cannot be separated from social and cultural contexts (Grabe, 1991; Hudson, 1998; Street, 1994; Wallace, 1988) and readers’ beliefs (Sugirin, 1997). Second or foreign language readers will undoubtedly bring into the text their own social and cultural values and beliefs which may be alien to the native readers of the target language.

Despite Gio’s unsuccessful comprehension of the texts, his being critical as a reader certainly deserves appreciation. For example, his comment that raising salaries did not guarantee the improved welfare of the teachers, as it could be followed by a rise in inflation, was a good point. However, his frequent associations with his personal feelings and his intolerance to almost anything in conflict with his belief did not aid his understanding of the information in the text. Dole and Smith (1989) point out that when readers possess knowledge that conflicts with the information encountered in text, their existing knowledge can and often does prevail over textual information. As Fyfe and Mitchell (1985:166) remind us, good readers are those who manage to keep the balance between the two sources of information: information within the text and that outside the text, i.e. background knowledge and experience needed to interpret the information found in the text. This is consistent with Widdowson’s (1989) warning of the danger of being too assertive (over-relying on the background knowledge). Widdowson (1989:94) points out that if a reader is too assertive, there is a danger that he may distort the writer’s intention and deny access to new knowledge and experience. In this regard, Gio was apparently too assertive.

The readers’ problems related to background knowledge such as Gio’s may find support from Bossers’s (1992:69) suggestion that interpretation of text requires the mobilisation of relevant experiential and conceptual knowledge, but the (L1) writer (whose work was cited as an L2 reading text in the present study) and L2 readers may not share the same assumptions. This has appeared to be a major source of text
comprehension problems to a number of readers in the present study. This is contrary to Bouvet's (2000) conclusion in his study that cultural knowledge did not pose problems to his informants. The reason was that French and Australian are both Western and Christian cultures; in this respect, they share many values. Thus, cultural orientation might have been minimal (Bouvet, 2000:74).

6.1.4 Reading texts of different types

As mentioned in Section 5.11 of Chapter Five, the comparison of the strategy uses in the readers' attempts to comprehend Texts 1 and 2 has provided evidence that the readers employed different strategies in reading different types of texts. In reading Text 2, which was considered more difficult than Text 1, these readers tended to make more use of the strategies of rereading, reading aloud and vocalising the text, making an intra-sentential relation, and conducting a sentence analysis. In contrast, they became less able to use strategies such as predicting, making an inter-sentential relation, making an association with prior knowledge, evaluating the text, providing an illustration to support or clarify interpretation or understanding, and reflecting on strategy use, which they used more frequently in reading Text 1. In reading a familiar text, the readers were able to use their prior knowledge to aid text comprehension, while in reading an unfamiliar or difficult text, the readers had to rely on print. In other words, while in reading a familiar text they used knowledge-based or top-down processing, in reading an unfamiliar or difficult text they used text-based or bottom-up processing (Bialystok & Ryan, 1985; Dornic, 1979; Taylor and Taylor, 1983; and Vanniaraajan, 1994).

Other than different levels of difficulty, different text types and the tasks involved after reading also caused different problems and, hence, entailed use of different strategies. As can be seen from Section 5.6.3 of Chapter Five, reading a text in a reading test, a newspaper, and a book prescribed by a lecturer had different purposes and entailed different tasks. Consequently, the readers claimed to use different
strategies. Reading the same text, for example reading a newspaper, could generate different strategy uses, if the tasks involved were different.

For example, as can be seen from Section 5.6.3.2, in reading a newspaper the readers usually focused on the general information or news of the day. They would not bother about looking up words in the dictionary when they encountered unfamiliar words. Their main purpose of reading was to obtain the gist. Even when they failed to obtain the gist, they would not be concerned. However, Yan claimed that, if a lecturer asked the students to read a newspaper or a newspaper article, the reading usually entailed an assignment such as writing a summary. In this case, he would have to understand its content. If there were words he did not understand, he would look them up in the dictionary, if the words were key words to understanding the content. This also means that in normal newspaper reading the readers relied on their prior knowledge (knowledge-based approach to the text), while in newspaper reading that entailed a summarising task the readers were dependent on both prior knowledge and the print. In other words, there were more interactions between prior knowledge and the information in the text. It appeared that similar phenomena happened to the readers in reading Text 1 and Text 2. In reading Text 1, which dealt with education, the readers were more able to use their prior knowledge, while in reading Text 2, which dealt with medical issues, most readers relied on the information provided in the text.

In reading a book prescribed by a lecturer the readers used strategies similar to those used in reading a newspaper that entailed a summarising task. The lecturer’s assignment was usually in the form of summarising the book or one of its chapters for submission, or writing pointers as a guideline for chairing a discussion. The readers usually employed an interactive approach to the text. At times they were aided by their prior knowledge, but there were occasions when they had to rely on print so that they had to look up the meaning of difficult words in the dictionary in order to obtain the gist of the book or its part.
In reading a text in a reading test, the readers appeared to employ a similar interactive approach to the text. In addition, the majority of the readers made good use of their test-wiseness strategies. A test-wiseness strategy is a test-taking tactic consisting of knowledge of how to take a test, which is not necessarily determined by proficiency in the language being assessed (Cohen, 1998:219). For example, nine (60%) of the fifteen readers read or skimmed the questions before reading the text. These readers claimed that by skimming the questions before reading the text, they had some idea about what to find in the text. Hence, the reading was more focused and they could spend the limited time available more effectively. Meanwhile, Fer struggled to obtain the main idea(s) of the text before looking at the questions and the options provided, as he did not want to be influenced by the distracters in choosing the correct answers.

While Section 5.12 of Chapter Five pointed out that reading comprehension strategy choice depended on the task following reading and the level of difficulty of the text, this section has shown that different purposes of reading also generated different strategies and strategy uses. In addition, familiarity and unfamiliarity with the issue(s) discussed in the text also influences the strategy use. Like Text 1, Text 2 is a typical text used in a TOEFL test. It concerns a popular issue with which readers in general are expected to be familiar. While the readers' unfamiliarity with the issue proved to hamper their comprehension, it seems reasonable to suggest that, other than introducing topics related to the learners' fields of study, reading instructors should give greater opportunities to learners to familiarise themselves with topics about popular issues, such as those commonly appear in the Reading section of a TOEFL test. Learners should be exposed to texts of various issues and genres to enrich their background knowledge and language repertoires.

6.1.5 Cognitive and metacognitive strategies

Other than striving to make sense of the texts (exercising cognition), the readers of the present study demonstrated awareness of the cognitive processes they went
through in attempts to make sense of the text. On a number of occasions most readers explicitly mentioned how they arrived at an interpretation of the text or its parts, regardless of whether the interpretation was appropriate or inappropriate. This can be seen from strategy reflections made by a number of readers in arriving at the interpretation of a problematic item (e.g. "five-fold", "extended the school year", and "that improved life expectancy would increase coronary heart disease death rate"). More importantly, most readers were aware of the problems when they occurred and kept monitoring whether their text interpretation made sense. As Block (1992:337) points out, questioning and monitoring are a part of good reading, not the result of imperfect knowledge of their target language. In this regard, the readers of the present study may be classified as good readers. However, Wongbiasaj and Chaikitmongkol (1995:114) observe that the high-level strategies seem to underlie the successful completion of a task. Most unsuccessful students in their study lacked cognitive strategies at the high level.

As can be seen from Subsection 5.3.2 of Chapter Five, the readers of the present study used high-level cognitive strategies and low-level metacognitive strategies more often than the low-level cognitive strategies and high-level metacognitive strategies. In other words, despite lacking high-level metacognitive strategies, they used a high proportion of high-level cognitive strategies. However, as can be seen from Section 5.7 of Chapter Five, which particular high-level strategies were used and the dynamics of the strategy use - what chains of strategies were used and how they used them - seemed to determine the success or failure of the strategy use. For example, the readers used the strategies of comprehension monitoring (115 times) and problem identification (114 times), two strategies belonging to low-level metacognitive strategies. Unfortunately, this high frequency of problem identification (a low-level metacognitive strategy) was followed by a low frequency (41 times) of identification of a key to problem solution (a high-level cognitive strategy). Despite the high frequency of problem identification, there were occasions when a number of readers were not aware of the problems they were facing. While awareness of the
source of the problems readers encountered is a necessary precursor to taking action (Block, 1992:337), on a number of occasions the readers in the present study were not able to follow up the awareness of the problem with successful problem solutions.

While a refined and extended study is needed, the limited data of the present study showed that a lack of systematic strategy training could have been the cause of the readers' unawareness of the comprehension problems and their solutions. The in-depth interview revealed that a number of prompts such as “Why did you choose that answer?” or “How did you come to that conclusion?” during the discussion of the test questions made the readers use their reasoning potential while monitoring their comprehension, activating their prior knowledge and directing endeavours to make sense of the text, and providing an acceptable reason for choosing a particular answer. The prompts enabled the readers to reflect on and reconsider their strategy use. The informant-researcher interaction during the in-depth interview proved to generate strategy awareness and trigger strategy use. As Min commented during the think-aloud process of Text 1, she learned something new (a strategy of comprehending the double-negative construction “no excuse for any citizen to be uneducated”) from the interview. With some modification to suit the purpose, this informant-researcher interaction can be adapted as a model for student-teacher interaction in comprehension strategy training, as part of the improvement of the reading instruction in TEFLIN.

In this regard, Parry (1996), Shearer and Lundeberg (1996), and Taillefer (1996) suggest that, if given the motivation and encouragement, individuals can change their strategies and behaviour to improve L2 reading comprehension. A number of researchers have suggested that teaching readers how to use strategies should be a prime consideration in the reading classroom (Barnet, 1988; Carrell, 1989; Swaffar, Arens & Byrnes, 1991). In this regard, Alderson (1984:27) claims that both good and poor first language readers learning to read in a foreign language need tuition in reading skills and strategies, undoubtedly with considerable tuition for poor first-
language readers. The present study proved that the EFL readers participating in the present study needed tuition in reading strategies. Even Dan, a reader with high language proficiency, was unable to maximise his potential as a good reader. Therefore, while the development of learners' language proficiency is pursued, tuition in reading comprehension strategies, which learners require in comprehending texts, is essential.

6.1.6 Modes of response

As has been mentioned in Chapter Five, the researcher in the present study uses the term “directive mode” in place of Block's (1986) term “extensive mode”. The preference for term “directive” was based on the fact that in “the directive mode”, readers “directed” attention to the information provided in the text. The term “reflexive” is maintained, because, in “the reflexive mode”, readers’ responses to the text represented self-reflections rather than the information provided in the text.

Supporting a finding in Block's (1986) study, the data in the present study show that the reader whose responses in the reflexive mode were highest in percentage terms, Gio, was the least successful reader. Gio's reflexive responses, which contributed to his unsuccessful comprehension, may be due to a number of reasons. His bitter experience as a young citizen seemed to have a great impact on his attitudes towards the world around him. His apathy towards the government officials in general, and the Indonesian armed forces in particular, distorted his interpretation of the word “authorities”. His intolerance of the author’s use of the term “super-powers” also directed his attention away from the information in the text and made him waste his time on self-reflections irrelevant to the task. Gio’s apathy towards the Indonesian government and his intolerance of the term “super-powers” provided evidence of a claim that reading and literacy cannot be separated from social, cultural, and political contexts (Gee, 1996; Grabe, 1991; Hudson, 1998), power and ideology (Hudson, 1998; Street, 1994) and readers' beliefs (Sugirin, 1997:8). Meanwhile, that Gio
blamed the author for using a sentence construction, with which Gio was not familiar, was apparently an argument to compensate for his deficiency in language proficiency. His language proficiency, which was below average for the informants, as can be seen from his low TOEFL score, could have contributed to his unsuccessful comprehension.

All the readers of this study made self-reflections in response to both Texts 1 and 2. However, while most readers' self-reflections were related to, and in support of, attempts to comprehend the information provided in the texts, many of Gio's self-reflections were strong reactions to the text, based on his personal belief, before sufficient attempts were made to comprehend the information provided in the text. Therefore, many (22%) of his responses were reflexive in nature, while those of other readers were in the directive mode.

Self-reflections were all initiated by the information in the text. For those who managed to control their self-reflections and return to the information in the text, the reflections aided attempts to comprehend the text. In contrast, those who did not relate the reflections to the information in the text used the reflections as a means to an end, and the reflections were distorting rather than aiding comprehension.

The self-reflections made by the readers in general, and those made by Gio in particular, provided evidence of how natural their responses to the task were. Despite the presence of the researcher throughout the data collection process, the readers did not show any hesitation to express their thoughts, feelings, and problems and, on one or two occasions, some of them even asked for the researcher's comment on the subject under attention. Gio even apologised for his conduct in performing the tasks, stating that he often said something as if he had been talking to himself.
6.1.7 Summary

In attempts to solve vocabulary problems the readers generally guessed meaning based on the context of use, analysed the problematic items based on derivatives or other related forms, or synthesised the items with other cues available in the text. In dealing with problems related to grammatical constructions the readers generally analysed the problematic constructions or related them to other constructions (phrases, clauses, and sentences) in the text. When problems were related to knowledge of the world, the readers related the problematic items to their logic based on their prior knowledge, both linguistic and non-linguistic. Readers who managed to keep the balance between their prior knowledge and information in the text treated conflicting knowledge as new information that they were prepared to learn. Self-reflections these readers made generally stemmed from the information in the text and were redirected to it to aid understanding. In other words, the readers generally employed the directive mode.

As Chapter Five has shown, the readers in this study used both top-down and bottom-up approaches in comprehending the given texts. When a local problem occurred they used the bottom-up approach, but when their prior knowledge did not conflict with attempts to make sense of the text, they used the top-down/meaning-based approach. There was an interaction between these approaches, depending on the level of difficulty the readers were facing. In other words, the readers generally used an interactive approach to the given texts.

Despite this, there were moments when the L2 readers in this study were “bound to print” and devoted much attention to bottom-up processing or form-orientedness (Bossers, 1992:186; Vanniarajan, 1994:20). However, there were many occasions when the reading process followed Goodman, Watson and Burke’s (1996) model of reading, i.e. that comprehension was achieved through the processes of sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating.
6.2 Frequency and patterns of strategy use and range of strategies

It was mentioned in Section 5.7 of Chapter Five that frequency of strategy use was related to the intensity or seriousness of the comprehension problems the readers encountered. For example, Eki's frequent use of the strategy pattern of reading/rereading, inferring and comprehension monitoring, in her attempts to comprehend Sentence 10 of Text 2 was due to her doubt about every inference she had made. In order to achieve her final inference of the sentence, she underwent repeated processes of reading, inferring, comprehension monitoring, and rereading. Other than the repetition of the use of these strategies, she also needed other strategies such as making an association with prior knowledge, conducting sentence analysis and providing an illustration to support or clarify her understanding. These strategies were needed to relate her tentative inferences with her prior knowledge or non-visual information (Smith, 1985:35) or with the information provided in the text. Thus, other than increasing the frequency of strategy use, the problems Eki encountered also increased the number or range of strategies she used. It may be said that, for the present study, frequency of strategy use and range of strategies used depended on the intensity of the problems the readers encountered.

In line with the theory that the main purpose of reading is to comprehend the content and retain the gist (Taylor and Taylor, 1983:116) or to make sense of the text (Goodman, 1996), Section 5.7 of Chapter Five suggested that the main pattern of the strategy use of the readers in the present study was “silent reading - inferring/paraphrasing”, in which an inference or paraphrase was seen as the gist obtained or as evidence of comprehending the content. Where appropriate, it was followed by “making self-reflections”. When direct interpretation of the text, which took the form of inferring or paraphrasing, was difficult, one or more intervening strategies were needed. A reader’s background knowledge consisting of formal schemata and content schemata (Silberstein, 1994:8) determined the strategy pattern the reader used, in that it determined whether s/he made an association with her/his prior knowledge, reread the text to enable linguistic analysis, monitored her/his comprehension, or took other
measures to solve her/his comprehension problem. In this regard, without undermining the specificity of each pattern, the six patterns of strategy use presented in Section 5.7 could be simplified into three main patterns:

1. Read-assoc-interpret (correctly),
2. Read-idprob-intervene-interpret (correctly), and
3. Read-assoc-idprob-intervene-interpret (incorrectly).

The first pattern consisted of reading the text, making an association with prior knowledge, and correctly interpreting the text immediately after the first reading, as seen from an appropriate inference or paraphrase provided. The second pattern consisted of reading the text, identifying a comprehension problem explicitly stated or implied by comprehension monitoring or rereading the text, using one or more of the intervening processes such making an association with prior knowledge, establishing an intra-sentential relation, or conducting a sentence, phrase, or word analysis, before correctly interpreting the text. The third pattern consisted of reading the text, identifying a comprehension problem explicitly or implicitly, using one or more of the intervening strategies such as making an association with prior knowledge, establishing an intra-sentential relation, or conducting a sentence, phrase, or word analysis, and interpreting the text incorrectly or ending the attempts in confusion.

The first pattern occurred when the text did not pose any significant problem to the readers. As can be seen from the individual strategy profiles, Dan and Lat used this pattern during the think-aloud session of Text 1. The second pattern occurred when, despite the problems the text posed, the readers were able to make use of their prior knowledge and strategies to solve their comprehension problems. With varying degrees of success, most readers used this strategy pattern in comprehending both Texts 1 and 2. The third pattern occurred when the readers were aware of the comprehension problems and attempted to solve them, but failed to comprehend the text. Gio and Min used this strategy pattern on many occasions.
Despite the simplification of the strategy patterns above, Acil’s strategy pattern may need highlighting. One striking difference between Acil’s pattern of strategy use from those of other readers was that she almost always started her response to the text by reading it aloud. She argued that she did so for the purpose of focusing attention. Despite the high score Acil obtained for the MC test and the retellings, Acil’s habit of reading the text aloud was a bad habit (Zuchdi, 1991). Zuchdi (1991:19) claims that the bad reading habits of the subjects of her study she considers to be related to their low achievement include vocalisation, subvocalisation, regression, and pointing at the text. In this regard, Acil’s habit of reading the text aloud was bad, as it could slow down the comprehension process (Zuchdi, 1991:13). Zuchdi’s (1991) argument is reasonable because Acil’s attempts to achieve comprehension followed the outside-in theory (Cambourne, 1979:79) where she had to pass the processes of discriminating letters or clusters of letters, synthesising them into words (or syllables) by matching the same letters which had been discriminated with their phonologically appropriate sounds, and attempting to pronounce them by running or blending the sounds quickly together, either aloud or sub-vocally, for the purpose of focusing attention. While effectiveness of reading the text aloud needs further investigation, it is apparent that her reading would have been less time consuming if she had not read aloud or vocalised the texts. Strangely, a habit of reading the text aloud for the purpose of focusing attention was also shown by Mumi, one of the most successful readers in Sugirin’s (1995) study. However, it mostly happened with portions of the texts she considered difficult. In this context, occasional vocalisation or subvocalisation of the text was also carried out by a number of readers in the present study.

While the present study did not intend to interfere with the readers’ awareness of their strategy use, that is, the strategies used, including any idiosyncrasies of the readers in the present study, were spontaneous in nature, it may be worthwhile in future research to see whether a habit such as reading the text aloud is related to religious belief, or community practice (Latham, 1972:396; Sugirin, 1997; Wallace, 1988:2), or previous reading instruction.
As the patterns of strategy use in Section 5.12 of Chapter Five showed, an inference or a paraphrase was usually followed by one or more strategies belonging to the category of comprehension utilisation. These patterns showed that, in general, not only did the readers comprehend the texts, but they were also able to evaluate them or reflect on their strategy use. Hence, the texts selected for the present study were at the right level of difficulty for most of the readers. While they were relatively easy for two readers (Dan and Lat), relatively difficult for three readers (Gio, Min and Yun), they seemed to be just right for the other ten readers (Eki, Yan, Tam, Lia, Fer, Eba, Aci, Sur, Tin, and Sil).

As mentioned earlier, a reader's background knowledge determined the strategy pattern the reader used. For example, the match or mismatch between the reader's background knowledge and the information in the text determined what strategy or strategies s/he used after the first reading of the text. As Goodman, Watson & Burke (1996:7) point out, if a reader's knowledge does not match the content of the print, s/he will regress, reread, and pick up additional cues until the text makes sense. Other possibilities are that the reader will stop, consider, and rethink why what is being read does not seem to make sense, or continue reading in order to build additional context. In turn, the measure(s) taken determined the pattern of strategy use adopted. As Section 5.7 of Chapter Five concluded, in general, strategy patterns depended on the problems the readers encountered.

Section 5.7 of Chapter Five further suggested that as far as the success or failure of attempts to comprehend the text was concerned, it was not the pattern of strategy use, but rather the strategy use itself that made reading successful or unsuccessful. Similarly, as far as the range of strategies was concerned, Section 5.10 showed that it was not the range, but rather the maximum utilisation of the range of strategies chosen and used that determined the success of strategy use. Table 5.14 showed that
Dan and Lat used numbers of strategies lower than the average, but they were successful as readers. Meanwhile, Gio was the least successful reader in the present study, but the number of strategies he employed was lower than the average. In contrast, as one of the unsuccessful readers, Min used a number of strategies higher than the average.

This section has discussed patterns and ranges of strategy use and confirmed that it was not the patterns or ranges of strategy use, but rather the strategy use itself that determined the success of text comprehension. Section 5.9 of Chapter Five noted that characteristics of productive strategy use were: economy, balance, flexibility, predictiveness, consistency, interpretation, alertness, and integration. These characteristics should be a prime focus in reading instruction programs. It means that while strategy training is important, productive strategy use should be the focus or one of the foci in the strategy training. Hence, the principle that good readers are those who can maintain the balance between prior knowledge and information provided in the text (Fyfe and Mitchell, 1985:166; Meyer and Keefe, 1990:9; and Widdowson, 1989:94) and other characteristics of productive strategy use suggested above should be considered in the training.

6.3 Comprehension strategies and comprehension measures

While Ellis (1994:543) suggested that professionals use more strategies more often than the laymen and higher level high school students use more strategies than the lower level students, the present study showed that frequency of strategy use and range of strategies used were a consequence of the need to solve comprehension problems and a skill to respond to the need. Despite their ability to use a high number of strategies, the readers in this study did not use them all when a small number of strategies were sufficient to achieve the purpose of reading, to comprehend the text. For example, Dan and Lat did not use strategies such as sentence, phrase, or word analysis, as they were able to comprehend the text without analysing the sentence,
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phrase, or word. In contrast, in reading Text 2, Min did not establish any inter-sentential relation, when it was actually needed to integrate the pieces of information from different parts of the text, as she seemed to have difficulty seeing the relations between the pieces of information contained in different parts of the text.

Figure 1 in Section 5.7 of Chapter Five showed that the high frequencies of identifying a problem, rereading, vocalising, and comprehension monitoring were followed by low frequencies of identifying a key to problem solution and establishing an inter-sentential relation. This indicated that on a number of occasions the readers were unable to solve their comprehension problems. For one reader, Min, her main problem in regard to comprehending Text 2 was due to her inability to establish intersentential relations and her inability to integrate information from different parts of the text, which was crucial to comprehending the whole text.

Dan, Eki, Yan, Lat, Lia, Eba and Aci were all successful readers in the present study. However, an examination of their strategy use indicated that they varied in their efforts to comprehend the texts. While Dan and Lat were relatively at ease in performing the tasks, Eki, Yan, Lia, Eba and Aci appeared to work harder in their attempts to comprehend the texts. Dan's and Lat's good language proficiency seemed to make them comfortable with their text comprehension, so that they did not need to use strategies such as subvocalising, referring, sentence analysis, phrase analysis and word analysis. Therefore, they used relatively low numbers of strategies. In contrast, readers such as Eki and Lia needed a number of the strategies above in order to achieve comprehension of the texts. However, as Section 5.10 of Chapter Five mentioned, it was not the number or the range of strategies but rather the maximum utilisation of the appropriate strategies selected and used that determined the success of text comprehension. In this regard, Eki, Lia, Eba and Aci were able to make use of both language proficiency and strategies to maximise their comprehension of the text. As a result, one reader, Aci, whose TOEFL score was lower than Dan's, was able to achieve a total score of 37 for the Multiple-Choice test and the Retellings. This total
score was the same as Dan's. Aci's TOEFL score was 503, four points below the average (507) and fifty-two points below Dan's score (555). As the TOEFL score has been assumed to represent language proficiency, this indicates that language proficiency is not the only factor contributing to reading ability. As Section 5.8.5 of Chapter Five shows, there was a significant correlation between the TOEFL scores and the total scores of the multiple-choice test and the retellings. However, the contribution of language proficiency to reading ability was only 23% of the total variance. This suggests that, other than language proficiency, factors such as reading comprehension strategies were responsible for the success or failure of the readers of the present study. Hence, the practice of using reading classes as a means developing language proficiency rather than reading proficiency, as mentioned in Section 1.2.2 of Chapter One, may not lead to comprehensive development of independent reading ability.

While strategy use determined the success of text comprehension, examples were given in Chapter Five of conditions which made strategy use successful or productive. It was summarised in Chapter Five that productive strategy use was a consequence of economy, balance, flexibility, predictiveness, consistency and direction, interpretation, and integration, while unproductive strategy use resulted from inefficiency, reflexiveness, and fragmentation. A number of these characteristics of productive strategy use may resemble some of the characteristics of fluent reading suggested by Grabe (1991), Barnett (1989) and Bamford and Day (1998). Grabe (1991:378) suggests that fluent reading is rapid, purposeful, interactive, comprehending, flexible, and gradually developing. Barnett (1989:71) reports that successful readers kept the meaning of the passage in mind while reading, read in broad phrases, skipped words they saw as unimportant to total phrase meaning, and had a positive self-concept as readers. Meanwhile, Bamford and Day (1998:129) found that, for first, second or foreign language learners, affective factors, such as motivation, determine the success or failure of reading.
6.4. The relation between strategy use and text types

It was reported in Chapter Five that while different text types required different strategies to comprehend, strategies employed to comprehend the texts were more dependent on the task(s) following reading. The apparent fluctuations in the frequency of strategy use shown by Table 5.18 in Section 5.11 indicate that in reading a less familiar text, the readers tended to use strategies of rereading, reading aloud and vocalising the text, making an intra-sentential relation, and conducting a sentence analysis more often. In contrast, they became less able to use strategies such as predicting, making an inter-sentential relation, making an association with prior knowledge, evaluating the text, providing an illustration to support or clarify interpretation or understanding, and reflecting on strategy use. In reading a less familiar text they became more dependent on print, as they lacked prior knowledge to aid comprehending the text.

While the fluctuations in the frequency of strategy use shown in Section 5.11 suggest that different text types require different strategy use, the informants also reported during the in-depth interview that they used different strategies for different types of reading materials. They reported different comprehension strategies for the same reading materials if the tasks following reading were different. For example, reading a newspaper for one’s own pleasure required strategies different from those needed in reading a newspaper for the purpose of completing a lecturer’s assignment. This supports Taillefer’s (1996) claim that tasks are important determinants in strategy choice. Taillefer’s (1996) study concluded that, although both L1 reading ability and L2 proficiency showed statistically significant relationships to L2 reading comprehension, their relative importance appeared to depend on the reading task as well as on the readers’ L2 proficiency. Successful readers approach the text strategically. This is in line with Wineburg’s (1991) and Pressley and Afflerbach’s (1995) claims that fluent readers read strategically.
6.5 A brief review of how the methods of data collection and data analysis worked to achieve the purpose of this study

In response to Nisbet and Wilson’s (1977) doubt about the believability of data obtained through introspective verbal reports, Kormos (1998:353-4) points out, researchers can instruct their subjects to verbalise directly only the thoughts entering their attention while performing a task. For this purpose, Block (1986), Lundeberg (1987), and Pressley and Afflerbach (1995) recommend that a practice run be given as a precaution against problems that may arise from data collection. In addition, Wallace (1998:88) argues that verbal reports, including think-aloud protocols, can be crosschecked against other sources of data.

In line with Wallace’s (1998:88) suggestion, authors such as Block (1986), Bouvet (2000), Ericsson and Simon (1984; 1993), Jimenez, Garcia and Pearson (1993), Kormos (1998), Levine and Reves (1998), Sugirin (1995), Wallace (1998), and Wongbiasaj and Chaikitmongkol (1995) complemented think-aloud protocols with other methods of data elicitation in their respective studies. It was in the same spirit as these studies that, as well as taking great care in running the think-aloud procedures, the present study complemented the think-aloud protocols with retellings, a multiple-choice test, an in-depth interview, and the researcher’s observations of the informants’ behaviours throughout the data collection process.

6.5.1 The think-aloud protocols

While providing a practice run, the present study took extra care in its execution. The main purpose of the practice run was to familiarise the informants with the procedures, not the content, of the reports. As the content of the responses had to be spontaneous, the researcher asked the informant to rehearse without any model given. When he considered that the informant’s responses represented the on-line thought processes, he asked the informant to start with the actual think-aloud task. The
appropriate practice run given proved to be a key determinant of the success of the think-aloud protocols.

As Chapter Five has shown, a large amount of data and a great deal of information have been generated by think-aloud tasks employed in this study. In addition, most readers reflected on their strategy use and all readers made self-reflections. The self-reflections made by the readers in general, such as those made by Gio, provided evidence of how natural their responses to the task were. Despite the presence of the researcher throughout the data collection process, the readers did not show any hesitation to express their thoughts, feelings, and problems. On one or two occasions, some of them even asked for the researcher's comment on the subject under attention, forgetting that they were participating in research. Gio even apologised for his conduct in performing the tasks, stating that he often said something as if he had been talking to himself. These conditions of “forgetting the participation in research” and “talking to himself” were exactly what the researcher hoped for. This means that their think-aloud processes were highly natural, eliminating Nisbet and Wilson's (1977) doubt about the believability of data obtained through think-aloud reports.

6.5.2 The retellings

The rereading time given before retelling the text made a number of readers revise their understanding of the text during the think-aloud session. For example, in the retelling of Text 2, Dan corrected his misunderstanding of the last sentence. For a number of other readers the rereading time given confirmed their understanding or misunderstanding, or reflected their strategy use. For Min, for example, her retelling of Text 2 reflected her inability to establish an inter-sentential relation. Her comprehension of the individual sentences during the think-aloud session was good, but she was unable to integrate the meaning of the individual sentences to obtain the gist of the whole text.
The examples given show that other than contributing information concerning comprehension, the retellings also contributed information related to comprehending - thought processes involved to achieve comprehension. This information excels Smith’s (1980) expectation that, other than telling us what the reader recalls, a retelling may also indicate what the reader adds to or infers from the text. Thus it confirmed Irwin and Mitchell’s (1983:393) and Morrow’s (1988:128) suggestion that retellings offer a perspective not available through other means of assessing comprehension such as questioning or cloze procedures. Other than providing information on product, the retellings in the present study also provided information on process, which was needed to crosscheck the information obtained from the think-aloud protocols.

6.5.3 The multiple-choice test and the in-depth interview

As with the retellings, the in-depth interview using the multiple-choice test as a reference focus for the discussion of test answers also provided information related to both product and process. The in-depth interview sought information concerning a reader’s reasons for choosing an option to a multiple-choice test question. As the individual strategy profiles show, in providing a reason, the reader retrieved or illustrated some of the thought processes used during the think-aloud session and thought-aloud the relation between the reader’s text interpretation and the options provided. The reason provided revived, refined and extended the think-aloud protocols.

In line with the main purpose of the in-depth interview to crosscheck an informant’s perception and understanding of a situation (Kirk and Miller, 1986; Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell & Alexander, 1995), special attention was focused on the discrepancy between the information obtained from the think-aloud protocols and that from the in-depth interview. By so doing the researcher was able to confirm whether a discrepancy between responses from the think-aloud session and that from the in-depth interview was based on understanding or mere confusion. For example, Min’s
correct answer to Question 6, which was contrary to her interpretation of the expression "... there was no excuse for citizens to be uneducated" during the think-aloud session, proved to be a revision of her text comprehension due to additional cues provided by the multiple-choice test options. This is in line with Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell and Alexander's (1995:177) suggestion that in the course of in-depth interviewing, the interviewer will sooner or later discover discrepancies and/or consistencies in the informant’s responses. Examples of the discrepancies and consistencies in the individual strategy profiles proved that the in-depth interview using the multiple-choice test answers as reference focus verified the information obtained from the think-aloud protocols.

6.5.4 Observations

As mentioned in Section 5.1 of Chapter Five the researcher noted a number of phenomena during the data collection processes. For example, firstly, Ham, Min, Ran and Yan started the think-aloud task by skimming the whole text, despite the researcher’s instruction to read the text sentence by sentence and report what they were thinking while reading. Secondly, while Min’s think-aloud protocol indicates a number of regressions in her comprehension processes, most of the time Min pointed her finger at the word(s) she was attending to. Pointing a finger at part(s) of the text attended to was also done a number of times throughout the think-aloud tasks by Lat and Tam (three times each), Sur (four times), Sil (six times), Eki (seven times), Gio (11 times), Lia (14 times), and Tin (15 times). Pointing at parts of the text being worked on seemed to be intended to aid centering attention when the portion of the text posed a problem.

Another phenomenon observed was that some readers marked a portion of the text they found problematic or in need of further consideration. For example, Tin underlined the words "furring-up" (in Text 2) which were already written between inverted commas, Min put double vertical lines at the end of the line containing these
words, while Fer put a small tick at the end of the line containing the word "Superintendent" (in Text 1). The small tick Fer put at the end of the line also confirmed his claim that he tended to keep his books or notes neat. In all these cases the readers seemed to use the symbols to mark the problematic spots to which they could easily return when they wanted to refer to them.

As Sommer and Sommer (1991:49-50) put it, a final report is best written after a long period of reflection, data gathering, and several drafts, but first impressions are most valuable when written while they are still fresh. Despite the casual nature of the observations, the recorded phenomena exemplified above show that the observation notes provided information to support or clarify the information obtained in the think-aloud, retelling, and interview sessions.

6.6 Summary

In line with the claim made by Bouvet (2000:77), Sugirin (1997:58), and Suharto (1985:82), lexical difficulties were the major problem of reading comprehension for most readers in the present study. Supporting Cojucaru’s (1977) and Grabe’s (1991) claims, a number of readers also had problems related to syntax, particularly sentence constructions. In line with the claim that background knowledge and experience related to the text are so important that without them no comprehension will occur (Garner, 1980:55; Goodman, Smith, Meredith & Goodman, 1987:210; Irwin & Baker, 1989:8; and Meyer & Keefe, 1990:6-7), a number of readers faced a comprehension problem due to the absence or a lack of background knowledge and experience. For example, Yan was able to translate the expression “extended the school year from five to six months” but was unable to make sense of it.

The discussion also concluded that frequency and patterns of strategy use as well as choice of strategies were dependent on perceived difficulty of text, prior knowledge (formal and content schemata), cultural knowledge, and purpose for reading, including tasks involved. This conclusion supports the contention that reading cannot
be separated from social and cultural contexts (Grabe, 1991; Hudson, 1998; Street, 1994; Wallace, 1988) and readers' beliefs (Sugirin, 1997). However, as Dole and Smith (1989) point out, when readers possess knowledge that conflicts with the information encountered in text, their existing knowledge can and often does prevail over textual information. Gio's controversial responses to the texts proved a prevalence of prior knowledge and personal belief over textual information.

Another conclusion of the study is that the range of strategies used did not determine the success or failure of a reader's attempts to comprehend a text. Rather, it was the maximum utilisation of the appropriate strategies selected that made the reader's attempts successful. This differs to some extent from Block's (1986) claim that more proficient readers used more strategies more frequently. Perhaps more proficient readers were more able to use a wider range of strategies if required. However, readers such as Dan and Lat did not need to use a number of low-level strategies that other readers might have needed to use.

While comprehending texts of different types required different strategies and strategy use, the same text might require different strategies if the purposes of reading or the tasks following reading were different. This confirmed the finding in Taillefer's (1996) study that the cognitive complexity of tasks influences the strategies used by the readers in comprehending the given texts.

This chapter has further discussed findings of the study presented in Chapter Five. The next chapter presents the conclusions of the present study.
Chapter Seven

CONCLUSION

7.0 Introduction

This thesis set out to study the strategies used by fifteen above average EFL readers in comprehending texts written in English. The study was justified in terms of its attempts to look at the process (i.e. the reading comprehension strategies) to balance the ubiquity of the product-oriented practice of teaching reading in TEFLIN, which may hamper the achievement of the overall TEFLIN goals.

The key research questions set out in Chapter One, which were considered in subsequent chapters were:

1. What strategies did above-average English as a foreign language readers in this study use in comprehending texts written in English?
2. What did these readers do when they had comprehension problems?
3. How were the strategies used by these readers?
4. Was strategy use related to results of comprehension measures?
5. Did the readers apply the same range of strategies?

In order to answer these questions, a mixed method approach to the research was adopted. To reveal the strategies used by the readers, think-aloud tasks and an in-depth interview were employed and supported by retellings, multiple-choice questions, and observations of the readers' behaviours while performing the tasks. The methodology adopted generated quantitative and qualitative data, but because of the small number of informants involved, parametric statistical analyses of the quantitative data were not appropriate, and this material was analysed using simple frequency counts and nonparametric analysis. The qualitative data were analysed using a grounded theory approach, whereby categories for coding and quantifying
data were derived from an inspection of the data rather than using pre-established category definitions.

In the next section of this chapter, a brief overview of the findings will be presented. The thesis will conclude with reflections on the possible implications of the study, and suggestions for further research.

7.1 Key findings

In this section each of the key questions will be considered and key findings outlined. As the question of strategy use refers to frequency, patterns, and range, the third and fifth research questions will be taken up simultaneously in Section 7.1.3.

7.1.1 What strategies did above-average English as a foreign language readers in this study use in comprehending texts written in English?

The comprehension strategies the readers used were obtained by analysing and coding the readers' think-aloud protocols, using a grounded theory approach (Strauss, 1987) whereby codes were derived from what the readers were doing or were assumed to be doing, and no attempts were made to impose pre-determined codes on the data. However, where it was of help and suited the data, known concepts were adopted or adapted as codes for this study and the codes used were as much as possible selected based on the forms which would be easily recognised by potential readers of this research report.

By combining the lists of the strategies used by the individual readers, it was found that the readers in the present study employed 30 reading comprehension strategies classified into five main categories: information gathering, information processing, comprehension monitoring, text interpretation, and comprehension utilization. Based on cognition, these strategies are classified into low-level and high-level cognitive
strategies, and low-level and high-level metacognitive strategies. The majority of the readers responded to the text mostly in directive mode, and only one reader (Gio) produced a high proportion (22%) of the responses in reflexive mode. The nine most often used strategies and their frequencies were: reading text silently (110), paraphrasing (100), inferring (96), identifying a problem (67), rereading text (66), monitoring comprehension (57), making a self-reflection (55), associating text with prior knowledge (47), and vocalising portion of text (40).

7.1.2. What did these readers do when they had comprehension problems?

The problems the readers encountered were linguistic and non-linguistic. The linguistic problems mainly concerned vocabulary (unfamiliar words) and complex sentence constructions, while the non-linguistic problems concerned logic and understanding different cultural contexts. To overcome vocabulary problems, the readers guessed meaning based on the context, analysed problematic words or phrases, and related them to other parts of the text. To overcome the problems of sentence constructions, they conducted a sentence analysis and established intra- or inter-sentential relations. To overcome problems of culture and logic they reread the text and related it to their linguistic knowledge as well as their limited cultural knowledge and experience, and used guessing strategy as their final resort. Most readers accepted possible cultural differences and kept their inferences open or tentative when they were in doubt, while one reader judged differences as a form of violation without further attempts to understand the information provided in the text.

7.1.3. How were the strategies used by these readers?

The issues of strategy use refer to frequency and patterns (related to the third research question) and range of strategies (related to the fifth research question). As described in Chapter Five, frequency and patterns of strategy use and range of strategies the readers used were obtained from the graphs showing the dynamics of strategy use
(Graphs 5.4.1.1 – 5.4.15.2) and the dynamics of strategy use of the fifteen readers in reading Texts 1 and 2 expressed in codes (Appendix 5.16).

**Frequency of strategy use**

From the nine most often used strategies and their frequencies (Section 7.1.1) it can be seen that, in general, the readers used a large proportion of high-level cognitive strategies (paraphrasing, inferring and associating the text with prior knowledge), a small proportion of low-level cognitive strategies (rereading the text), and a large proportion of low-level metacognitive strategies (identifying a problem, monitoring comprehension, making self-reflections, and vocalising portion of the text). The large proportion of high-level cognitive strategies and the small portion of low-level cognitive strategies the readers used show that, in general, they were effective comprehenders, as they were able to make use of their prior knowledge in order to interpret the text as indicated by inferences and/or paraphrases made. However, the large proportion of low-level metacognitive strategies shows that they were not efficient readers as they had to spend time on strategies that proficient readers would skip. The large proportion of these strategies shows that the readers had to make regressions in order to achieve text comprehension. Similarly, the high frequency of inferring and/or paraphrasing also shows that the readers had to make tentative inferences or paraphrases before confirming their understanding. It may, therefore, be concluded that, for the present study, frequency of strategy use depended on the intensity of the problems a reader encountered. The more serious a problem, the more chances there were for the reader to make regressions or repetitions of a number of selected strategies considered leading to a problem solution.

**Patterns of strategy use**

The finding in Chapter Five and the discussion in Chapter Six indicated that patterns of strategy use were a consequence of the perceived problems the readers encountered. Dan and Lat used simple patterns of strategy use, as they were able to infer the gist or paraphrase the sentence immediately after the first reading. This was
because they were able to make use of their prior linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the world. In contrast, other readers had to make repeated attempts using a number of strategies in order to arrive at a final inference or paraphrase. As suggested in Chapter Six, the six patterns of strategy use presented in Chapter Five basically stemmed from the following patterns:

(1) Reading the text silently – associating the text with prior knowledge – interpreting the text correctly as indicated by a correct inference or paraphrase,

(2) Reading the text silently – identifying a problem – (using intervening strategies) – interpreting the text correctly as indicated by a correct inference or paraphrase, and

(3) Reading the text silently – associating the text with prior knowledge – identifying a problem – (using intervening strategies) – interpreting the text incorrectly as indicated by an incorrect inference or paraphrase.

Note: intervening strategies were strategies that might or might not be used, depending on the reader’s perceived difficulty or need.

Range of strategies
A successful reader knew the appropriate strategies needed and was able to use them appropriately. However, as Chapter Six pointed out, the range of strategies used did not determine a reader’s success or failure in comprehending the text. It was the maximum utilisation of the appropriate strategies selected and used which determined the success or failure of the readers. Similar to the case of strategy patterns, the more complex a reader’s perceived comprehension difficulty was, the higher the range of strategies used.

It may be inferred that frequency and patterns of strategy use and range of strategies used were influenced by:
• prior knowledge (linguistic and cultural knowledge and knowledge of the world),
• perceived difficulty of text, and
• purposes of reading or tasks involved following reading.

Meanwhile, choice of strategies appears to be influenced by:
• different text types
• different tasks
• different purposes for reading

7.1.4 Strategy use and results of comprehension measures

It was mentioned in Chapter Three that the retellings of the text content and the multiple-choice reading comprehension test had been intended to measure text comprehension. Chapter Six suggested that reading comprehension strategy use was responsible for the success or failure of the readers of the present study as indicated by the total scores of the multiple-choice test and the retellings. However, only certain conditions of strategy use resulted in successful text comprehension.

Chapter Five summarised that productive strategy use was a consequence of economy, balance, flexibility, predictiveness, consistency and direction, interpretation, and integration, while unproductive strategy use resulted from inefficiency, reflexiveness, and fragmentation. As the examples given in Section 5.9 of Chapter Five show, while using a number of strategies reflecting characteristics of unproductive strategies, hence characteristics of poor readers, the readers in the present study also shared characteristics of productive or good readers. A number of readers with average language proficiency obtained high total scores on the multiple-choice test and the retellings through effective use of comprehension strategies, while a number of readers with high language proficiency failed to maximise their potential.
7.1.5 Strategy use and text types

The study has shown that, while different types of text required the use of different strategies, the same text also required different strategies if the tasks involved were different. Thus, text types influenced strategy use, but the anticipated tasks involved following reading also determined strategy use. In addition, as mentioned earlier, the perceived difficulty of the text determined the complexity of strategy use. Strategy use in reading Text 2 was more complicated than that in reading Text 1. As a number of readers claimed, books on linguistics were more difficult than books on education. Consequently the strategy use in reading books on linguistics would be more complex than that in reading books on education.

7.2 The possible implications of the study

This was a small-scale study involving fifteen student-teachers of English as a foreign language in Indonesia, and it is necessary to be cautious in drawing implications. However, Chapters Five and Six have shown that, because of the large amount of diverse data gathered, this study contributes to the understanding of how English as a foreign language readers comprehended texts written in English and provides some implications for EFL reading programs and reading comprehension research.

7.2.1 Pedagogical implications

As reading comprehension strategies contributed to successful text comprehension, strategy training should be part of and embedded within reading instruction. As productive strategy use was a consequence of economy, balance, flexibility, predictiveness, consistency and direction, interpretation, and integration, there is a need not merely to teach strategies as such, but rather to teach flexibility in strategy use and other characteristics of productive strategy use.
Based on the sources of comprehension problems the readers in this study encountered, it is recommended that teachers of EFL reading should consider the following:

- the provision of a range of texts of different difficulty levels,
- the range of degrees of prior knowledge assumed by the texts,
- the range of cultural knowledge assumed,
- the range of different text types provided in the curriculum,
- the range of tasks involved, and
- the range of purposes for reading.

Although the informants in the present study were all above average readers, there were individual variations in their strategy use. This is a reminder that teachers of reading should treat all students as individuals with their own individual skills, beliefs, and preferred strategies.

7.2.2 Research implications

The large amount of diverse data gathered from this study has contributed to the understanding of how the EFL readers in the present study comprehended texts written in English. However, given the small number of informants, it is necessary to be cautious in drawing research implications. Two issues may be worth considering for further research: methods and reading instruction.

7.2.2.1 Research methods

The think-aloud method is fruitful, but as there are many things to be reported in a short time, parts of the thought processes may not be revealed. An interview proved an appropriate and useful complement to the think-aloud method. Similar contributions have been made by the use of other complementary methods such as retellings and observations. However, another study with a larger cohort is needed to
verify the results of the present study. In addition, further research should be conducted to devise and develop other complementary methods to maximise the benefits obtained from the use of the think-aloud protocol studies.

7.2.2.2 Reading instruction

The paucity of research in the reading process in English as a foreign language in Indonesia (EFLIN) is, among others, due to the common practice of focusing reading instruction on training students to answer questions rather than asking the students to read. In other words, the teachers focus most of their attention on the product of reading - the comprehension, and neglect the process - the comprehending (Djiwandono, 1993; Parera, 1997). Therefore, a vast area of research is open on reading instruction. The issues range from the EFLIN teachers’ perceptions of what constitutes good reading to issues directly related to the teachers’ practice in encouraging learners to learn to read.

7.3 Achievements and limitations of the study

This study set out with the assumption that attention to process/strategies was important to the development of independent reading ability. The study has attempted to use both quantitative and qualitative data within a case study approach, and a deliberate decision was taken to have the informants read in an experimental condition but with the manipulation of context minimised.

The small size of the group and the different data collection approaches used mean that the study has generated a large set of “densely textured facts” (Geertz, 1973:28), and the researcher came to know and understand the informants well. The study has established that understanding the reading process is important to reading instruction, and the total reading process must be taken into account if we are to understand reading and help students to develop into independent and competent readers. With
all its limitations, the study has managed to provide a great deal of information about the comprehension strategies used by the EFL readers participating in the present study.

Despite its achievements, the present study has a number of limitations. While the small number of informants made the generalization of the results inappropriate, the large amount of data generated and space limitations for the thesis did not allow for deep analysis of the data pertaining to individual readers. Although the readers in the present study fell into the categories of successful and less successful readers, they were all above average readers among their peers. Consequently, direct comparison between these readers and average or below average readers could not be conducted.

While another study to verify the results of the present study is needed, the next study should involve samples of readers from all levels of language proficiency.

7.5 Conclusion

This study has been conducted within a context in which traditional views of reading instruction are being increasingly contested. Until relatively recently, reading instruction has been seen as a means of testing the students' comprehension rather than developing their skills of comprehending (Bamford & Day, 1998; Djiwandono, 1993; Nuttall, 1989; Parea, 1997). The study has attempted to bridge these two views. Product and process are both considered important in the development of independent reading ability.

The study might appear to be disappointing for lecturers who spend a great deal of time focusing on product (testing the students) and used reading instruction as a means of developing language proficiency. However, in another sense, the findings are positive. The product (comprehension) can, in fact, be used as a means of examining the process (comprehending), and language proficiency is central to
reading. Comprehension is indeed central to reading, but that centrality does not depend merely on language proficiency as frequently assumed. The present study has shown how the use of reading comprehension strategies contributed to the success of text comprehension. Therefore, strategy training should be part of and embedded within reading instruction. Min's statement that she learned something new about the meaning of a "double negative" construction during the discussion of test answers shows that such a discussion can serve as a simple form of fruitful comprehension strategy training. The pedagogical implications outlined above may be worthwhile considering for the purpose of strategy training.

The study does not make any pretension to claim to have revealed a complete picture of the strategies the above average EFL readers used, but the findings may have laid a ground or opened a path for further research studies. The research implications suggested earlier may serve as a reference for those interested in following up the present study.
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Ulungpandang under control

Thousands of troops and police were seen standing on alert along the streets throughout the day. Business centers and schools remained closed as shock and fear overwhelmed most parts of the city.

Thousands rioted on Monday night and Tuesday following the murder of a 9-year-old girl identified as Ann Mujahidah Baisullah by an ethnic Chinese youth identified as Benny, who was later declared to be mentally ill.

Benny was also killed in retaliation by a mob. Many residents placed placards and wooden planks in front of their homes and shops yesterday saying they were Moslems or indigenous people. Others displayed either their praying mats (sajadah) or clothes to notify they were Moslems.

A small number of drivers who had the courage to drive through town were also seen showing sajadah through their car windows.

Fire continued to raze shops on JI. Irjan, JI. Urip Sumohardjo and JI. Nusantara yesterday afternoon. Witnesses said some shops were often left burning as fire departments ran out of water to extinguish the fires.

Masses of people shrugged off tight security measures around Karetboni soccer field trying to force themselves to the ethnic Chinese district.

But the security forces managed to keep them at bay.

Separately, angry students of the Alauddin state-run Islamic Institute launched a demonstration at their campus yesterday. Witnesses said security forces opened fire after the mob began to burn rubber stacks.

Chief of the provincial police Brig. Gen. Ali Hanafi told a press conference later on the day that eight people were wounded in the incident. Hanafi said they included a fireman who was shot by accident as he was extinguishing the fire.

There were no reports of casualties.

Hanafi said yesterday that as of Tuesday, eight night clubs, a Buddhist temple, a Protestant church, 25 shops, 10 cars and 68 motorcycles were burned.

Another 67 cars, 100 motorcycles and 1,471 shops were damaged, he added.

Death toll

According to Ali, the death toll in the riot aftermath increased to six when the remains of two women at a razed pub on JI. Nusantara were found yesterday.

Hanafi said as of yesterday over 200 people had been questioned, but 70 of them have been released. Most of them were detained for their alleged role in the riots and looting. "Those who are found guilty will face legal procedures," Hanafi said.

Hanafi made his statement yesterday during a press

(The Jakarta Post, Thursday, September 18, 1997, page 1)
Appendix 4.2

Texts for the actual think-aloud tasks

Text 1

(Quoted from *Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL*
by Deborah Phillips, 1996, pp. 62-3)

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American educational system was desperately in need of reform. Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment that children who would grow up to be laborers should not “waste” their time on education but should instead prepare themselves for their life’s work. It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task. Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated. As Superintendent of Education in the state of Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848, he initiated various changes, which were soon matched in other school districts around the country. He extended the school year from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system, they at least increased public awareness as to the need for a further strengthening of the system.
There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species of the animal kingdom. Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificates issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths had risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. However, generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.
Appendix 4.3

Multiple-Choice test for trial-testing texts and test items

Directions:
In this section you will read two passages. Each one is followed by a number of questions about it. You are to choose the one best answer, (A), (B), (C), or (D), to each question. Then on your answer sheet, find the number of the question and put a cross on the letter that corresponds to the answer you have chosen.

Answer all questions about the information in a passage on the basis of what is stated or implied in that passage.

Text 1

(Quoted from Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American educational system was desperately in need of reform. Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment that children who would grow up to be laborers should not "waste" their time on education but should instead prepare themselves for their life's work. It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task. Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated. As Superintendent of Education in the state of Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848, he initiated various changes, which were soon matched in other school districts around the country. He extended the school year from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system, they at least increased public awareness as to the need for a further strengthening of the system.

Questions 1-9 refer to Text 1

01. Which of the following would be the most appropriate title for the passage?
   (A) A fight for change
   (B) Nineteenth-Century Reform
   (C) American Education
   (D) The beginnings of Reform in American Education

02. It is implied in the passage that to go to a private school, a student needed:
   (A) a high level of intelligence
   (B) a strong educational background
   (C) good grades
   (D) a lot of money
03. The word “sentiment” in line 3 is closest in meaning to
   (A) action
   (B) opinion
   (C) sensation
   (D) disagreement

04. Why is the word “waste” in line 4 punctuated in this manner?
   (A) The author wants to emphasize how much time was wasted on education.
   (B) The author is quoting someone else who said that education was a waste of time.
   (C) The author thinks that education is not really a waste of time.
   (D) The author does not want students to waste their time on education.

05. What are “reformers” in line 6?
   (A) People who try to change things for the better
   (B) People who really enjoy teaching
   (C) People who believe that education is wasted
   (D) People who work for the government

06. According to the passage, why did Horace Mann want a better educational system for Americans?
   (A) Education at the time was so cheap.
   (B) In a republic, all citizens should be educated.
   (C) People had nothing else to do except go to school.
   (D) Massachusetts residents needed something to do with their spare time.

07. The word “initiated” in line 8 is closest in meaning to
   (A) regretted
   (B) broadened
   (C) overturned
   (D) started

08. The word “matched” in line 9 could be best replaced by
   (A) observed
   (B) equaled
   (C) fitted
   (D) burnt

09. According to the passage, which of the following is a change that Horace Mann instituted?
   (A) Better teacher training
   (B) Increased pay for students
   (C) The five-month school year
   (D) The matching of other districts’ policies
There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species in the animal kingdom.

Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificate issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths has risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer.

However, generally it would seem probable that population increase, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.

Questions 10-17 refer to Text 2

10. What is the main topic of the passage?
   (A) Diseases of the heart
   (B) Diseases of old age
   (C) Fatal diseases
   (D) The health of the aged in California

11. Which category of society is the most likely to contract a cardiovascular disease?
   (A) Politicians
   (B) Street workers
   (C) People of middle-age
   (D) People of advanced years

12. When was coronary heart disease first diagnosed?
   (A) After the eighteenth century
   (B) Before the eighteenth century
   (C) In 1942
   (D) In the eighteenth century

13. What causes the disease?
   (A) Poor blood circulation
   (B) Stress
   (C) Old age
   (D) Blocked arteries

14. Which answer could best replace the word "authorities" in line 9?
   (A) Police
   (B) Government officials
   (C) Medical experts
   (D) Demographers
15. Why is cardiovascular disease considered a "modern epidemic"?
   (A) Because of new diagnostic methods and improved treatment
   (B) Because of increased awareness and publicity
   (C) Because some believe it is more common today
   (D) Because cardiovascular disease is more common than all forms of cancer

16. What are the statistics relating to the disease based on?
   (A) Publicity given by the media
   (B) Registered fatalities
   (C) Advanced diagnostic methods
   (D) The estimates of doctors

17. How widespread is the disease today compared to the situation during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?
   (A) More common
   (B) Less common
   (C) Equally common
   (D) Uncertain
Appendix 4.4

Item analysis of the MC test result, ITEMAN (tm) Version 3.00 (1988)

MicroCAT (tm) Testing System
Copyright (c) 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988 by Assessment Systems Corporation

Item and Test Analysis Program -- ITEMAN (tm) Version 3.00

Item analysis for data from file data2.dat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>A 0.102</td>
<td>-0.390</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.119</td>
<td>-0.527</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.119</td>
<td>-0.332</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.661</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.507 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>A 0.169</td>
<td>-0.756</td>
<td>-0.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.102</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.051</td>
<td>-0.579</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.678</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.576 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>A 0.119</td>
<td>-0.625</td>
<td>-0.383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.492</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.281 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.186</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.203</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>A 0.186</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.203</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.407</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.342 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.203</td>
<td>-0.513</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>A 0.678</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.535 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.051</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.169</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td>-0.457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.102</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>A 0.068</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.712</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.396 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.102</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.119</td>
<td>-0.625</td>
<td>-0.383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>A 0.085</td>
<td>-0.636</td>
<td>-0.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.119</td>
<td>-0.430</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.102</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.695</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.522 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>A 0.288</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>B 0.169</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.407</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>D 0.136</td>
<td>-0.346</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHECK THE KEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B was specified, C works better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 0.723</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 0.051</td>
<td>-0.888</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.085</td>
<td>-0.428</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.136</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 0.525</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 0.085</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.136</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.237</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.017</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 0.068</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 0.102</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.220</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.593</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.017</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 0.068</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 0.254</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.153</td>
<td>-0.359</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.508</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.017</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 0.051</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 0.034</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.085</td>
<td>-0.844</td>
<td>-0.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.831</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td>-9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 0-13  0.831  0.500  0.337

14 0-14  0.576  0.205  0.163

A 0.153 -0.140 -0.092
B 0.220 -0.151 -0.108
C 0.576 0.205 0.163  
D 0.051 -0.023 -0.011
Other 0.000 -9.000 -9.000
### Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>A 0.220</td>
<td>0.045 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.153</td>
<td>0.134 0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.356</td>
<td>0.371 0.288 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.271</td>
<td>-0.552 -0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000 -9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>A 0.271</td>
<td>0.111 0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.288</td>
<td>0.515 0.388 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.339</td>
<td>-0.497 -0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.102</td>
<td>-0.172 -0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000 -9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>A 0.542</td>
<td>0.036 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.119</td>
<td>-0.234 -0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.136</td>
<td>-0.079 -0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 0.203</td>
<td>0.171 0.120 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.000</td>
<td>-9.000 -9.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 59 examinees in the data file.

Scale Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Examinees</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>6.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>2.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skew</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>1.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean P</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Item-Tot.</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Biserial</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores for examinees from file data2.dat
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Appendix 4.5
Revised MC test for the actual comprehension assessment

**Directions:**
In this section you will read two passages. Each one is followed by a number of questions about it. You are to choose the one best answer, (A), (B), (C), or (D), to each question. Then on your answer sheet, find the number of the question and put a cross on the letter that corresponds to the answer you have chosen.

Answer all questions about the information in a passage on the basis of what is stated or implied in that passage.

**Text 1**

(Quoted from *Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL* by Deborah Phillips, 1996, pp. 62-3)

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American educational system was desperately in need of reform. Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment that children who would grow up to be laborers should not “waste” their time on education but should instead prepare themselves for their life’s work. It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task. Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated. As Superintendent of Education in the state of Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848, he initiated various changes, which were soon matched in other school districts around the country. He extended the school year from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system, they at least increased public awareness as to the need for a further strengthening of the system.

**Questions 1-8 refer to Text 1**

01. Which of the following would be the most appropriate title for the passage?
   (A) A fight for change
   (B) Nineteenth-Century Reform
   (C) American Education
   (D) The beginnings of Reform in American Education
02. It is implied in the passage that to go to a private school, a student needed
   (A) a high level of intelligence
   (B) a strong educational background
   (C) good grades
   (D) a lot of money

03. The word “sentiment” in line 3 is closest in meaning to
   (A) action
   (B) opinion
   (C) sensation
   (D) disagreement

04. Why is the word “waste” in line 4 punctuated in this manner?
   (A) The author wants to emphasize how much time was wasted on education.
   (B) The author is quoting someone else who said that education was a waste of time.
   (C) The author thinks that education is not really a waste of time.
   (D) The author does not want students to waste their time on education.

05. What are “reformers” in line 6?
   (A) People who try to change things for the better
   (B) People who really enjoy teaching
   (C) People who believe that education is wasted
   (D) People who work for the government

06. According to the passage, why did Horace Mann want a better educational system for Americans?
   (A) Education at the time was so cheap.
   (B) In a republic, all citizens should be educated.
   (C) People had nothing else to do except go to school.
   (D) Massachusetts residents needed something to do with their spare time.

07. The word “initiated” in line 9 is closest in meaning to
   (A) regretted
   (B) broadened
   (C) overturned
   (D) started

08. According to the passage, which of the following is a change that Horace Mann instituted?
   (A) Better teacher training
   (B) increased pay for students
   (C) The five-month school year
   (D) The matching of other districts’ policies
Text 2

(Quoted from *The Penguin Practice Book for the TOEFL Test*
by Daniel De Souza, 1996, p. 26)

There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases, the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species of the animal kingdom. Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificates issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths had risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. However, generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.

Questions 9-16 refer to Text 2

09. What is the main topic of the passage?
   (A) Diseases of the heart
   (B) Diseases of old age
   (C) Fatal diseases
   (D) The health of the aged in California

10. Which category of society is the most likely to contract a cardiovascular disease?
   (A) Politicians
   (B) Street workers
   (C) People of middle-age
   (D) People of advanced years

11. When was coronary heart disease first diagnosed?
   (A) After the eighteenth century
   (B) Before the eighteenth century
   (C) In 1942
   (D) In the eighteenth century
12. What causes the disease?
   (A) Poor blood circulation
   (B) Stress
   (C) Old age
   (D) Blocked arteries

13. Which answer could best replace the word “authorities” in line 9?
   (A) Police
   (B) Government officials
   (C) Medical experts
   (D) Demographers

14. Why is cardiovascular disease considered a “modern epidemic”?
   (A) Because of new diagnostic methods and improved treatment
   (B) Because of increased awareness and publicity
   (C) Because some believe it is more common today
   (D) Because cardiovascular disease is more common than all forms of cancer

15. What are the statistics relating to the disease based on?
   (A) Publicity given by the media
   (B) Registered fatalities
   (C) Advanced diagnostic methods
   (D) The estimates of doctors

16. How widespread is the disease today compared to the situation during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?
   (A) More common
   (B) Less common
   (C) Equally common
   (D) Uncertain
Appendix 4.6

Retelling Checklists

Text 1

Theme: The beginnings of reform in American education

Main idea:
In the nineteenth century the significant educational reformer, Horace Mann, opposed the idea that the majority of children did not need education.

Supporting details:
1. The prevailing belief was that children who would become labourers did not need education
2. There were private schools for the rich and very few public schools
3. As Superintendent of Education in Massachusetts Mann gave the reforming lead which was followed in other districts
4. The reforms were realised in longer school year; better teacher education and better salaries for teachers
5. As a result there was a positive change of public opinion.

Text 2

Theme: Coronary heart disease, a fatal disease

Main idea:
Probably the apparent rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate is actually a consequence of population increases, improved life expectancy and more accurate diagnosis and death certification.

Supporting details:
1. Coronary heart disease is well known and widespread
2. It is a disease mainly of the aged, but can attack the middle-aged and the young.
3. Humans and animals can suffer from the artery blocks which cause the illness.
4. The illness was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century.
5. Some doctors call it “modern epidemic.”
6. From 1942 to 1962 in California there was a five-fold increase in deaths certified as being caused by the disease.
7. Twice as many deaths are caused by this disease than by cancer.
Appendix 4.7
Answer sheet for the MC test

**Answer Sheet**

**NAME:** ........................................

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JAKARTA (JP): The hazardous level of haze caused by forest fires in Indonesia has prompted a joint response by neighboring countries offering over a thousand volunteers and water bombers to help quench the blaze.

Malaysia will send 1,210 volunteers to Sumatra and another 210 to Kalimantan to combat fires on the two giant islands, Indonesian Coordinating Minister for People’s Welfare Azwar Anas said here yesterday.

The Malaysian government has also offered three C-130 Hercules planes to take part in cloud-seeding operations with the Indonesian Air Force.

“President Soeharto welcomes Malaysia’s assistance to help us face this disaster,” he said at Merdeka Palace.

Separately, deputy secretary of the National Disaster Management Coordinating Board Hernowo Hadiwonogo said Thailand had also offered to send two water bomber aircraft.

“Normally, we never ask for assistance, but we will consider it when there are offers. Our policy is that we don’t ask,” he told The Jakarta Post at the board’s command post yesterday.

Hernowo also said that the haze caused by forest fires in the last three months had prompted four provinces in Kalimantan and Sumatra—the worst disaster-stricken areas—to declare a condition of first alert.

“First alert doesn’t mean a state of emergency, however. It means that the situation in the respective areas is dangerous,” he said of the provinces of Riau, Jambi, South Kalimantan and West Kalimantan.

He said that reports on losses caused by the fires and the haze have yet to be determined, but the health conditions of people in the affected areas are “increasingly becoming poorer”.

The government has not declared this year’s forest fires a “national disaster”, but only a “disaster”.

Some 300,000 hectares of forests are reportedly ablaze. The thick smoke has enveloped several areas including neighboring countries.

Malaysia is one of the worst hit areas with health effects of the haze reaching previous levels.

Azwar, also chairman of the National Coordinating Board for Disaster Prevention, said most of the Malaysian volunteers would leave for Dumai, Riau, next week. Another 210 would standby in Kuching and Sabah ready to be sent to Kalimantan at anytime.

Choking

The worsening situation has forced West Kalimantan Governor Aspar Aswin to suggest the possibility of closing schools in the province starting tomorrow.

“But we need approval from the Minister of Education and Culture,” Antara quoted Aspar as saying. A very thick fog has also enveloped Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, where visibility is less than 50 meters.

At least 21 students were rushed to a hospital yesterday for breathing difficulties after attending a weekly morning flag-raising ceremony at school.

Local authorities have called for children under 5 years old and the elderly to stay indoors. People in Pekanbaru, Riau, apparently do not realize the full extent of the smoke’s effects, as only a few were seen

(The Jakarta Post, Tuesday, September 23, 1997, page 1)
Appendix 4.9

Book section used as text in the in-depth interview

1.3 Learner-Centred Curriculum Development

This work differs from other publications in that it provides a theoretical and empirical rationale for learner-centred curriculum development within an adult ESL context. Such a curriculum will contain similar elements to those contained in traditional curriculum development, that is, planning (including needs analysis, goal and objective setting), implementation (including methodology and materials development) and evaluation (see for example Hunkins 1980).

However, the key difference between learner-centred and traditional curriculum development is that, in the former, the curriculum is a collaborative effort between teachers and learners, since learners are closely involved in the decision-making process regarding the content of the curriculum and how it is taught.

This change in orientation has major practical implications for the entire curriculum process, since a negotiated curriculum cannot be introduced and managed in the same way as one which is prescribed by the teacher or teaching institutions. In particular, it places the burden for all aspects of curriculum development on the teacher.

In a curriculum based on the traditional ends–means model, a fixed series of steps is followed. Thus, in the curriculum planning process proposed by Taba (1962), planning, implementation and evaluation occur in sequential order, and most of the key decisions about aims and objectives, materials and methodology are made before there is any encounter between teacher and learner.

(Nunan, 1988, page 2)
## Observation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>When/Related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvocalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression/reread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing at text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding head/nose, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing of relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frowning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking text sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.11

Personal Information Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar/conference attended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time job:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Translating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guiding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5.1

Lia's Coded Protocol of the first three sentences of Text 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Text</th>
<th>Phenomenal/typical exponents</th>
<th>Mode of response</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American educational system was desperately in need of reform.</td>
<td>(As indicated by researcher's observation note)</td>
<td>[D ...]</td>
<td>Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;It talks about educational system.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I must imagine about education or educational system or about schools.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Here there is the word 'reform'. I should think what is meant by the word 'reform' in the educational system.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;When I read a sentence I think I must understand what it is. May be, if necessary, well, I'll read it again and again, I think.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(As seen from researcher's observation note)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;This sentence seems to suggest that education in Indonesia also needs a reform.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;There is the word desperately.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Idkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;From the word 'desperately', there must be some damage in the system or the condition of the system.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;So I want to know what comes after this sentence. Why should there have been a 'reform'? There must be a reason in the next sentence.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(As indicated by researcher's observation note)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;There is the word 'desperately' but followed by American educational system. Oh, this turned out to be in America.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment that children who would grow up to be laborers should not "waste" their time on education but should instead prepare themselves for their life's work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conf</th>
<th>Monit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal</td>
<td>Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monit</td>
<td>Refstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idkey</td>
<td>Infer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Rdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer</td>
<td>Conf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Um, OK. I think something looks like what happens here. That's right, private schools existed but only for the very rich."

"Um, yeah there is something what happens ... or what, because ... Was it like this in America? I don't know."

"... instead they should prepare themselves for their life."

"I think in Indonesia there is already this; I mean children have to go to school up to junior high, or take Learning Package A, or something alike."

"Wait a minute; this is not clear yet."

"I must repeat it."

"There is this public sentiment."

"Um, it seems there is some solution or something alike in the third sentence."

"So in the second sentence there was a problem, the third sentence solution, then about whom?"

"Um, it was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task."

"Yeah, it means because of this the reformers focus their attention on their work, right?"

"Yeah, that's what it means."

"So I have to see this relation, yeah."
Although the condition (in America) may be like that in Indonesia, I have problems comprehending a text in English.

Here I see 'reform'. Then the second sentence seems to suggest the need to go to school again.

But what happened, um, I am confused here.

Children of the poor seemed to be unable to go to private schools, probably because of a lack of education. The poor lacked awareness of the need for education. Thus reform was needed. They lacked awareness of the need for education. Then they did not know where to send their children.

If I continue with the next sentence, it is in line with what happens here.

The third sentence seems to offer a solution as to how people who had not got the opportunity to go to school or those that had not been aware of the need for education became the concern or task of the reformers, that is, how they were willing to send their children to school.
Appendix 5.1a
Strategy Profile of Reader 1 (Dan)

The early part of this strategy profile, Think-aloud protocol, refers to Graph 5.4.1.1 (The dynamics of strategy use of Reader 1, Dan, in reading Text 1).

**Think-aloud protocol**

In reading the first text, despite the instruction to read it sentence by sentence, Dan started by skimming the whole text before focusing on the first sentence. After reading the text once, he seemed to be in doubt about the gist, reread the sentence silently, made an appropriate inference, related it to his knowledge about the present educational conditions in America, and paraphrased the sentence correctly:

"Ya, setelah membaca,... saya, em, ... melihat atau membayangkan bahwa pada awal abad 19 Amerika itu belum begitu maju dan di bidang pendidikan khususnya. Kemudian, di sisi lain sebalunya saya malah membandingkan dengan keadaan Amerika yang sekarang ini dalam bidang pendidikan yang sudah maju. Di sini tersurat bahwa pada awal abad 19, em, sistem pendidikan di Amerika memerlukan reformasi. (Yeah, after reading, ... I imagine that ... at the beginning of the 19th century America was not so advanced, especially in the field of education. On the other hand, I am comparing it with America today which is highly advanced in education. It is implied here that at the beginning of the 19th century, um, the educational system in America needed reform.)"

As soon as he read the second sentence, he associated it with his knowledge about present-day America, expressed his surprise and questioned the text content, despite his acceptance of the fact of the history without any pretension to anything different:

"Untuk kalimat ke-2 di sini saya agak heran, kenapa sampai terjadi bahwa masyarakat Amerika pada saat itu melihat bahwa pendidikan tidak begitu penting bagi anak-anak, dan mereka menganjurkan anak-anak mereka itu, em, mempersiapkan diri untuk bekerja. Jadi ini bertentangan dengan, em, kesan saya, rakyat Amerika sekarang ini. Sebenarnya saya tidak mengharapkan hal yang lain, karena ini mungkin faktanya yang memang ada. Jadi saya cuma m... membaca sejarah saja sebenarnya. Nggak apa. (For the second sentence, I am a bit surprised here. How was it possible that the American people viewed education as unimportant for children and suggested that children should prepare themselves for life work. So it is contrary to my impression about the American people today. I did not expect anything different, anyway, as this was the fact. So I just read this history. Never mind.)"
Upon reading the third sentence Dan referred to the second sentence and correctly inferred what problems the reformers envisaged, evaluated the text content and justified what the policy maker (Horace Mann) did:

_Keudian kalimat ke-3. Yak, saya mendapat kesan bahwa para pelaku reformasi di sini itu benar-benar melihat bahwa pendidikan memang memang diperlukan. Jadi mereka menganutisipasi pendapat rakyat Amerika yang tersirat dalam kalimat ke-2 tadi. Dan saya kira ini wajar karena orang yang terdidik, atau yang melakukan 'policy' terhadap pendidikan itu memang harus melakukan hal-hal semacam ini. (Then the third sentence. Yeah, I got the impression that the reformers here really saw that education was indeed needed. So they anticipated the American public opinion implied in the second sentence above. And I think this is quite natural because educated people or policy makers in education should take such measures.)_

Moving to the fourth sentence, he read and reread it silently, and evaluated the text content, as can be seen from his agreement with what Horace Mann did. Dan commented:

"... saya sangat senang dengan tindakan dari Horace Mann di sini bahwa dia melakukan tindakan yang nyata." (... I am very pleased that, here, Horace Mann took real measures).

This agreement must have been preceded by his inference on Horace Mann’s views and efforts, because when the researcher asked for clarification, "Tindakan nyata, ya? Maksudnya?" (Real measures. What do you mean?), he said:

_Ya, Jadi dia merasa kecewa sekali dan menganggap rakyat Amerika itu harus terdidik, tidak boleh tidak terdidik. Saya sangat senang dengan pendapat dia. (Yeah. So he was very disappointed and demanded that the American people should be educated. They must not be uneducated. I like his opinion.)_

Then, he made an association with, and reiterated his expectation of conditions in Indonesia, followed by his agreement with Horace Mann’s views:

_Jadi saya juga membayangkan seharusnya di Indonesia juga begitu, saat membaca ini. Ya, Jadi dia merasa kecewa sekali dan menganggap rakyat Amerika itu harus terdidik, tidak boleh tidak terdidik. Saya sangat senang dengan pendapat dia. [On reading this sentence I also imagine that the condition in Indonesia should also be like this. Yes. So he (Mann) was very disappointed and claimed that the American people must be educated. They must not be uneducated. I am pleased with his views.]_

Only after making an evaluation based on his inference about the fifth sentence and that of the previous sentences did Dan point out his understanding of the sentence
when he paraphrased it as follows: “Jadi dia merasa kecewa sekali dan menganggap rakyat Amerika harus terdidik.” (So he was very disappointed and claimed that the Americans must be educated.) And, again, he reflected on conditions in Indonesia when he said, “Jadi saya juga membayangkan seharusnya Indonesia juga begini, saat membaca ini.” (I also thought that Indonesia should be like this, when I read this.)

In reaction to the sixth sentence, he read it silently, inferred the gist appropriately, evaluated the text content, made an association with the conditions in Indonesia and implicitly criticised the Indonesian educational system, while praising Horace Mann’s comprehensive effort:

Di sini masih tentang tindakan dari Horace Mann. Dia begitu bersungguh-sungguh dalam mewujudkan keinginannya untuk menjadikan masyarakat Amerika itu terdidik, dan dia melakukan, em, atau mewujudkan keinginannya sb dengan banyaknya inisiatif yang dia wujudkan dengan perubahan-perubahan yang nantinya akan, em, berarti terhadap keinginan yang ingin dia capai di masyarakat Amerika sb. Em, kemalangan saya membayangkan seharusnya saya kaitkan dengan negara kita, yaitu Indonesia. Orang-orang semacam ini memang perlu sekali. Em, kalau seorang pembuat kebijakan itu, em, menebuskan kebijakannya, juga jangan hanya menargetkan satu hal lagi tujuannya tercapai saja, tapi juga harus memikirkan orang-orang atau apa saja yang akan ikut serta dalam perubahan atau melakukan perubahan sb untuk mencapai tujuannya. Nah di siti dia tidak hanya melakukan perubahan sb tetapi juga meningkatkan kesejahteraan dari orang-orang yang akan menyertainya, yaitu guru. Misaunya, dengan rumit masalah guru sb.

(The second sentence here still concerns measures Horace Mann took. He was very serious in realising his ideals to make the Americans educated through changes he made, which might, eventually, result in the ideals he wished to achieve in the American society. Um, again, I imagine that I should relate this to our own country, Indonesia. People such as Horace Mann are badly needed. Um, when a policy maker makes a policy, he should not think only of the achievement of the target, but he must also consider people or other components involved in making changes in order to achieve the target. Here I see that he did not just make changes but also improved the welfare of the people involved, such as teachers, by raising their salaries.)

Based on his personal observation he indirectly expressed concern about the unfair treatment of teachers in Indonesia when he said:

Di sini saya yakin bahwa guru sb juga akan ikut merasa senang membantu dengan rasa senang ... atau dengan sungguh-sungguh nantinya ... karena dia tidak dihadapkan objek saja, tetapi ia juga dihadapkan orang yang ikut serta melakukan perubahan dan diperhatikan. (Here I believe that teachers will participate whole-heartedly, because they were not only made objects but also subjects of the change, and their well-being received proper attention.)
In response to the concluding sentence, he read and reread it silently, predicted the content based on his general knowledge of the world, paraphrased the gist, and provided an illustration to support his prediction, which demonstrated his evaluative capacity and reflected his involvement in the text:

_Saya sudah memprediksi bahwa akhirnya memang yang terjadi akan sesuai dengan kalimat terakhir ini - bahwa perubahan di bidang pendidikan itu nggak bisa, em, apa namanya ‘instant’, nggak bisa instant, langsung terjadi. Ya, akan diubah itu adalah bukan benda, bukan benda dalam arti merah jadi hijau, tapi adalah pendapat masyarakat yang tidak bisa langsung diubah secara drastis. (I already predicted that, eventually, what happened would be in accordance with this last sentence - that changes in educational sectors cannot be ‘instant’, taking place immediately. Yeah. What was to be changed was not an inanimate thing, not in the sense of changing an inanimate thing from red to green, but a public opinion which could not be drastically changed within a short period of time.)

The accuracy of the expression chosen to illustrate the phenomenon shows Dan’s serious thought given to the text and his expertise in reflecting the thought in language that every listener or reader will find easy to understand. He concluded his comment on the last sentence by summarising his previous comments and paraphrasing the sentence:

_Em, di sini bahwa, dinyatakan bahwa perubahan tsb tidak em, menghasilkan peningkatan yang, em, tiba-tiba dalam sistem pendidikannya. Ya jelas karena sesuai yang saya katakan tadi, memang nggak bisa diubah secara drastis pendapat seseorang. Tapi ada point yang positif di sini yang diperoleh dari tinjauan Horace Mann ini adalah ada suatu peningkatan kesadaran terhadap pendidikan.

(Um, it is stated here that the changes could not result in sudden improvement in the educational system. Yeah, it is obvious, as I said earlier, that one’s opinion could not be changed drastically. However, there was a positive point gained from Horace Mann’s measures, i.e., there was increased awareness about education.)

As can be seen from Graph 5.4.1.2, in regard to the first sentence of Text 2, Dan read it silently, identified the subject of the discussion, interpreted the sentence incorrectly as seen from his disagreement about the content, showed doubt about his interpretation, reread it silently, corrected his misunderstanding and showed his agreement with the content:

_Saya langsung terjut pada ini. Kalau nggak salah ini artinya penyakit jantung koroner. Saya membayangkan orang-orang yang punya penyakit tsb. Tapi saya tidak setuju dengan kalimat pertama yang menyatakan bahwa hanya sedikit orang, mungkin
hanya sedikit orang yang tahu. ... Oh, ya sorry, saya senang dengan kalimat ini karena saya yakin di Indonesia ini, em, sudah banyak yang tahu tentang penyakit koroner. Jadi saya senang. Saya ralat. Jadi saya senang dengan kalimat pertama. (My mind was directly focused on this. If I am not mistaken this means heart disease. I imagine the people who suffer from this disease. But I disagree on the content of the first sentence which says that only few people know about the disease. Oh, I’m sorry, I agree on this sentence, as I believe that, in Indonesia, there have been many people who know about coronary heart disease. So I agree on this. I corrected my earlier comment. I agree on the first sentence.)

In response to the second sentence, he read it silently, associated it with his prior knowledge, paraphrased the first half of the sentence, read aloud a phrase of interest, provided an illustration to justify the text content, and completed the paraphrase:

Saya melihat kaitan kalimat ini dengan hal yang pernah saya dengar, yaitu bahwa penyakit ini tidak memandang batu; kalau mau menyerang langsung saja stupa orang pun akan terteka. Ungkapan "strike president" di sini saya terus membayangkan bahwa Bapak Presiden kita pun mungkin juga akan terteka heart attack. Dan saya dengar almarhumah ibu presiden juga maut karena heart attack. Dan ... ya menarik sekali ini bahwa tidak hanya presiden atau pengusaha, tapi orang-orang kecil yang di jalan-jalan mungkin juga akan terteka "heart attack".

(I saw a relation between this sentence and the information I heard that this disease is no respecter of persons; if it wishes to attack, it may attack anyone. The phrase "strike presidents" here made me imagine that our president may also get a heart attack. And I heard that the late wife of our president also died of a heart attack. And ... this is interesting that this disease attacks not only presidents or authorities but also the ordinary man in the street.)

Moving to the third sentence, he read it silently, related it to the previous sentence, paraphrased the sentence appropriately, provided an illustration, and made a self-reflection:

Ini penyakit ini juga bukan hanya tidak memandang stupa yang akan diserang, tetapi di sini bahwa dia juga tidak memandang umur. Jadi orang yang baru setengah baya, pemuda yang mungkin masih seusia saya ini mungkin juga akan terteka. Di sini dikaitkan ada sebagian kasus yang menimpa the young - yang masih muda. Saya membayangkan bagaimana diri saya kalau kena.

(This disease is not only no respecter of persons but also no respecter of ages. So people of middle age or young people of my age may also be attacked by the disease. It is said here that there were cases in which it attacked the young. I imagine how I would be if I were attacked by this disease.)

In response to the fourth sentence, Dan read it silently, attempted to visualise the problem causing the disease based on the information in the text, made a self-reflection, and paraphrased the sentence correctly:

(I imagine that in the heart there are blocked arteries. I imagine that it is very painful. If the patient is not saved, the consequence can be fatal. I just learned (from this text) that the cause of coronary heart disease is blocked arteries. Another thing I learned is that the blocking of the arteries can occur in some species of animals. So animals can be affected by the disease.)

In response to the fifth sentence, he read it silently, reflected on his strategy by visualising the scene in the cardiovascular section of a hospital, related the text to his prior knowledge, and paraphrased the gist of the sentence incompletely:


(From this I imagine the medical world, particularly in the cardiovascular section, that they make a lot of efforts to help the patients. And from what I heard, which is also stated here, knowledge about coronary heart disease has been so advanced. For example, diagnostic methods and treatment of the patients have been advanced. This medical advancement has also been supported by printed as well as electronic media.)

Moving to the sixth sentence, Dan read it silently, monitored his comprehension, reread it silently, reflected on his strategy by visualizing a scene of a press release, attempted a paraphrase, provided an illustration for clarification, and attempted to complete the paraphrase, but missed a point:

Ehm, ... Di sini dinyatakan bahwa ada beberapa orang yang punya otototis, mungkin mungkin dokter ... yang menyatakan bahwa penyakit jantung koroner itu adalah suatu epidemis yang moderen ... atau wabah moderen. Waktu membaca ini saya membayangkan ada seorang dokter yang melakukan 'press release' begini, di tv atau apa, menyatakan hal ini, menyatakan bahwa jantung koroner itu wabah moderen.

(Uhm, ... It is stated that there are some people who have authorities, for example doctors, who claim that coronary heart disease is a modern epidemic. While reading this sentence I imagined there was a doctor giving a press release on TV, saying that coronary heart disease was a modern epidemic.)
In reaction to the seventh sentence, he read it silently, inferred the gist correctly, and paraphrased the sentence appropriately:

*Kemudian ... saya memboyangkan begitu banyak orang yang mati karena penyakit jantung koroner tah. Di sini dinyatakan bahwa di California pada tahun 1942 ada 18,591 orang meninggal. Jadi banyak orang yang mati karena penyakit ini.*

(Then, I imagine that there were so many people dying of coronary heart disease. It is mentioned here that 18,591 people died of this disease in California in 1942.)

In response to the eighth sentence, he read it silently, kept on imagining the previous scene but switched the focus to numbers or figures, and, based on these figures, paraphrased the gist of the sentence correctly:

*Untuk kalimat selanjutnya, masih sama yang saya boyangkan, yaitu orang-orang yang meninggal karena penyakit itu, tapi di sini dinyatakan bahwa 20 tahun kemudian dari 1942 ini, banyak sekali peningkatan jumlah penderita penyakit jantung koroner yang meninggal.*

(For the next sentence, I still imagined the same scene, that is, that of people dying of the disease, but it is stated here that, twenty years after 1942, there was a great increase in the number of coronary heart disease patients who died.)

Responding to the ninth sentence, he read it silently, paraphrased the gist correctly, and made an appropriate inference about the disease:

*Kemudian, ... ee... saya baru tahu di sini bahwa tiap tahunnya jumlah penderita penyakit jantung yang meninggal itu melebihi dua kali lipat dari yang dinyatakan oleh penyakit kanker. Ternyata memang penyakit jantung lebih membahayakan dibanding penyakit kanker. Saya memboyangkan betapa bahayanya penyakit jantung.*

(Then, ... ah ... I just found out here that every year the number of cardiovascular disease patients who died was more than twice those due to cancer. I imagine how dangerous this disease is.)

Responding to the last sentence, Dan read it silently, monitored his comprehension, reread it silently, attempted a paraphrase incorrectly, identified a difficult phrase and vocalised it, monitored his comprehension, revocalised the phrase, reflected his confusion, monitored his comprehension, and attempted to paraphrase the gist of the sentence unsuccessfully:

*Ee, ... Di sini ada kesimpulan yang menyatakan bahwa ada kemungkinan bahwa dengan meningkatnya jumlah penduduk ... akan meningkatkan tingkat harapan hidup. Dan lebih tepatnya lagi, pendekatan diagnosis yang tepat dan death certification. Saya nggak tahu arti "certification" di sini. Ya, "death certification" nggak tahu. Secara
Retellings

Dan's retelling of the first text was brief but complete, containing the theme, the main idea and 80% of the details. A half point was missing from the early part of the text when he said:

Walaupun banyak private school yang berdiri di sana, tapi masyarakat memandang bahwa untuk menjadi buruh anak-anak itu tidak perlu ... menghabiskan waktunya untuk ... pendidikan secara formal. (Although there were many private schools, the public viewed that to be labourers' children did not need to waste their time on formal education.)

Dan failed to mention the existence of the few public schools but this failure did not seem to interfere with the logical flow of his thought. His use of the term 'formal education', in fact, made the meaning of his reconstructed text more comprehensible than the original text. The implication of his retelling is that rather than wasting time on formal education, children should prepare themselves for work through non-formal or informal education.

He missed another half point of the detail because did not mention where and when Mann started the changes (in Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848) which were soon matched in other school districts. However, the absence of these points did not disrupt the storyline and the expression of the main idea of the text. Apparently, he was able to distinguish the important points from the less important ones. Other than retelling the content of the text, he also evaluated it when he said:

Perubahan tsb memang dilakukan oleh Horace Mann, dan dia melakukannya dengan bijaksana, yaitu dengan memperhatikan orang-orang yang akan menyetujuiya dalam mewujudkan keinginannya tsb, yaitu di sini misalnya ... guru. Guru ditingkatkan gajinya, sehingga mungkin dia mengharapkan guru itu akan mendukung dengan sepenuh hati dan sungguh-sungguh.

(These changes were made by Horace Mann, and they were conducted wisely, by paying attention to teachers - the people who would be involved in the realization of his ideals - so that they would give their full support to the program).
The content of Dan’s retelling of Text 1 is consistent with his comprehension of the text content in the think-aloud task. While informants were free to talk in English, Indonesian, or Indonesian and English, Dan’s responses, which were expressed fully in Indonesian, gave a strong indication that he really comprehended the text.

Like his retelling of Text 1, Dan’s retelling of Text 2 was relatively complete, covering the theme, the main idea, and 71 per cent of the details. Despite the information given before rereading the whole text that he was expected to retell as much as he could remember about the text, Dan missed 29 per cent of the details. Instead of mentioning “a five-fold increase” in deaths due to the disease, he mentioned that there was a great increase in the death rates. The absence of figures in his retelling apparently shows that he paid more attention to the gist than the details. However, the rereading time given seemed to improve his comprehension, as he revised his earlier comprehension of the concluding sentence, which contained the main idea of the text:

\textit{Kemudian, ... saya ingin meralat pemahaman saya tadi. Em, harapan hidup ... tingkat harapan hidup, jadi tingkat harapan hidup, kemudian peningkatan jumlah penduduk dan angka-angka yang menyatakan sebanyak banyak yang meninggal karena penyakit jantung koroner itu ... seharusnya dijadikan acuan kalau kita ingin melihat faktor penyebab peningkatan angka kematian dari jantung koroner ini.}

(Then, I want to revise my comprehension earlier. Um, life expectancy, then population increases and figures showing the numbers of people dying of coronary heart disease should be used as a reference if we want to see factors causing the increase of death rate due to coronary heart disease.)

Despite the incompleteness of Dan’s retelling of Text 2, his revision of his miscomprehension of the last sentence contributed to the presence of the main idea, which shows his pursuit of the gist. This last sentence posed problems related to sentence construction, logic, and prior knowledge to most readers. While a number of other readers remained puzzled by the last sentence, Dan ultimately obtained a correct inference of its essence, and paraphrased the sentence correctly.

Although they were stated in different parts of the retelling, Dan provided two pieces of information indicating the complete theme of the text:
While the first piece of the information indicates Dan's understanding that coronary heart disease dominates the discussion in the text, the fact that it is a fatal disease was inferred from the words "sangat berbahaya" (very dangerous) and his awareness that, based on the number of annual deaths, coronary heart disease was twice as dangerous as cancer. However, as Dan did not manage to integrate these two pieces of information into a single statement, he did not obtain a full score of 4. Instead, he obtained a score of 3 for the theme.

In addition to retelling the text, Dan also offered his personal comment on the text, which was also relevant to the topic:

Kalau saya boleh komentar, bacaan ini seharusnya menjadi 'warning' bagi orang-orang sibuk yang kurang memperhatikan olahraga dan pola makan, terutama keseimbangan gizi. Lemak perlu, tapi terlalu banyak kan nggak baik.

(If I may give my comment, I want to say that this text should be a 'warning' for the busy people who do not pay adequate attention to physical exercises and eating patterns, especially balanced nutrition. Fat is needed, but too much fat is not good.)

This was a consistent sign of his being one of the good readers in this study.

**In-depth interview: Discussion on the multiple-choice test answers**

Out of the 16 questions in the multiple-choice test Dan got 14 questions correct. The discussion of the test result reveals that almost all of the correct answers given were based on firm comprehension, not merely lucky guessing. The reasons for choosing the answers were reiteration of, inference from, or development of his understanding in the think-aloud tasks and retellings. The reasons for not choosing the distracters also confirmed his comprehension and demonstrated his reasoning ability. Although
peripheral to the main research issues, certainly Dan's test-wiseness strategies (Cohen, 1998:219) played an important role in completing the test and giving reasons for choosing the answers. When a guessing strategy was used, it was based on context and consideration of the meaning of the passage as a whole. His interpretation of the meaning of a word, which was slightly different from the meaning intended by the author, could have distracted his attention from the correct option, but it was not the case. For example, for Question no. 3 (What does the word 'sentiment' in the first paragraph mean?), he said "... 'strong sentiment' saya anggap suatu pendapat yang sentimen, ...." (I consider 'strong sentiment' as 'sentimental opinion' ....). And when asked about the other options he said:

Kalau A jelas tidak sesuai, karena "action" itu suatu tindakan, Yang C kemungkinan memang "sensasi", tapi saya menganggap kurang ... kurang .... "it's not match."
Kemudian D - disagreement, ketidak ... tidak setuju, ... ketidaksetujuan, ... menentang, pertentangan. Saya kira nggak sesuai kalau dimasukkan dalam kalimat di situ.

(i is clearly inappropriate, as 'action' is a measure. C may be 'sensation', but I think it does not match. Then. D - disagreement, disagree = disagreement, contradict - contradiction. I think it won't fit as a slot in the sentence.)

In short, the answer would not be "action", "sensation", or "disagreement". He said that it could be "sensation", but it would not match the context so that he was firm with his choice for the option "opinion".

Dan recognised that the author's intention to use punctuation marks for the word "waste" was to emphasise some meaning:

Em. Memang ada hal yang ingin ditekankan oleh penulis ini tentang kata "waste" di sini. Jadi dia menganggap ini hal yang tidak benar. Sebenarnya pendidikan memang bukan "wasting of time", ... menurut penulis di sini. Jadi dia me... memberi tekanan pada kata "waste". Jadi jawaban saya adalah jawaban yang C.

(Em. Indeed there is something the author wants to emphasise on the word "waste" here. So he considers this (that education is a waste of time) is not true. Education is truly not wasting of time, according to the author here. The author gives an emphasis on the word "waste". Therefore, my answer is C.)

These last two examples also show that Dan's word attack skills were of high quality.

The development of Dan's comprehension of the text also occurred during the discussion session of the interview. In answer to question no. 8 (According to the
passage, which of the following is a change Horace Mann instituted?), initially Dan chose option D (The matching of other districts’ policies), but switched to A (Better teacher training) after a reason was demanded for choosing the preferred option. He did not seem to have paid enough attention to the sentence containing the phrase ‘instituting teacher education’. Both his think-aloud protocols and retelling did not mention this phrase. It could be because he did not comprehend the phrase fully or because he considered it peripheral to the meaning of the sentence as a whole. The inaccurate option he initially chose indicates that the former reason, that Dan did not comprehend the phrase fully, is most likely to be the case. It is further evidence that the interview confirms the validity of the think-aloud protocol and the retellings.

It was revealed in the discussion that Dan interpreted “people of advanced years” (the fourth option following Question 10) as “modern people”. This made the researcher assume that his silence about the phrase “advancing age” in the think-aloud task might have been due to his uncertainty about its meaning, so that he just mentioned the middle-age and the young as the groups with the heart attack potentials. However, after seeing the option, he referred to the text and, probably remembering his inference in his think-aloud task, stated:

*Ini penyakit ini juga bukan hanya tidak memandang siapa yang akan diserang, tetapi di sini bahwa dia juga tidak memandang umur. (This disease is not only no respecter of persons but also no respecter of ages, in regard to those attacked.)*

He then corrected his interpretation, concluding that “people of advancing age” is the same as “people of advanced years”. Hence, he chose the fourth option. Once again, this shows that the interview provided information that would not be accessible through the think-aloud or retelling tasks.

*Observations*

The researcher’s observation notes indicate that Dan pointed his finger at the text when he reread the first sentence of Text 2 and corrected his response. He did the
same when he reread the last sentence of the same text and corrected his interpretation of the sentence. It seems reasonable to assume that Dan’s pointing at the text was intended to focus his attention on the problematic sections of the text. Pointing at the text, for some readers (Dan, Eki, Gio, Lei, Min, Ran, Tam and Tin), may have a similar function to that of reading portions of or the whole sentences aloud, for the same and other readers (Aci, Eba, Gio and Tin), i.e. to focus attention.

When asked about the strategies used in reading different types of text, Dan said that they depended on the purpose. For example, if reading a newspaper also entailed writing a report, then he would read it carefully to see the main points to be included in the summary. Otherwise, he would skim through it to obtain general information about the news of the day. If he was interested in a certain article, then he would read it more attentively to obtain the gist, and the details, occasionally. In reading prescribed books, he focused on important points and made notes or marked the important lines, which would be useful when he wanted to refer to them later. In a reading test, he often read the questions first to obtain some idea about points he had to find in reading the text.
Appendix 5.2
Strategy profile of Reader 2 (Min)

Think-aloud protocol, which constitutes the first part of this strategy profile, refers to Graph 5.4.2.1 (The dynamics of the strategy use of Reader 2, Min, in reading Text 1).

*Think-aloud protocol*

In reaction to the first sentence of Text 1, despite the instruction to read and respond to the text sentence by sentence, Min first skimmed over the whole passage, and returned to the beginning of the text only after the researcher reminded her to respond to the first sentence. She read it silently, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, paraphrased the sentence, and made an inference of the gist:

Um, from this first sentence, um, I'm sure that the author here wants to state that the American educational system needs a reform. And that happened in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Meaning that something wrong or something needs to be the better solution.

In regard to the second sentence, she read it silently, subvocalised some phrases, and read not only the second sentence but the whole paragraph or even the whole text, while remaining silent, reread the whole sentence, attempted a paraphrase, monitored her comprehension, vocalised the second clause, identified key words, subvocalised parts of the sentence, completed the paraphrase, provided an illustration to support her interpretation, identified a word of multiple meanings, and finally reflected on the strategy to be used:

Um, ... um, ... yeah. The author starts to talk about private schools in America, um, the special schools for the rich people. "There were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment, um, ... um, ...." Um, I need to underline the words "strong sentiment" here. As if the author states that education here is not so important for the children because they just will be laborers. So they should not waste their time in education. And that something more important for them is preparing themselves for their life work. So may be the ... the technical skills that they need in their life. But I'm not sure, um, because I don't know exactly what the author means by the word "prepare" in the life work here. So I need to read longer ... or the next sentences, right?
Responding to the third sentence, she read it silently, reread it while vocalising a number of words, inferred the gist, referred to the text, identified a key word as a reference for the gist, monitored her comprehension, related the sentence to the previous one to provide an illustration for clarification, restated her inference while finding a suitable word to reformulate the gist, and monitored and confirmed her comprehension:

And now the third sentence, “... in the face ... educational ......”. Oh, it tells us that ... that's the problem ... that's the ... the problem that public faces, yeah. And that's the things that the reformers or the educational reformers, um, have to do or have to solve. Because here I read the word 'task', so what is to be the strong sentiment of the public is the educational reformers' task. Is it so? The main idea here is that the author wants to express or state the strong sentiment of the public about the educational system in America - that the schools, the private schools, are not so important for the children. Or it means that the author is not so ... what is the opposite of “pessimistic”? Um, yeah, he is not so optimis ... not optimistic with the result of educational system in America. Yeah. Is that right? I think so.

Moving to the fourth sentence, Min expressed surprise at the message as a result of misunderstanding the sentence construction, inferred the gist, made self-reflection, monitored her comprehension, and paraphrased the gist incorrectly while disagreeing with the text content:

Em, ini, agak heran ini (Um, this is surprising). The reformers, one of the reformers, um, Horace Mann, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated. I wonder why, because, um, I'm sure and I think that education is very important for everyone, especially for children, right? So I don't know why this man or this famous reformer, Horace Mann, felt that the education in America, in a republic, is not so important, because he said that there was no excuse in there for any citizen to be uneducated. Jadi saya membayangkan, um, nggak ada masalah, nggak ada ... nggak perlu disalahkan, kalau di negeri tersebut orang-orang itu uneducated, gitu. Ini saya kurang setuju, tapi itu dari yang saya tangkap pertama (So I imagine, um, that there is no problem, no one should be blamed if people in that country were uneducated. I don't agree on this, but that's my understanding).

Responding to the fifth sentence, Min read it silently, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, vocalised the first few words, related the sentence to the information from the previous sentences, paraphrased the sentence appropriately, and anticipated the content of the next sentence:
Um, the next sentence, "As Superintendent of Education...," departemen pendidikan, ah, departemen pendidikan di salah satu bagian dari Amerika yaitu Massachusetts pada tahun 1837 sampai 1848 mulai berbagai perubahan, dengan adanya kenyataan-kenyataan dari (department of education in one of the states in America, that is, Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848 started various changes, based on) what the first paragraph said. Then the changes applied or dilakukan di berbagai (carried out in various) school districts around the country. Em, dan saya berpikir dari kalimat ini, kemudian (Um, and then, from this sentence, I think) what changes, what kind of changes that the Superintendent of Education here did.

In regard to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, vocalised a number of words, and skimmed the next sentence, returned to the third sentence and paraphrased the gist, related it to her prior knowledge, evaluated the content, and made a self-reflection, identified a problematic phrase, guessed its meaning based on the context, monitored her comprehension, inferred the gist, and reflected her uncertainty:

Oh, the ... alternative that ... he ... 'he' here is Horace Mann or, yeah, Horace Mann. "Although these changes..." Um, the solution or the alternative that he offered here are: first, improving the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. And I think that because offered solution here are very good, maybe it can be implemented, it can be done in our country too. Raising the salary of the teachers ... it will encourage it, um, it will encourage the teachers to improve their quality of teaching ... to make them better teachers, right? And I don't know exactly what, what the author here means by "extended school year five to six months", the school year from five to six months. Per semester or ... I don't ... the school year from five to six months. Maybe the previous time the school year is five months, right? And the change here is, um, from five to six months. So the length of the school year is longer, is longer, yeah? I don't know.

In response to the concluding sentence, Min read it silently, inferred the gist, monitored her comprehension, vocalised a phrase while rereading the sentence, related it to the information from the previous sentences, monitored her comprehension, and offered a paraphrase:

Above all, um, the conclusion of the last sentence is that the ... the need for further strengthening of the system, for educational system, in America is badly needed. Um, "... further strengthening ...." It means that the educational system is not so good in the opinion of the public or the educational experts. Um, yeah, but the changes or the things that changed ... in the prior sentence here... didn't bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system. Jadi perubahan-perubahan itu tidak langsung membawa perbaikan yang besar, tapi paling nggak ada kesadaran secara umum.
masyarakat untuk lebih memperkuat sistem tersebut (So the changes did not bring about
great improvement directly, but at least there was public awareness for further
strengthening of the system).

As Graph 5.4.2.2 indicates, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Min read it
silently, related it to her prior knowledge of the topic, inferred the gist correctly, and
stated her comprehension of the text:

Ah, dari kalimat pertama ini langsung sambung. Saya jadi ingat bacaan-bacaan
untuk kehatian dari majalah regional atau dari cerita teman yang kuliah di
kedokteran itu lho. Jadi ini tentang penyakit jantung koroner. Ya, langsung ada
gambaran.
(Ah, the first sentence directly rang the bell. I remember some articles on health from
regional magazines or stories from a friend who is a student of medicine. So this is
about coronary heart disease. Yeah, I got a picture right away.)

In response to the second sentence, she read it silently, expressed agreement with the
content resulting from her association with her preconception about the disease, and
paraphrased the sentence correctly:

Em, ya, benar. Memang penyakit ini tidak hanya untuk orang-orang yang penting lah,
pejabat atau orang-orang yang dianggap secara sosial ekonominya itu tinggi, tapi
ternyata ordinary man pun yang di jalanan bisa saja terkena, gitu.
(Um, yeah, right. Indeed this disease did not attack only the important people or
officials whose socio-economic status is high, but also the ordinary man in the street.)

Responding to the third sentence, she read it silently, attempted a paraphrase,
monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, and completed the paraphrase
appropriately:

Kalimat ini menyatakan bahwa memang penyakit ini untuk usia lanjut. ... Ya, seringkali
menyerang orang yang tengah baya, tapi ada beberapa kasus juga orang muda pun
bisa kena. (This sentence says that indeed this disease is for the advancing age. ... Yeah,
it often attacks the middle age, but there were cases in which the young could also be
attacked.)

In regard to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, identified a problematic phrase,
reread the sentence silently, analysed the phrase, attempted a tentative meaning of the
phrase based on one of its constituents, expressed doubt about the proposed meaning
of the phrase, reread the sentence silently, re-attempted a paraphrase of the sentence
incorrectly, restated her unfamiliarity with the problematic phrase mentioned earlier, and finally inferred the gist correctly:

"Aaah ... "furring-up"! What's "furring-up"? Um, I don't know the meaning of "furring-up". Um, yeah, the furring-up of arteries which is the basic cause of the coronary condition. Kondisi koroner-nya jantung ini secara dasar penyebab awalnya adalah, barangkali ..., "Up" itu kan sesuatu yang naik, gini ya? "Fur ... furring" ... I don't know. "Furring-up" ... sesuatu yang, em, sebenar. Artery, pembuluh darah, kalau nggak salah. Jadi, nampak se ... tekanan darah, apa ya? Em, nggak tahu. Em, pokoknya itu ... also found in other species. Ah, ya, jadi sebab-sebab jantung koroner itu juga bisa terjadi pada species lain selain manusia, yaitu pada dunia hewan. (The basic cause of coronary conditions is, probably, ..., "Up" means "going up", right? ... "Fur ... furring" ... I don't know. "Furring-up" ... something, um, wait a minute. Artery is blood vessel, if I'm not mistaken. So, is it the rise in blood pressure? Um, I don't know. But in principle, this means that this (coronary condition) is also found in other species. Ah, yeah, so the causes of coronary heart disease were also found in species other than human beings, that is, in the animal world.)

Responding to the fifth sentence, she read it silently, reread it while vocalising a time reference, inferred the gist of the sentence, attempted to provide details, monitored her comprehension as seen from her regression and subvocalisation of the sentence, scanned the sentence elements containing the main idea, made self-reflection on her confusion, analysed the sentence to see the main clause, reread the sentence silently, and attempted another paraphrase of the whole sentence incompletely:

"By eighteenth century." Em, jadi meskipun penyakit jantung koroner ini terjadi telah berabad-abad dan dikenal oleh dokter pertama kali pada abad ke-18, tapi perkembangannya sangat cepat sejalan berkembangnya publikasi dari massa media. Em, jadi semakin meningkat jumlah pasiennya. Ini dikenal dari perkembangan perawatannya yang lebih diperbaiki dari metode-metode diagnostiknya. ... Sebenar, Pak, ini agak kacau. Em, mana main idea, topik sentence-nya. ... Intinya kan, kalau nggak salah ya, penyakit sudah dikenal sejak abad ke-18. Kemudian, massa media kan semakin berkembang, jadi lebih mampu memberitahukan kepada masyarakat luas tentang penyakit ini. Penyakit itu dikenal malin meningkat, pengidapnya makin banyak. ("By eighteenth century." Um, so, although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and first known to doctors in the eighteenth century, it develops rapidly in accordance with the development of the publication by mass media. Um, so the number of the patients increases. This is known from the improved treatment and diagnostic method. ... Wait a minute, Sir, this is confusing. Um, where is the main idea -- the topic sentence? ... If I'm not mistaken, the disease has been known since the eighteenth century. Then, in line with the development of mass media, they could inform the public of this disease. The disease is known to increase; there are more patients of this disease.)
In regard to the sixth sentence, Min read silently, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, provided her interpretation of the sentence phrase by phrase but unsystematically and partly incorrectly, followed by illustrations for clarification, completed the paraphrase, and inferred the gist inappropriately:

(Oh, a modern contagious disease, ... the disease of the modern men? Cardiovascular disease? The authorities ... these mean doctors and people who deal with health. They believe that the increase of the number of the people suffering from this disease is real. So, it is real, not anything made up. And it is usually called "modern epidemic". So the spreading or the development of this disease, um, is modern.)

In reaction to the seventh sentence, Min read it silently, reread it aloud, monitored her comprehension, attempted a paraphrase, identified a difficult term, guessed its meaning based on the context, provided an illustration, and finalised the paraphrase appropriately:

"The number of people dying of the disease according to death certificate ...." Oh, ini di Amerika ... di California, jumlah orang yang meninggal karena penyakit ini menurut ... ya ... menurut berita atau laporan tentang kematian, em. death certificate? Death certificate ... maksudnya apa? Em, barangkali kalau orang meninggal itu ada catatan, gitu, bahwa "Telah meninggal ... siapa, di mana, dsb." Jadi menurut laporan di California tsb selama tahun '42 itu jumlahnya 18.591 orang mati karena jantung.
("The number of people dying of the disease according to death certificate ...." Oh, in America, in California, the number of the people dying of this disease, according to the news or report on death, um, death certificate? Death certificate ... what does it mean? Um, probably, if someone dies, there will be a record saying "Has died ... who, where, etc." So, according to the report in California during 1942 there were 18.591 deaths due to coronary heart disease.)

In response to the eighth sentence, she read it silently, vocalised a phrase under attention while rereading the sentence, monitored her comprehension, provided an illustration for clarification while paraphrasing the sentence, monitored her comprehension, and confirmed her comprehension of the phrase under attention:
"Five-fold increase." Em, ... dua puluh tahun kemudian, berarti sekitar '62, jumlah kematian yang tercatat meningkat juga menjadi ..., oh, banyak juga, ... meningkat menjadi 102,478 orang. Jadi lipat lima kali. A five-fold increase, ya kan? Em, ... ya. Lipat lima kali ... lebih dari lima kali lipat.

("Five-fold increase." Um, ... twenty years later, it means about 1962, the number of recorded deaths has risen to ..., oh, quite a lot ... has risen to 102,478. So, it is a five-fold increase, isn't it? Um, ... yeah. Five-fold ... more than five-fold.)

Responding to the ninth sentence, she read the time reference aloud, read and reread the rest of the sentence silently, restated the sentence, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, questioned a logical relation in the text content, and made self-reflection, leaving the matter unresolved:

"At present ...." Oh. Sekarang ini, ... akhir-akhir ini, jumlah kematian kanker ini sangat tinggi dari penyakit tubuh lainnya dari penyakit tubuh yang lebih dari dua kali lipat ... yang disebabkan karena semua bentuk kanker. Ada kaitannya ... antara kanker dengan penyakit ini? Sebenar. Em, ... em. Nggak tahu. Kurang jelas karena ... I'm not the expert of modi ... medication.

("At present ...." Oh. Now, recently, the number of deaths annually from this disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. Is there any relation between cancer and this disease? Wait a minute. Um, ... um. I don't know. It's not clear, because I'm not an expert in medicine.)

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Min read it silently, attempted a paraphrase, subvocalised the sentence, re-attempted a paraphrase unsuccessfully, made an association with the Indonesian context, identified an irrelevance of the text to the Indonesian context, and finalised the paraphrase inappropriately:

Walaupun begitu secara umum mungkin ... death rate ... rate-rata kematian karena penyakit ini. Oh, sebenarnya sudah dilakukan usaha untuk mengatasi kenaikan jumlah orang yang terkena penyakit ini. Biar kenaikan jumlah tidak drastis, maka dilakukan berbagai usaha, seperti the improved life expectancy. Biar harapan hidup orang yang mengidap penyakit ini bisa lebih ditingkatkan, atau tidak cepat meninggal dunia, bisa dilakukan berbagai pengobatan, juga diagnosa yang lebih akurat, dan, em, certification. I'm not sure that in Indonesia we can find this death certification. And death certification is responsible for this rise, yeah, in the ... disease death rate.

(Although generally probably ... death rate – average number of deaths due to this disease. Oh, actually there have been efforts to overcome the rise of the number of people affected by this disease. In order to avoid a drastic increase in number, various efforts, such as improved life expectancy, have been made. In order to improve the life expectancy of the people suffering from this disease so that they will not die immediately, various treatments, more accurate diagnosis, and, um, certification can be provided. I'm not sure that in Indonesia we can find this death certification. And death certification is responsible for this rise, yeah, in the disease death rate.)
Retellings

Min’s retelling of Text 1 was relatively complete but incorrect due to, among others, her misunderstanding of Mann’s view. Min thought that Horace Mann claimed that there was no problem if the American citizens were uneducated. Rather than trying to paraphrase or summarise the gist, most of the time Min merely restated the sentences from the text she remembered. For example, starting his retelling, she said:

“In the beginning of the nineteenth century the American educational system were need in a reform.”

This is merely an incorrect restatement of the first sentence of the text. In regard to its content, the retelling covered the theme, the incorrect main idea, and 80% of the details. In addition, she also went beyond the information provided in the text by relating teachers’ salary rise (in the text) to teachers’ welfare in the Indonesian context. Here is her comment:


(Raising the teachers’ salaries, I think, will motivate the teachers to do research or perform their duties as lecturers or teachers better. Salaries are, indeed, important, yeah. If we look at America, if I did not misread, um, 40% of the national budget is allocated on education, Sir, while in our country (Indonesia) the budget for education is only 12%, at the most. Yet, there are still illegal deductions everywhere, so that, yeah, the results inevitably depend on this condition. There are many graduates, Sir, but the rate of unemployment is also high. This is because the quality of the human resources is considered far left behind compared with that of those of other countries.)

Like the retelling of Text 1, Min’s retelling of Text 2 was limited to the restatement of whichever sentences she remembered. The content was relatively complete, except
that she misunderstood the main idea due to her misconception of the text and misinterpretation of the word “responsible” in the last sentence. She said that population increase, improved life expectancy, more accurate diagnosis and death certification were responsible to overcome or to lower death rate due to coronary heart disease. The problem was on the interpretation of the word “responsible” and her preconception that the factors mentioned were considered efforts to overcome the spread of the disease, instead of being merely factors considered to cause the death rate increase. However, the retelling covered the correct theme and 71% of the details. Here is her retelling of the last sentence, which contains the incorrect main idea:

Em, walau pun begitu, em, harapan hidup yang lebih diperbaiki, diagnosa yang lebih akurat, serta sertifikasi kematian itu dilakukan atau bertanggung jawab untuk mengatasi kenaikan the death rate atau rata-rata kematian yang disebabkan oleh the coronary heart disease itu. (Um, however, um, improved life expectancy, more accurate diagnosis, and death certification were responsible or carried out to overcome the rise in the death rate due to coronary heart disease.)

The time given to reread the text before the retelling the text had not improved her text comprehension, and her retellings confirmed her misunderstanding of the main ideas as well as a number of individual sentences in the texts.

*In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers*

Out of 16 multiple-choice questions Min answered 9 questions correctly. While her misunderstanding of the main idea made her fail to answer some of the questions, vocabulary proved to be a problem. Like a number of other informants, Min associated the word “sentiment” (opinion) with the Indonesian word “sentimen” (ill feeling). Hence, she considered the word “sentiment” to be close in meaning to the word “disagreement.” Here is her comment:

The word “sentiment” here, um, what is going on in my mind, “sentiment” is that something ... something is debated, sesuatu yang tidak disetujui ... sesuatu yang diperdebatkan, sehingga saya kira maksudnya “disagreement” (something that is disapproved, something that is contrasted, so that I think it means “disagreement.”)

Another point worthy of mention is that Min’s comprehension of Text I developed
during the discussion of the test answers. Possibly due to the multiple-choice test options provided following Question 6, she corrected her misunderstanding of Mann's view. She learned that a sentence construction with "double negatives" means "positive". Here is her comment:

Saya sadar ada "no excuse" dan "uneducated". Jadi kalimat begitu ternyata maksudnya songat positif, gitu. In a republic all citizens should be educated. (I realised that the sentence contained the words "no excuse" and "uneducated." So, such a sentence turned to have a positive sense. That is, in a republic all citizens should be educated.)

Reading texts in a reading test

When asked about the strategies she employed in reading texts in a reading test, she claimed that she started by reading the whole passage sentence by sentence rapidly. If time allowed, she would reread the parts she did not understand or had the most questions about, or the sections she was interested in, and underline them, if necessary. Then she would see how these parts were linked with other parts or the whole text in order to understand the gist. Only then would she look at the questions and return to the text to find the answers.

When asked about problems she had in reading, she considered vocabulary to be the major problem. This was consistent with her misunderstanding of Text 2 which seemed to a consequence of her limited vocabulary mastery. However, she also admitted that at times some sentence constructions (such as double negatives) still posed a problem:

Kesulitan saya masalah vocab terutama ... vocab. Kebetulan saya dulu sekolahnya SMA kan A3, jurusan social-ekonomi. Khususnya yang paling nggak dihong itu kalau masalahnya bukan bidang social-ekonomi. Sementara struktur kalimat nggak begitu masalah, tapi kadang, seperti tadi double negatives, saya masih bingung juga. (The problem is mainly with vocabulary. In high school, I happened to be a student of A3, which means that major was socio-economy. The most difficult text is the one that deals with non-socio-economic issues. While sentence construction is not a real problem, sometimes I am still confused with constructions such as double negatives I had earlier.)
To solve the problem of vocabulary, she relied on guessing based on the context:

Kadang just guessing, em ... kadang yang langsung dilewat. Seperti kalau kalau menerjemahkan kan makna keseluruhan, nggak harus word per word, kan? Cuma kalau itu ya apa si, pasnya, gitu. (Sometimes I just guess, sometimes I skip a problematic part. Just like in translation, I usually look at the meaning of the whole, not that of word by word. In this context, what is the suitable meaning of this word?)

Reading newspapers

Min was not highly motivated to read newspapers in English published in Indonesia because the content was almost the same as that of newspapers in Indonesian. She read a newspaper in English especially when she was assigned by a lecturer to read one. When reading newspapers in English on her own, she paid more attention to the style of expression and layout rather than to the content. In this regard, she usually skimmed to obtain the gist and disregarded the details.

Reading books

When asked about the strategies she used in reading books, particularly those prescribed or recommended by the lecturers, Min stated that it depended on what subject the book was about. She employed different strategies for different subjects. Her strategies used in reading books on linguistics were different from those used in reading books on English language teaching (ELT). In reading books on ELT she could relate the content to her prior knowledge and day-to-day practice in the classroom, and discuss problematic sections with friends. In reading books on linguistics, however, she had to work mostly on her own and rely on reading the text over and over, scrutinising definitions and relating one definition to others, looking the words up in the dictionary frequently, marking, underlining, or making notes on portions of the text. Here are her comments:

Kan beda kalau misalnya tentang ELT itu kan kita langsung bisa nggambarkan ... oh, prakteknya di kelas seperti ini. Jadi sudah ada ... prior knowledge. Terus ada secara praktis itu pragmatisme ini itu ada kemonfasian besok kalau ngajar praktiknya begini caranya. Tapi kalau linguistics kan, apa, abstrak sekali. Di sini saya harus mengkaitkan-makain macam-macam istilah. Pendidikan ini, pendidikan ini, maksudnya ini gimana? Sering sekali konsepnya saya nggak dhong. Ha, untuk linguistics ini saya harus bacan nginggling definisi-definisinya, kemudian menghubung-hubungkan definisi satu dengan...
 lainnya. Yang jelas saya harus baco berulang-ulang, banyak corat-coret garis bawah, catatan arit yaia biar tidak berkali-kali buka kamus. Kalau ELT saya bisa diskusi dengan teman, tapi kalau linguistics mereka kebanyakan juga sama-sama tidak dhuang. (The strategies I used are different. For example, I can directly picture the practice of ELT in the classroom. So, I already have prior knowledge on the subject. It also has practical benefits for my future teaching practice. But linguistics is highly abstract. Here I have to relate various terms. The meaning according to this author, the meaning according to that author and, what do these all mean? Very often, I don’t understand the concepts. Well, for linguistics, I have to scrutinise definitions and relate one definition to the others. Obviously, I have to read it over and over, make many marks such as underlines and notes on the meaning of difficult words in order that I don’t have to open a dictionary repeatedly. I can discuss books on ELT with friends, but I cannot discuss books on linguistics with them because many of them share the same problem with me: they don’t understand the concepts either.)

Observations

The observation notes mention that other than skimming the whole passage before reading Text 1 sentence by sentence, Min often looked at the next sentence while thinking aloud a sentence. She also underlined, circled and linked some words in both Texts 1 and 2. In addition, she pointed at the problematic parts of Text 2 at least six times.
Appendix 5.3
Strategy Profile of Reader 3 (Eki)

The early part of this strategy profile, Think-aloud protocol, refers to Graph 4.4.3.1 (The dynamics of the strategy use of Reader 3, Eki, in reading Text 1).

Think-aloud protocol

A close look at Eki's think-aloud protocol, as indicated in Graph 4.3.1, shows that her reading comprehension processes and strategies were quite complicated. They resembled some of the processes and strategies reviewed in Chapter Two. There were occasions when Eki's strategies were within the framework of Goodman, Watson and Burke's (1996) model of reading, that comprehension was achieved through the processes of sampling, inferring, predicting, confirming, and integrating. However, there were occasions when her strategies did not reflect these processes. Her strategies sometimes reflected these processes with other (intervening) processes involved, at other times they reflected processes proposed by constructively responsive theory of reading (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995), and at still other times did not reflect any of these. Nevertheless, Eki made every effort to integrate the pieces of information in order to achieve full understanding of the text.

After reading the first sentence of Text 1 silently (sampling), she questioned the meaning of the word 'desperately' and reflected on her unfamiliarity with the word: "What is 'desperately'? I don't know this." However, she claimed that she could still understand the main idea of the whole sentence and made a tentative conclusion by paraphrasing that "the American educational system needs reform." She assumed there was a problem, or probably some shortcoming, in the American educational system and correctly inferred that improvement was needed (inferring).
Moving to the second sentence, she glanced at it (sampling), and understood that it provided some explanation for the first sentence. She understood that there were also two kinds of schools in America, private and public. Despite the problem posed by the phrase, 'strong sentiment', she tried to make sense of the whole sentence. Rereading the first clause of the sentence - "Private schools existed, but only for the very rich ...", she inferred that there was some discrimination in the American educational system, that is, private schools were only for the rich. However, her understanding was disrupted by the next clauses - "children who would grow up to be laborers should not waste their time on education" and "but should instead prepare themselves for their life's work". As to the former clause, she commented, "... ini saya kira "not waste" (I think it is "not waste"), which indicated that Eki evaluated the text content (showing disagreement on the public opinion that education was a waste of time). But, from the phrase "should not waste their time on education", she inferred that children in America also had to go to school, that is, "they had to waste time on education." This inference was very superficial, probably because she did not comprehend the last clause of this second sentence, which provided a reason why children who would be laborers should not waste their time on education. Eki did not make her comprehension or non-comprehension of this portion of the text explicit, left it, and went on to the next sentence.

Reading the third sentence, she related it to the second sentence and inferred that the second sentence contained a reason for the need of reform. Rereading the third sentence and relating it to the second one, she made a tentative inference that the need for reform was due to the difference between schools for children of the rich and those for children of the poor. She added that whenever she failed to comprehend a sentence, she would simply leave it and proceed to the next one:

Em, kalimat yang ketiga ini ... merupakan alasan mengapa perlu diadakan reformasi. Kalau diliburkan, mungkin saya bisa menafsirkan kalimat yang kedua bahwa perlu diadakan reformasi dalam pendidikan karena adanya perbedaan antara sekolah anak kaya dan anak-anak yang miskin. Begitu. Ee, ini saya kira misalnya nggak tahu maksud kalimat ini ... sudah saya biarkan saja ... saya lanjutkan kalimat yang terakhir ya.
(Um, the third sentence contains the reason for the need of reform. Relating this sentence to the second one, I see that the need of reform was due to the difference between schools for the rich and those for the children of the poor. I think that’s it. Um, when I don’t understand the meaning of a sentence, I just leave it, and proceed to the next one.)

Reading the fourth sentence, she related it to her tentative inference of the previous sentence and inferred that Horace Mann was an educational reformer who opposed discrimination and proposed that every citizen should be educated (inerring). In her words:

Horace Mann, the reformer, um, that refuse the ... the discrimination between, um, some people that can take education and for common people. I mean that, according to Horace Mann, all the people should take education. Horace Mann ... dia antipati ... melihat anak-anak di sana tidak mengenyam pendidikan. [Horace Mann ... he had an antipathy against seeing (American) children who did not enjoy education]

Then she wondered what Horace Mann would do (anticipating content), and predicted that the next sentence(s) would talk about what Horace Mann did in realising the reform (predicting).

Scanning the fifth sentence she found a cue that confirmed her prediction, but went on asking what Horace Mann did next:

Yes, here I can find a little answer: "... he initiated various changes, "" (confirming)
But, What changes? (anticipating content/predicting)

Glancing at the sixth sentence, she related it to the previous sentence, found her prediction confirmed, restated and inferred that it provided details of the information presented in the previous sentence as predicted:

And then the next sentence ... also complete the previous sentence. He changed the school year from five to six months, and improved the quality of teacher by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. Jadi dia sudah berusaha, sudah merealisasikan perubahan-perubahan di situ ... caranya dengan ini. Dia mengembangkan sekolah-sekolah from five to six months, kemudian meningkatkan kualitas gurunya. (So he already made efforts, realising the changes by extending the school year from five to six months and improving the quality of the teachers.)
Arriving at the concluding sentence, Eki read it silently, monitored her comprehension, identified some key words, such as “although” and “sudden”, established an intra-sentential relation, and managed to obtain the gist. In Eki’s opinion, the presence of the word “although” implied the sense of “disappointment”, and she felt that, despite what Horace Mann had done, the result had not been completely satisfactory:

I find the word ‘although’. Um, ‘although’ ... It means that there is something, um, kekecewaan. Karena ada ‘although’ di sini bahwa apa yang dilakukan itu itu belum sepenuhnya ... belum sepenuhnya memuaskan.
(I find the word ‘although’. Um, ‘although’ ... It means that there is something, um, some disappointment. The word “although” implies that what Horace Mann had done was not completely satisfactory.)

Meanwhile, she related the word “sudden” to the word “suddenly”, the word she was more familiar with. She had not used the word “sudden”, but had often used the word “suddenly”. Hence, she interpreted “sudden improvement” as “changes of which the result could be observed immediately” and provided an illustration to clarify her inference:

Ini ada “sudden”, ... mungkin saya hubungkan dengan “suddenly” ... “sudden improvement”. Jadi di sini kan Horace Mann ini sudah berusaha untuk mengembangkan sistem pendidikan di sana walaupun dia juga yakin apa yang dilakukan itu belum sepenuhnya berhasil. Maksudnya, apa yang diusulkan belum sepenuhnya terlaksana.
(There is the word “sudden”. ... Probably I can relate it to “suddenly”. Here Horace Mann already attempted to develop an educational system there. However, he realised that what he had done was not a complete success. In other words, his ideals had not been fully realised.)

As Graph 4.4.3.2 indicates, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Eki commented that she had no problem understanding the first sentence, because she did not find any difficult words. “It’s easy”, she said. Initially she found the word “coronary” unfamiliar, but then she associated it with the Indonesian words “jantung koroner” (coronary heart disease). Considering that “coronary” sounded like “koroner”, she assumed that “coronary heart disease” meant “jantung koroner”, and appropriately inferred that the text was about “health.”
Moving to the second sentence, she questioned the meaning of a few difficult words such as “respecter” and “strike”. She said she knew the word “president”, but she noticed that the word was used with a special sense in this text. After rereading the whole sentence, she reflected on her approach to the problem, saying she noticed that the phrase “presidents of superpowers” was set in contrast with “ordinary man in the street.” From this contrast she correctly inferred that the disease did not care about the social status of the patient; everyone could be infected:

-Mungkin dari ini, “presidents of super-powers”, ini, ya, em, saya tadinya nggak tahu Pak, kemudian saya hubungkan kata berikutnya... “the ordinary man in the street”. Jadi di sini ada presiden dan ada ordinary man in the street. Saya menafirkananya penyakit itu tidak pandang bunga; siapa saja bisa terkena.”

(Probably from this, “presidents of super-powers”, this, yeah, um, initially I did not know, Sir, then related it to the next words, “the ordinary man in the street”. So, here the word “presidents” is set in contrast with the words “ordinary man in the street.” My interpretation is that this disease does not care about the social status of the patient; everyone could be infected).

In response to the third sentence, she commented that the previous (second) sentence helped her comprehension of the third sentence. She inferred that the disease could attack people of various ages: the elderly, the middle aged, and the young. Relating the third sentence to the second one, she said that her understanding of the former resolved the problem she had with the latter. She inferred that, while the former stated that the disease disregarded the social status, the latter stated that the disease disregarded the ages of the patients. To validate her inference, she provided a reference in regard to the ages mentioned:


(It is stated in the second sentence that the disease disregards the position or social status of the patients. The third sentence is now easier to comprehend. So this disease can attack anyone in regard to age. It may attack the elderly, or the young. Here, it says “the elderly”, “the middle aged”, and “the young.”)

Moving to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, vocalised and questioned the meaning of the phrase “furring-up of arteries”, reread the sentence, guessed the
meaning of the phrase inappropriately, but managed to identify it as the basic cause of the coronary condition. The information that “the furring-up of arteries” was also found in animals made her assume that the basic cause of coronary heart disease was “bacteria” which could be found in animals. Consequently, her inference about the meaning of “furring-up of arteries” was inappropriate:

“Furring-up of arteries.” Apa ini? Nggak tahu. Ee ... ini. Tapi yang jelas ini merupakan penyebab utama jantung koroner. Ini juga disebutkan bahwa ini, “furring-up” ini juga ditemukan pada binatang. Em, mungkin ini bakteri. Ya, berarti bakteri. (“Furring-up of arteries.” What is this? I don’t know. Um ... this. But, it is apparently the basic cause of coronary heart disease. It is also mentioned that this “furring-up” is also found in animals. Um, probably it is bacteria. Yeah, it means bacteria.)

Subvocalising the fifth sentence, she found that this sentence was rather long. However, from the phrases “diagnostic methods” and “improved treatment” she predicted that the fifth and the following sentence(s) would talk about how to handle the disease or to treat the patients. Upon seeing the word “media”, she inferred incorrectly that books and electronic media had revealed a large number of patients of coronary heart disease:

Walau pun saya belum bisa menangkap semuanya, saya kira kalimat ini menggaul bagaimana penanganan para penderita jantung koroner ini. Mengapa? Kata-kata “methods and improved treatment” mengarah ke situ, usaha untuk mengatasi jantung koroner. Mungkin mass media, dari buku-buku atau media electronic juga mengungkap bahwa penyakit ini sudah amat tinggi jumlah pasiennanya. (Although I haven’t comprehended the whole sentence, I think this sentence reveals how to handle the coronary heart disease patients. Why? The words “methods and improved treatment” lead to the efforts to overcome coronary heart disease. Probably mass media, books and electronic media, also reveal that the number of patients of this disease has been very high.)

In response to the sixth sentence, she read it aloud, reread it silently, paraphrased the gist of the first clause of the sentence, vocalised the term “cardiovascular disease”, reflected on her unfamiliarity with the term, and inappropriately inferred the gist of the second clause:

“Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease ...” Em, mungkin sudah dialiri bahwa menang kenyataannya penderita jantung koroner itu angkanya sudah meningkat. Di sini juga disebutkan nama menyakit ini “cardiovascular disease”. Ini istilah medis. Mungkin yang berkaitan dengan coronary heart disease. Jadi walau pun di sinu saya tidak mengerti maknanya, saya tahu ini Istilah medis yang berkaitan dengan “coronary heart disease”.
("Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease ..." Um, probably it has been recognised that the number of coronary heart disease patients has increased. The name of this disease is also mentioned here, "cardiovascular disease." This is a medical term which is probably related to "coronary heart disease.")

In reaction to the seventh sentence, she read and reread it silently, identified a key phrase ("dying of the disease"), made an inference, vocalised the figure (18,591), and provided a reference to support her inference:

Um ... yeah. Um, I find the words "dying, dying of this disease". Um, so from the sentence I know that the coronary heart disease can cause the, the people dying, can cause the dying. And the number here is, um, mentioned that there was eighteen, five nine one (18,591). And this number is based on the death certificates, yes, announced in California.

Responding to the eighth sentence, she read it silently, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence and vocalised a number of problematic words, particularly the words "five-fold". From the figures presented she inferred that the increase of the number of the patients had been very high:

Kemudian 20 tahun berikutnya, "the number of recorded deaths has risen to ..." meningkat menjadi seratus dua ratus empat tujuh delapan, "more than a five-fold increase." Saya nggak tahu makna "fold" di sini. Ini mungkin sudah melebihi dari target atau angka normal. Yang jelas, peningkatannya sudah amat tinggi.

(Then twenty years later, "the number of recorded deaths has risen to ..."); has risen to 102,478, "more than a five-fold increase." I don’t know the meaning of "fold" here. It may have surpassed the target or the normal figure. Apparently, the increase has been very high.)

In regard to the ninth sentence, she read the main clause of the sentence aloud before responding: "At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice ...". Up to this point she was able to infer that "the number of deaths was twice ...", but questioned the phrase "... those due to all forms of cancer". She said she could not understand the phrase, but, looking at the word "cancer", she made a tentative inference and provided an illustration based on prior knowledge:

Ini berarti ... mungkin kalaupun dihubungkan dengan penyakit kanker. Karena di sini ada "cancer", asosiasi saya dengan penyakit-penyakit berat kayak penyakit jantung koroner.

(Probably this means if it is compared with cancer. Because of the word "cancer", my association is with fatal diseases such as coronary heart disease.)
Through rereadings, monitoring her comprehension, and revisions of her interpretation, Eki was finally able to make an acceptable inference:

Jadi penyakit jantung koroner itu dibandingkan dengan kanker ternyata lebih dari dua kali angka kematiannya, dua kali lebih banyak dari kanker. Penyakit kanker sama-sama penyakit yang berbahaya. (Thus compared with the number of deaths due to cancer, coronary heart disease causes twice the number of deaths caused by cancer. Cancer and coronary heart disease are both dangerous diseases.)

In reaction to the concluding sentence, Eki read it silently, commented that initially she had difficulty understanding the sentence because of the word "probable". Based on her background knowledge and experience, she predicted that the last sentence would contain something "definite", not "probable". As she did not comprehend the fifth sentence fully, that is, that the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made the disease appear to be on the increase, she incorrectly inferred that the last sentence talked about the need for accurate treatment of the disease. In fact, after monitoring her comprehension and rereading the sentence she made an appropriate use of her logic, as reflected in her inference. She even succeeded in going beyond the information given in the text when she said:

"Biasanya semakin meningkat suatu populasi ... peningkatan populasi itu berarti semakin banyak menimbulkan masalah. Jadi kemungkinan atau peluang untuk meningkatnya jumlah penderita ini juga meningkat, itu. (Usually, the larger the population is, the more problems there will be. Thus, the probability or the chance for an increase in the number of patients is also higher.)

However, this success was followed by serious confusion due to her inability to see the relations among components in the last sentence. She thought that the last sentence consisted of two clauses: "However, generally it would seem probable that population increase, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis would increase problems" as one clause, and "death certification are responsible for the rise in cardiovascular disease death rate" as another clause. The addition of the phrase "would increase problems" resulted from her personal judgment beyond the information provided in the text:

Biasanya semakin meningkat suatu populasi, berarti juga semakin banyak menimbulkan masalah. (Usually, as the population increases, there will be more problems arising.)
This confusion was made worse by her interpretation of the words “responsible” and “death certification”. She interpreted the word “responsible” as “in charge of”, while “death certification” was interpreted as a body or a board in charge of administrative matters:

_Mungkin di sini dimaksud stapa yang bertanggung jawab terhadap masalah ini. Ada kata “responsible for this rise”, tapi kok di sini jawabannya kok cuma “death certification”? “Certification” itu mungkin semacam sertifikat. Tapi di sini “death certification are responsible ....” Saya pikir itu semacam badan yang bertanggung jawab tentang masalah-masalah administrative, bukan dari segi medinya. (Probably it is meant who is in charge of this matter. There is a phrase “responsible for this rise”, but why is there only one answer; “death certification”? “Certification” is probably a kind of certificate. But here “death certification are responsible ....” I think this is a kind of body or board in charge of administrative matters, not medical ones.)_

Unfortunately, she did not pay close attention to the use of the verb “are” after the phrase “death certification”. The use of the verb “are” indicates that there are a number of items including “death certification” making up the subject of the clause. If she had been able to see the relation between the verb “are” and the phrases making up the subject, the confusion would have been eliminated. Consequently, up to the end of the think-aloud session Eki was not confident about her inference, and kept looking for the clue:

_Tapi kalau badan, kok hurufnya kecil ini? Saya nggak tahu ini. (But if it is a body or a board, why is it written in small letters? I don’t know this.)_

It may be said that, in general, Eki did not worry much about details; she read a sentence as a whole and, despite some words or phrases she did not know for sure, she attempted to report the gist of the sentence. At other times she responded to the portions of the sentence before completing reading the whole sentence. In this regard, she sometimes seemed to comprehend the portions with ease, but was frustrated when she found that her interpretation did not make sense or when she had difficulty comprehending the next portions or the remainder of the text. However, it can be seen from her pauses in reading aloud that she usually paused at the end of meaningful chunks.
Retellings

Eki’s retelling of Text 1 shows that in reading she tried to understand what the text was about. She mentioned that the text was about educational reform in America. She also paid attention to the text organisation. She recognised the text as consisting of two parts: the first part being about the background or reason for the educational reform, the second part informing that Horace Mann was a reformer of the educational system and what he did to innovate the educational system in America that time. Eki mentioned that the efforts Horace Mann made were raising the teachers’ salaries and improving the teaching materials. While raising the teachers’ salaries was true, improving the teaching materials was not explicitly mentioned in the text. Mann’s explicit efforts such as improving the quality of teachers and extending the school year from five to six months were not reported in the retelling. While forgetting the two things was possible, another possibility was that Eki was not sure about the meaning of “improving the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education” and “extending the school year from five to six months”. Her think-aloud protocol stated “Dia (Horace Mann) mengembangkan sekolah-sekolah from five to six months ... ” (He developed the schools from five to six months). This interpretation deviates from the original sense of the text. It seemed that Eki did not really understand the meaning of “extending the school year from five to six months.”

Consistent with the think-aloud protocol of the first text, Eki’s retelling was concluded by her understanding that Horace Mann was not satisfied with the educational reform he initiated. Despite her misunderstanding of two details, Eki’s retelling contains the correct theme, the correct main idea and 60% of the correct details. In addition, Eki also went beyond the information provided in the text. The existence of private schools which were only for the rich in America, which Eki considered a form of discrimination, was recalled in the retelling and was associated with Kartini’s struggle for women’s emancipation in Indonesia. Eki said that discrimination in Indonesia was not only based on gender but also on social status, that is, the rich had better chances to send their children to school.
After completing rereading Text 2 Eki realised that she did not pay close attention to the portion of the text “few people who have not heard” in the first sentence in her first reading. This changed her impression that she had no problem with the first sentence. She then wondered whether the sentence meant “the disease has been known as a common disease” as she had interpreted earlier. This proves that the demand to retell the text content made her put more effort into comprehending the text, and she was successful in this. However, it was surprising that Eki inferred bacteria as the cause of coronary heart disease. The information that the basic cause of coronary conditions was also found in other species in the animal kingdom seemed to make her think that the basic cause of the disease was bacteria.

Consistent with her think-aloud protocol, she concluded that population increase provided more potential hosts. Another cause was, in her opinion, the responsibility of “death certification.” Eki’s rereading of Text 2 for the purpose of retelling improved her comprehension of the text, especially her comprehension of the concluding sentence, so that her retelling contains the correct theme, the correct main idea and 57% of the details. She remained puzzled about the meaning of “death certification”, but she corrected her interpretation of the sentence in the conclusion of the think-aloud session:

(Then I want to correct the end of the paragraph. It proved that the chance for the disease to attack more patients is greater with the increase in population. Because the number of people increases, there is a chance for that from year to year. And more accurate “death certification” and diagnosis also cause the increase in death rate. But I don’t know what “death certification” is.)

Similar to her retelling of Text 1, she also went beyond the information provided in Text 2. In regard to the widespread information on coronary heart disease, Eki commented as if she had been speaking on behalf of the author, stating that on
television we often had programs on various diseases. Therefore she believed that coronary heart disease was known even by villagers due to the frequent broadcasts of information about the disease. In addition, she also illustrated the logical relation between population increases and the increase in the death rate from coronary heart disease:

Dikatakan bahwa peluang untuk meningkatnya penyakit ini semakin besar juga karena populasi semakin meningkat. Karena jumlah manusianya meningkat dari tahun ke tahun, ada peluang untuk itu juga makin besar. (It is said that the chance for the disease to spread is bigger due to population increases. As the number of the people increases, the chance for the death rate increase is also bigger.)

In-depth interview: Discussion on the multiple-choice test answers

From the discussion of the multiple-choice test result during the in-depth interview, a number of inferences can be reported. First, Eki recognised text structure when she said that a title for a text had to represent the content of the whole text. She retained the gist of the text as she could easily report that it was about reform. Therefore she recognised that only options B and D, which included the word “reform”, could be candidates for the correct answer. Referring to the text, she inferred that it was just the beginnings of reform. Therefore, she chose option D, “The Beginnings of Reform in American Education”. Her answer to Question 2 (that to go to a private school, a student needed a lot of money) also confirmed her inference that there was some discrimination in education, that is, the rich had better chances to enjoy education. Eki’s incorrect answer to Question 3 (the meaning of the word “sentiment”) indicated that Eki’s silence about the word, when she read the text sentence by sentence, was due to her uncertainty about the meaning of the word. This was also apparent in her retelling, which did not make any mention of the word “sentiment” or her interpretation of the word. In the interview it was found that, like another reader (Yan), Eki interpreted ‘sentiment’ as something negative. She associated it with the Indonesian word ‘sentimen’ which means ‘ill-feeling’ or ‘jealousy’ and has a sense of ‘disagreement’.
Her failure to mention the word “waste” (waste time on education) in the retelling and her incorrect answer to Question 4 showed that she did not pay enough attention to details, or she did not understand the exact meaning of the sentence. The think-aloud protocol showed that when she read “… children who would grow up to be laborers should not ‘waste’ their time on education”, she commented: “… ini saya kira not waste” (I think it is ‘not a waste’), which indicated that Eki did not agree with the public opinion that education was a waste of time. In this context Eki actually was transacting with either the author or the public referred to in the text.

In response to Question 8 (A change that Horace Mann initiated), she chose option C (The five-month school year) because she said that it was found in the text (“… extended the school year from five to six months”). However, the change was actually not “the five-month school year” but “the six-month school year”. It seemed that Eki did not understand the exact meaning of “extending the school year from five to six months.” She did not understand that the change was to the length of the formal study period. The five-month period was the former school year, whereas the current one was the six-month period. As the six-month period was not one of the options, Eki should have considered another option. She did say that option A (Better teacher training) was also a possible answer, as it was close in meaning to “improve the quality of teachers”. However, when asked to choose only one answer, she chose option C (The five-month school year). From her choice, it was apparent that she merely considered the fact that the period of five-months was found in the text, whereas “better teacher training” had be inferred from the phrase “improving the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education”. Eki might not have comprehended the essence of “instituting teacher education”. In the discussion she explicitly stated that there were only two important points in the educational reform – “extended the school year from five to six months” and “improve the quality of teachers …”. In regard to improving the quality of teachers, she commented: “Seingat saya cuma meningkatkan gaji guru.” (As far as I remember, it was only raising the teachers’ salaries). She remembered “… raising the teachers’ salaries”
but did not consider the phrase "... by instituting teacher education". This phrase seemed to be beyond her framework of thinking.

Eki's think-aloud and interview protocols indicate that she applied a top-down approach when she was familiar with the text. However, she applied a bottom-up approach when she encountered unfamiliar words. She tended to disregard portions of Text 1 with which she was unfamiliar or which she might have thought she could do without in order to get the gist of the text. Her silence about portions of the text such as "instituting teacher education" was apparent during the think-aloud task, the retelling, and the discussion of the test. This portion was very important in order to answer Question 8 of the test. She could have referred to this portion because an informant was free to read the text during the discussion of the test result, but she did not. This proves that the retelling and the interview functioned well as a means of crosschecking the phenomenon (e.g. Eki's being silent about "instituting teacher education") present in the think-aloud protocol.

When asked about the main topic of Text 2 (Question 9) Eki was undecided because, to her, two options were equally acceptable (A. Diseases of the heart, and C. Fatal diseases). She thought the passage talked about "diseases of the heart", but she was tempted by option C, "fatal diseases". Looking at figures in regard to death rates, she was inclined to think that coronary heart disease was a fatal disease. Therefore she had more confidence in option C, "fatal diseases". However, she was in doubt because she realised that "fatal diseases" implied uncertainty about what disease it was. Without considering the mention of "cancer", Eki was confident that the text talked about heart disease and finally decided to choose option A, Diseases of the heart. Although in this context the problem might not be only of comprehension strategies, but also of test-taking strategies known as "test-wiseness strategies" (Cohen, 1998:219), it was also surprising that Eki seemed to be unable to distinguish between "diseases of the heart" and "heart disease". Her focus on trying to comprehend the gist and lack of attention to details might have caused a few of Eki's
answers to be based on false reference, when careful inferences were needed. When asked to find what causes the disease, she was helped by the options provided. In the retelling she mentioned that the basic cause for the coronary condition was “bacteria”, but, due to the options provided, she managed to answer the question – “furring up of arteries”. The option “blocked arteries” seemed to give Eki enough clues to infer that it was the same as “furring-up of arteries”.

Like Aci, Eba, Fer, Lat, Tam, and Tin, Eki always associated “authorities” with “power” which is derived from “government”. Hence she associated “authorities” with “government officials”. The association might be due to her limited vocabulary, but her daily experience could have enforced her belief. During the reign of the Indonesian New Order regime (1966-1997), the government and government officials were identical with authorities. There was no alternative discourse that allowed people to learn of any alternative source of authority.

Reading texts in a reading test

In regard to strategies used in a reading test, Eki’s strategies were based on the task at hand. She started by skimming the questions before reading the text. If the question asked about the theme, she would skim the text to find the answer; if the question was about details, she would scan the details; if she had a general comprehension problem, she would reread the text. She worked on easy questions first, then the difficult ones. If time did not allow, she simply guessed the answers as a final resort.

Reading newspapers

Asked to comment on her strategies in reading newspapers, Eki claimed that she usually looked at the title, skimmed through the text, and matched it with knowledge of the news obtained from other mass media. For Eki, the main purpose of reading an English newspaper was just to see how news or information was presented or expressed in English. In reading a newspaper she never wanted to know the exact meaning of the whole article. It was enough if she could get the gist from the topic,
subtopic or the first few lines of the article to match her knowledge of news obtained from other mass media.

For example, in reading a newspaper article entitled “Forest Fire”, first she identified a problem (Idprob) when she questioned difficult words found in the first paragraph. With her knowledge obtained from other mass media, she guessed meaning based on context (Guess) and predicted (Pred) the gist. After reading further, she confirmed (Conf) that the article was about a forest fire. Then she paraphrased (Par) the gist of the article.

In regard to book reading, Eki claimed that books were usually read seriously as they entailed tasks and were related to her future. Linguistics books were difficult in both concepts and presentation (sentence constructions), but ELT ones were more familiar. When comprehension problems occurred she read the book over and over, checked key words in the dictionary and asked friends when available. She rarely consulted lecturers about problems in her study.

Her protocol on reading the paragraphs on the “Learner-Centred Curriculum” seemed to indicate that prior knowledge could block comprehension if a reader could not use the knowledge tactically. Eki’s knowledge about the learner-centred approach, which was slightly different from the essence of the paragraphs the researcher asked her to read, seemed to have blocked her effort to scrutinise the paragraphs. Instead of reading the text closely, she based her response on her previous knowledge of the approach. All she knew about the approach was that learners should be involved actively in all the classroom activities because learners should be the centre of the teaching-learning process. However, she did not have the slightest idea that learners were also involved in the process of curriculum development. Instead of seeing the text content as further information on what she had learned, she saw it as a controversy. She missed the links and lost interest in the topic.
Appendix 5.4
Strategy Profile of Reader 4 (Yan)

Think-aloud Protocol

As can be seen from Graph 5.4.4.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Yan read it silently, identified difficulty comprehending the word “desperately”, vocalised the word, guessed its meaning based on the context, monitored his comprehension, reread the sentence, made an appropriate inference while reflecting on the strategy used, questioned why reform was needed, and predicted that the next sentence would detail problems that demanded the need for reform:

Saya dapatan kesulitan itu ... “desperate” ... “desperately”. Tapi kemudian ... “desperate” ... berarti suatu penderitaan. Oh, berarti sangat perlu, kagihan untuk sesuatu ... Ah, saya mengartikannya begini ... itu berarti ... berarti sangat perlu untuk adanya reformasi, sangat perlu adanya reformasi dalam sistem pendidikan. Lho kenapa membutuhkan seperti itu? Jadi saya harapkan, dari kalimat-kalimat berikutnya itu berisi permasalahan-permasalahan yang ada di Amerika saat itu.
(I have difficulty with the word “desperately”. But, then ... “desperate” ... means “suffering”. Oh, it means “urgent need for something.” Ah, I interpret it this way ... it means ... it means that reform was urgently needed in the educational system. Why was reform needed? So I expect that the next sentences will contain problems existing in America at that time.)

Glancing at the second sentence, he found that it confirmed his prediction for it presented one of the problems. While his paraphrase of the first clause was appropriate, his inference of the whole sentence indicated that he did not comprehend the sentence thoroughly:

Sudah terjawab itu pertanyaan saya, bahwa tidak ada, em, maksudnya tidak ada sekolah swasta kewali bagi mereka yang kaya, sehingga anak-anak yang kurang mampu itu tidak mempunyai kesempatan untuk sekolah swasta, dan dari kecil mereka sudah diarahkan untuk bekerja. Ya, berarti bagi orang-orang miskin tidak punya kesempatan sekolah ... sekolah di ... swasta.
My question has been answered, that is, there was no, um. I mean private schools existed but only for the rich. Children of the poor did not have any chance to go to private schools, and from their early childhood they had been directed to work. Yeah, it means that the poor did not have any chance to study at private schools.
Moving to the third sentence, Yan read it silently, identified a problem related to the sentence construction, related the sentence to the previous one, reflected on his approach to the problem, monitored his comprehension, and made an incomplete inference:

*Em, ada kesulitan saya, gimana menafsirkan “It is in the face of this public sentiment ...”.* Dari konteks tadi, mengenai permasalahan-permasalahan sistem pendidikan, ... em ... saya kemudian menyimpulkan atau menebak bahwa permasalahan seperti itu, berangkat dari permasalahan itu kemudian mereka, para 'reformer' itu, berangkat atau memulai pekerjaan mereka, memulai reformasi sistem pendidikannya.

(Um, I have difficulty interpreting the expression "It is in the face of this public sentiment ...". From the previous context, in regard to problems in the educational system, ... um ... I conclude or guess that such problems, basing on the problems, the reformers started their task, reforming the educational system.)

Moving to the fourth sentence, Yan read it silently, inferred the gist appropriately, and read it aloud to monitor and confirm his inference:

*Eem, di sini, salah satu dari reformer itu menyatakan bahwa tidak boleh ada masyarakat yang tidak ... berpendidikan, karena di sini kan jelas, "Horace Mann felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated". Itu, berarti bahwa reformer yang terkenal itu menyatakan tidak ... masyarakat tidak boleh tidak berpendidikan.*

(Um, here, one of the reformers stated that no member of the community was allowed to be uneducated. It is mentioned explicitly here: "Horace Mann felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated". It means that this famous reformer claimed that members of the community were not allowed to be uneducated.)

In reaction to the fifth sentence, Yan read it silently, related it to the previous sentence, made an inference, paraphrased the sentence, and reflected on his strategy use. As he interpreted "changes ... were matched in other school districts" as "changes ... suited the conditions of other schools", his paraphrase did not fully represent the gist of the sentence:

*Saya tahu bahwa Mann memulai ... memulai reformasi itu dari tahun 1837 sampai 1848. Dan itu sesuai ... sesuai dengan kondisi sekolah-sekolah yang lain. Saya kok bisa menyimpulkan seperti itu karena, oh, Horace Mann yang paling terkenal di situ ... paling terkenal. Berarti pasti tindakannya itu yang paling sesuai. Saya cara menafsirinya seperti itu, Pak.*

(I know that Mann initiated changes from 1837 to 1848. The changes he made suited the conditions of the other schools. I made this inference because, oh, Horace Mann was the most famous there. It means that his measures were the most suitable. That's my way of comprehending this sentence.)
Upon reading the sixth sentence, Yan identified a problematic phrase, guessed its meaning, paraphrased the whole sentence, monitored his comprehension, identified a problem resulting from the absence of prior knowledge of "extending the school year", and reflected on the problem:

Ein, sebenarnya saya terganggu ini "instituting teacher education". Tapi saya perkirakan, oh, "instituting" ... berarti membuat para guru itu belajar sampai perguruan tinggi sehingga meningkatkan mutu pendidikan guru, dan meningkatkan gaji mereka. Secara keseluruhan saya kira, em, Si Horace Mann itu mulai reformasi dengan memperpanjang tahun ... memperpanjang masa sekolah dari lima menjadi enam bulan, meningkatkan kualitas guru-nya, meningkatkan pendidikannya, dan meningkatkan gajinya. Terus terang saya ada kesulitan memfasilitkan "He extended the school year from five to six months." Maksudnya saya tidak tahu. Saya tahu terjemahannya, tapi prakteknya gimana, gitu loh?

(Oh, actually I am obstructed by this "instituting teacher education". But I think, oh, "instituting" ... it means making teachers study up to the university level in order to improve their quality and increase their salaries. As a whole, I think, um, Horace Mann initiated reform by extending the year, extending the period of study from five to six months, and improving the quality of teachers, improving their education, and increasing their salaries. Frankly speaking, I have difficulty interpreting "He extended the school year from five to six months." I don't know its essence. I know the translation, but how is the practice?)

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Yan read it silently, paraphrased the gist, evaluated the text content, as seen from his support of the author’s idea, reflected his predicting strategy in dealing with the text, provided an illustration, made another prediction about the content of the next sentences:

Ya, kita tahu, dari usaha-usaha itu tidak langsung menghasilkan sesuatu, tapi em... tapi membuat masyarakat itu paham bahwa ada suatu kebutuhan untuk... untuk meningkatkan sistem pendidikan. Karena ini proses, proses sistem pendidikan, saya sudah menduga paling kesimpulannya seperti itu. Proses ya nggak mungkin langsung hasilnya. Terus mungkin bagian berikutnya akan bicara usaha lain-lain.

(Yeah, we know, those efforts did not bring about direct results, but they made the public understand that there was a need to improve the educational system. As this was a process, a process in the educational system, I already predicted that the conclusion would be like this. As it was a process, it was impossible to see the result right away. Then, the next section may talk about other efforts.)

This prediction implies Yan’s assumption that Text 1 was a part of a longer article or piece of writing.
As Graph 5.4.4.2 shows, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Yan glanced at it, found key words, inferred the topic of the discussion, associated the text with the information from television, newspapers and other mass media, made a further inference, made a further association with his prior knowledge, and reflected on his knowledge of the topic:

_Begitu membaca, saya langsung, tentang apa sih? Oh, “coronary heart disease”_. tentang penyakit jantung koroner. Telur saya ingat informasi dari TV atau koran. Jantung koroner katanya pembunuh nomor satu di dunia, begitu. Jadi ini penyakit yang berat. Saya langsung ingat, oh, ini penyakitnya orang kaya, karena kalau kita baca itu, oh, jantung koroner itu penyakitnya orang-orang gemuk, banyak makan. (Reading this sentence, I immediately wondered: “What is it about?” Oh, “coronary heart disease.” Then I remember the information from TV and newspapers. It was said that coronary heart disease was the number one killer in the world. Thus, it is a serious disease. I remembered right away, oh, this is the disease of the rich, because from the article I read, oh, coronary heart disease is the disease of the fat people, people who think a lot.)

Reading the second sentence, he associated it with his prior knowledge and found that not all the information he learned earlier was true, vocalised a phrase that disconfirmed his prior knowledge, inferred the gist of the sentence, and provided an illustration to support his inference:

_Oh, ternyata bahwa ... anggapan saya selama ini ... bahwa itu penyakitnya orang kaya itu sebagian benar, tapi tidak seluruhnya benar. Bukannya di sini bisa saja orang-orang umum saja bisa kena penyakit ini. Em, “... the ordinary man in the street ...”. Berarti kan orang biasa saja ... malah mungkin gelandangan yang nggak miskin apa-apa saja bisa kena penyakit itu._

(Oh, my assumption that this is the disease of the rich is not completely true. It is proved here that the ordinary man could be affected. “Um, ... the ordinary man in the street ...”. It means that the ordinary man, or even the tramps, who have nothing to worry about, can be affected by the disease.)

Upon reading the third sentence, he read and reread the sentence silently, made an association with his prior knowledge, corrected his assumption, inferred the gist appropriately, and made a self-reflection:

_Jadi kan pikiran saya itu penyakitnya orang kaya, orang tua, begitul. Dan ternyata ini berlaku juga bagi orang-orang yang sepoor kaya dan yang masih muda. Oh, pikiran saya salah, ternyata. (So, I thought it was the disease of the_
Moving to the fourth sentence, Yan read it silently, had difficulty finding the meaning of a phrase, vocalised the phrase, and made an inappropriate guess at the meaning of the phrase “furring-up of arteries”. Due to this problem, he paraphrased the sentence inappropriately, but correctly inferred that “furring-up of arteries” was the cause of the disease:

Saya dapatan kesulitan the “furring-up of arteries”. Terus saya memahaminya. "artery" berarti sesuatu yang berhubungan dengan pembuluh darah. Jadi yang membawa darah itu ke seluruh tubuh dari ... dari jantung. Terus saya memperkirakan "furring-up" itu sebagai "pemompaan", pemompa darah agar mengalir. Terus, yang pening ini bahwa penyakit yang ini juga bisa berjangkit ke selain orang; binatang juga bisa terkena. “Kerja jantung dalam memompa darah di arteri ini” yang biasanya menyebabkan jantung koroner ini... bisa menjangkit pada binatang. Ya, maksudnya bahwa penyebab adanya jantung koroner itu, "furring-up of arteries" itu, Pak.

(I have difficulty with "furring-up of arteries." Then, my way of comprehending it, "artery" means something related to blood vessels. So it carries the blood from the heart to all parts of the body. Then I guess "furring-up" is the "pump", to pump the blood in order that it can flow. Then, an important thing to note is that this disease can also attack animals. The work of the heart in pumping the blood in the arteries, which usually causes coronary heart, may attack the animals. Yeah, I mean that the cause of coronary heart disease is "furring-up of arteries", Sir.)

Reading the fifth sentence, Yan identified and reflected on a comprehension problem, reflected on his strategies in comprehending a sentence, monitored his comprehension, reread the sentence while vocalising a number of key words, established an intra-sentential relation, reflected on strategy use, made an inappropriate inference of the gist, identified a problem, and reflected on his further strategies:

Em, saya kesulitan mencari bagian intinya apa; kalimatnya panjang banget. Kalau saya baca, yang penting oh, intinya ini. Namn haru saya mengarah ke kata-kata yang sulit. Kalau kata-katanya mengganggu, ya saya tebak, kalau nggak ya saya tinggalkan. ... Sebentar. Yang nampak meningkat di sini penyakitnya atau kabar mengenai informasi tentang jantung koroner? Atau treatment-nya? Saya harus membaca berrilang-ulang ini. Untuk mendapatkan intinya ini saya dibantu oleh keterangan “Although the coronary heart ...” dst. ini. Terus berikutnya ada "... together with the publicity ...": Ha, berarti ini... jelas yang dimaksud ini yang tengah. Saya menyimpulkannya itu, "The rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment ...". Ini berarti
metode-metode diagnose penyakit itu dan treatment-nya itu meningkat. Tapi ini malah membingungkan, kok metodenya meningkat? Karena bingung, saya meloncat ke kalimat berikutnya.

(Oh, I have difficulty finding the main clause as the sentence is very long. When I read, the most important thing is finding the gist. Only then will I look at the difficult words. If they obstruct comprehension, I will make a guess. Otherwise, I will just leave them. ... Wait a minute. Is what appears to be on the increase here the disease, or information about coronary heart disease, or the treatment? I have to read this over and over. The adjuncts "Although the coronary heart..." and "... together with the publicity..." seem to be of help in locating the main clause. It is apparent that the main clause is the middle section of the sentence. That's my conclusion. "The rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment..." It means that diagnostic methods and the treatment increased. But it is confusing, why do the methods increase? Being confused, I will skip this one and move to the next sentence.)

In regard to the sixth sentence, he read and reread it silently, related it to the previous sentence, reflected his confusion, identified another problem, made an association with prior knowledge, made an inappropriate inference, and reflected his strategy in regard to this problematic sentence:


(I am confused again, as I have not been sure, from the beginning, about what is on the increase; is it the diagnostic method or the treatment? Then, it is said in this sentence that the increase was "real." And, another disease, "cardiovascular", which is a modern epidemic, is mentioned. And, again, I remember "cardiovascular", which is the disease of the rich. Then came a thought, oh, so what is on the increase may be the number of the patients. Then, there is "cardiovascular" mentioned earlier. Probably there is some complication, suffering from coronary heart disease and cardiovascular disease. Then, I will just jump to the next sentence.

In response to the seventh sentence, Yan read it silently, found it confirmed his prediction because he found a figure showing that 18,000 people died because of this disease in 1942, related the sentence to the previous one, inferred the gist, reflected the strategy use, and confirmed that it was the number of patients who died of the disease that was in the increase:
Di sini saya tenukan bahwa selama tahun '42 yang meninggal itu 18,000. Oh, saya mantap, em, berarti yang meningkat jumlah penderitanya, dan yang meninggal saja segitu. Em, jadi untuk kalimat yang itu, saya langsung melihat itu, "... people dying ..." Kata-kata yang lain itu sudah ... saya abaikan. Yang saya lihat, oh, yang meninggal tahun ini sejumlah ini. Jadi saya membaca ini sekedar untuk memantapkan yang meningkat itu apanya.

(Here I find that during 1942 there were 18,000 people dying of the disease. Oh, I am convinced, um, it means that it was the number of the patients that increased, and the number of the people dying was that high. Um, so for this sentence, I just look at this "...people dying ...." I can just ignore the other words. What I need to see is the number of the people dying in that year. So I read this sentence merely to confirm what is on the increase.)

Responding to the eighth sentence, Yan read it silently, related to the previous sentence, correctly inferred the gist of the sentence, and confirmed his inference of the previous sentence:

Oh, kemudian lagi, itu lebih menambah ... menambah kepanahan saya tadi bahwa yang meninggal itu pasiennya, karena di sini ditegaskan jumlahnya naik menjadi 102,000 orang, meningkat lima kali lipat lebih. Berarti jumlah penderitanya yang meningkat.

(Oh, then again, this confirms my understanding that it is the patients that increase, because it is pointed out here that the number has risen to 102,000, making more than a five-fold increase. It means the number of the patients that increases.)

Skimming the ninth sentence, Yan paraphrased the sentence, inferred the gist, reflected his misconception about the disease, corrected his misconception, and summarised the content of the last few sentences:

Em, terus dari ini, em, saya secara sekilas langsung, oh, bahwa yang meninggal karena penyakit cardiovascular itu malah lebih besar dari yang meninggal karena kanker. Oh berarti cardiovascular itu penyakit berat. Ya, sebelumnya, begitu melihat, wah ini penyakitnya orang kaya, penyakitnya orang tua. Tapi dari beberapa kalimat tadi, yang pening bahwa, oh, jumlah korbannya besar.

(Um, from this, um, I can see right away that the people dying of cardiovascular are greater in number than those dying of cancer. Oh, it means that cardiovascular is a serious disease. Yeah, earlier, as soon as I saw this (cardiovascular), I considered it the disease of the rich and the old. But from the last few sentences, what is important is that a great number of people have become the victims of the disease.)

In response to the concluding sentence, Yan glanced at it, identified a potential problem due to the length of the sentence, reflected his worry about the problem, attempted a paraphrase, identified a logical problem in regard to the
causes of death rate increase, monitored his comprehension, reread the sentence silently, found another logical problem, identified the word "responsible" as a key word, interpreted the word, reflected the strategy used to overcome the comprehension problem, made an appropriate inference, associated the text with his prior knowledge about euthanasia, and made a self-reflection:


[This last sentence is difficult and long. I can see that the number of deaths from cardiovascular disease is the consequence of population increase. But the other reasons make me confused. Initially, I was convinced that the number of deaths increased because the population also increased. If the population increased, the percentage (of the population who died of the disease) would also increase. But, rereading the sentence, I found life expectancy and accurate diagnosis. These are confusing. "Responsible" here means those influencing, either in positive or negative sense, or causing the increase in the number of deaths from cardiovascular disease. Then, I usually reread it to find the essence. I conclude that the factors causing the death rate increase are population increase, life expectancy, accurate diagnosis, and "death certification" - a permit to die. I mean, as I once read, patients who are very weak and whose lives are dependent on medicine, may make a request to die. These patients know that they only become burdens, and if the medication is stopped, they will undoubtedly die. For a serious disease such as "cardiovascular," the patients may make a request to die. But, there is still a controversy on this (euthanasia).

Retellings

Yan's retelling of Text 1 was brief, but contained the correct theme, the correct main idea and 60% of the details. In addition, in line with Lia's comment, he evaluated the text, saying that there was inconsistency in the content:
Yan was able to comprehend the text content, but he questioned the logic of the problem solution. In his opinion, Mann's measures - raising the teachers' salaries and extending the school year - were not directly related to the main problem, the problem of the children of the poor in America. On the one hand, Yan could be right in that the measures taken by Horace Mann had not solved the problem. On the other hand, he did not notice that, in fact, the author did not claim that the main problem was solved. However, rather than being considered a form of misunderstanding, Yan's comment should be seen as evidence of his being a critical reader. This might have been beyond the author's intention because none of the test questions was related to this point. However, there is no doubt that texts in a reading comprehension test do not generally present information in a straightforward manner. Some of the information is usually implied, and it is the reader's task to make inferences from the limited cues provided.

Meanwhile, Yan's retelling of Text 2 reflected almost all points he understood during the think-aloud task performance, that is, when he read the text sentence by sentence. He started his retelling by saying:

Yang jelas itu mencatatkan hal-hal mengenai penyakit jantung koroner. Bahwa itu merupakan penyakit yang umum dan sangat berbahaya, bisa yang orang biasa saja kena sampai bohkan pada orang yang sangat pintar pun bisa kena, dan itu bisa berlaku bagi orang yang masih muda, bisa yang tua, hewan dan amnestia bisa kena, dan bahwa jantung koroner itu merupakan penyakit yang sangat berbahaya terbukti pada tahun 1942 itu membahayakan em ... 13 ribu orang lebih, kemudian 20 ih berikunya itu sekitar 102 ribu orang meninggal karenanya. Berarti ada peningkatan besar, empat atau lima kali. Dan em ... dan penyakit itu lebih berbahaya dari penyakit kanker karena ... penyakit kanker itu cuma mengakibatkan kematian yang jumlahnya separoh dari yang diakibatkan
oleh penyakit jantung koroner.
(Apparently the text is about coronary heart disease, that the disease is common and very dangerous, that it can affect common people as well as important people, that it can attack the young as well as the old, humans as well as animals, and that it is very dangerous. It can be seen from the statistics that in 1942 it killed 18,000 people, and twenty years later 102,000 people died of this disease. This means that the increase was great, four or five times. And, um, the disease was more dangerous than cancer because cancer killed only half of the number of people who died because of coronary heart disease.)

This shows how he perfectly integrated the information from different sections of the text to summarise the essence of the text, although the instruction did not mention any of the aspects, such as the theme or the main idea, which would be assessed from his retelling.

Then he mentioned four factors causing the rise in the death rate: population increases, improved life expectancy, more accurate diagnosis and death certification:

Em, bahwa jumlah kematian akibat jantung koroner itu dipengaruhi oleh empat hal, yaitu mengenai kenaikan jumlah penduduk, perbaikan angka harapan hidup, diagnosa yang lebih baik, dan yang keempat itu ... oleh ... death certification. (Um, the number of deaths due to coronary heart disease was influenced by four factors: population increases, improved life expectancy, better diagnosis and death certification.)

However, he obtained a score of 3 instead of a full score of 4 for the main idea of the text, because he misinterpreted the term “death certification” as “ijin untuk mati” (a permit to die). When the researcher asked him what was meant by “ijin untuk mati”, he provided the following explanation:

Death certification ... saya ingat pada bacaan bahwa untuk orang-orang yang ... sudah hidupnya itu tergantung sama obat dan karena sudah sangat lemah sekali, itu bisa minta untuk mati. Tapi ini masih kontroversi.

(Death certification ... I remember from an article I read that people whose lives were dependent on medicine, and because they were very weak physically, they were allowed to make a request to die. But there was still a controversy on this.)

Apparently he related “death certification” to euthanasia, which he remembered from an article he had read.
In-depth interview

There are a number of points to note from the discussion of the test result during the in-depth interview session. When asked about the main topic of Text 1, he chose “The beginnings of reform in American education”. The reason was that, in Yan’s opinion, reform was a process. Since it was mentioned in the second paragraph that Horace Mann initiated changes, Yan inferred that this must have been just the beginning of this process. This confirmed his understanding revealed in the retelling that results of a reform could not be seen immediately. In regard to the meaning of the word “sentiment”, he learned from the context that it means “opinion”:

“Sentiment” itu saya mengartikannya begitu. Dari “... the strong sentiment that children ...” itu bukan herati perasaan sentimen, tetapi bahkan “pendapat”. Entah itu, mengapa pendapat kok disebut “sentiment”. Mungkin pendapat yang bermula miring karena negatif. (I interpret “sentiment” this way. The word “sentiment” from “… the strong sentiment that children …” does not mean “sentimen” (feelings) but “opinion”. I don’t know why “opinion” is called “sentiment”. Probably it is an opinion that has a negative connotation.)

Thus his silence about the word “sentiment” in the think-aloud task was because, based on the context, he had already guessed the meaning of the word. However, this guessing of meaning based on context was not revealed in the think-aloud protocol, indicating the importance of not relying on only one source of information in the analysis. During the think-aloud session, he did not mention a problem with any individual word. As can be seen from Yan’s response to the third sentence of Text 1 during the think-aloud session, his problem concerned the interpretation of the whole expression:

En, ada kesulitan saya, ginana menafsirkan “It is in the face of this public sentiment ...”. Dari konteks tadi, mengenai permasalahan-permasalahan sistem pendidikan, saya kemudian menyimpulkan atau menebak bahwa permasalahan seperti itu, berangkat dari permasalahan itu kemudian mereka, para ‘reformer’ itu, berangkat atau memulai pekerjaan mereka, menulai reformasi sistem pendidikannya. (Um, I have difficulty interpreting the expression “It is in the face of this public sentiment ...”. From the context, in regard to problems in the educational system, I conclude or guess that such problems, basing on the problems, the reformers started their task, reforming the educational system.)
In regard to Text 2, it was revealed from the interview that, when asked about the topic, Yan only thought of coronary heart disease and forgot about cancer. In addition, he did not seem to look closely at the option he chose. The option was “Diseases of the heart” but he read it as “Disease of the heart”, missing the “s” at the end of the word “Disease”. Therefore he chose “Disease of the heart” (spelled “Diseases of the heart”) instead of “Fatal diseases” which included cancer. If he had managed to detect the final “s” in the word “Diseases”, he might have remembered that there was only one heart disease mentioned in the text, that is, coronary heart disease. This confirms his comment during the think-aloud session that he looked closely at words only when he had problems understanding. When a sentence made sense, he did not bother making a crosscheck. Hence, a small element such as the plural morpheme “s” in “Diseases” was undetected.

It was revealed from the interview that Yan’s inferring strategy was good. When asked about the meaning of the word “authorities” as used in the passage, he considered the context properly:

“Some authorities believe that this increase is real ....” Kemudian saya nangkapnya, oh, ini bidangnya bidang kesehatan, terus saya jawabnya "medical experts". (“Some authorities believe that this increase is real ....” Then I understand, oh, this is the area of health. Then my answer was "medical experts").

When asked about what strategies Yan uses in a real reading test, his comment indicated that his strategies depended on the task:


(I usually read the questions first, because from the questions I will get a picture of what the text is about. My reading will depend much on the questions. If the question is about the topic, then I will skim the text to see the gist of the text as a whole, but if it is about the year, I will scan the text to look for the year. When I have a problem with vocabulary, I will just guess its meaning.)
Yan’s comment may be justified by his multiple-choice test performance. There were a number of points in the text he did not comprehend properly, such as the “extension of school year” (in Text 1), and “furring-up of arteries” (Text 1), but his test score was good (13 out of 16 possible points). Out of the three questions he could not answer correctly only one question required global comprehension of the text (Question 9 asking for the main topic of the passage), while the other two questions were based more on vocabulary mastery (the meaning of “furring-up of arteries” and “by” as the word used in “by the eighteenth century”).

In regard to reading newspapers, he stated again that his choice of strategy depended on the nature of the task. However, he always focused on the gist:

Kalau baca koran atas kemauan sendiri, yang penting saya tahu intinya. Saya tidak perhatikan kata per kata. Tapi kalau ditugaskan dosen, harus saya pahami intinya apa. Kalau suruh meringkas, saya harus paham, dan kalau ada kata sukar ya saya cari di kamus. Dan kalau baca koran bahasa Inggris kan biasanya saya sekedar ingin tahu bagaimana menguapkan berta atau sesuatu dalam bahasa Inggris. (When I read a newspaper on my own, the most important thing is to know the gist. I do not read it word by word. But if it is an assignment from a lecturer, I must understand its content. If I have to summarise its content, I must understand it and if I have a vocabulary problem, I will look it up in the dictionary. And in reading a newspaper in English, my purpose is just to see how to report news or to express something in English.)

When asked about the strategies used in reading textbooks assigned by lecturers, he outlined that he read for gist first, before rereading for details:


(Just like reading newspapers, but I have to read it over and over. In general, I have to know the gist, first. Only then, will I look at details. If there is a problem of difficult words, I will look them up in the dictionary, but if I cannot get the gist, I will have to read over and over, linking the sentences that may be related. If necessary I will read another book on the same subject, even if it is in Indonesian. When the chance allows, I sometimes discuss it with friends.)
Appendix 5.5

Strategy Profile of Reader 5 (Lat)

Think-aloud protocol

As Graph 5.4.5.1 shows, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Lat read it silently, commented that she had no problem with it, and inferred the gist correctly:

From the first sentence I have ... I get to the conclusion and I understand what the sentence means. It means that the educational system there in America is not perfect yet. That's why reform is desperately needed ... was very much needed in the American educational system.

In response to the second sentence, she read it silently, inferred the gist, and identified herself with the author in evaluating the text content, as can be seen from the use of the pronoun "I" instead of "he" in her illustration to explain the author's intention of putting the word "waste" between quotation marks:

In the second sentence the writer actually wants to underline that education is not a waste of time, by using the quotation marks, because I interpret that the "waste" here is not in actual meaning, just a way to say something that, something I want to say, that is stressed. That's why I use quotations, or may be with the "negative - negative" or "not" or by using something like "it is not impossible", for example, which means "possible", "very possible".

This inference indicates that not only did Lat comprehend the sentence but she also identified the special function of the quotation marks used as a key to interpretation.

Moving to the third sentence, she read it silently, attempted a tentative inference, provided an illustration to support the inference, and finalised the inference:

May be the public sentiment is so strong, the educational reformers think that there should be a change in the people's opinion. If that opinion kept going on, the education system in America will be worse. So to anticipate the problem, they plan to do something as their duty to change the public sentiment or the public opinion.

In response to the fourth sentence, Lat read it silently, paraphrased the gist chunk by chunk, provided an illustration to clarify the paraphrase, made an association with her prior knowledge about democracy, and completed the paraphrase of the sentence.
Her paraphrase indicates her support of the author’s opinion on Mann’s concern over the condition of the American educational system:

Horace Mann, as a ... one of the people in America, who ... who is concerned with the condition of educational system ... um ... felt that he ... ... he had to do ... something like a reform to ... to make the education better, because he had an opinion ... or he had an opinion that um ... any citizen in a republic ... that is similar with the democratic ... so every person had the equal right ... in everything, including in education ... so any citizen should be educated.

Responding to the fifth sentence, Lat read it silently, evaluated the content as reflected on her associating the text with her observation on the development occurring in Indonesia, reflected her support of the author’s opinion, and provided a lengthy illustration:

Well, in Indonesia, the reforms also happened. Um, the most, um, nyata (obvious) is the innovation in curriculum, the change of curriculum from Curriculum ’75, and then Curriculum ’84, and then we go to the Curriculum of ’92. And now maybe there will be another change of curriculum, especially in higher education. Um, the changes of the curriculum, um, dimaksudkan (is meant) to, um, to improve the quality of teaching learning process, in my opinion. And that’s only one of the changes in ... in education, because another development in the teaching materials, the textbooks ... and also the technique of the education of teachers, giving, um, semacam penataran (a kind of training) held for teachers. And also the ... the meeting of teachers who have the same area of study to ... discuss ... what material is suitable for their ... the learners.

After this lengthy illustration, an inference was made about what Horace Mann did, followed by a further association with development in education happening in Indonesia, and concluded with self-reflection:

Um, Horace Mann, first of all, he makes some changes in his own district, but maybe another district feels that the result is better, so they also follow what Horace Mann did. And I think that also happens in some districts in Indonesia. For example with the ... introduce ... introduction of English in elementary schools ... are not only Yogyakarta who ... who have some elementary schools with English subject, but I am informed that other places like Central Java also have English for children in some elementary schools. Maybe because they see that the result is good ... in Yogyakarta, so they want to apply that in another district.

Even after reading the sixth sentence silently, Lat still made an association with the decision recently made by the Indonesian Ministry of Education. Formerly, children were obliged to complete primary school (six years of schooling), but now they have to complete junior secondary (nine years of schooling). However, she seemed to
confuse the concept of "school year", the period of study within a single year, with that of "the nine-year compulsory education" in Indonesia:

The extent ... the extension of a school year in this text is also found in Indonesia with the, um, implementation of wajib belajar sembilan tahun (the nine-year compulsory education) ... means that, before that, children ... children ... hanya diwajibkan (were obliged only) to have elementary school education, but now it's improving to SMP (junior secondary) level.

Reading the concluding sentence, Lat evaluated and justified the message content, and provided an illustration to support her justification:

Of course, the changes will not ... bring about a sudden improvement ... in a short time, because I also realise that, um, what I did will not get, um, mendadak (sudden) ... instant result ... not instant result, but we need some time and, um, hasilnya itu bisa dinikmati kemudian (we can enjoy the result later), but we don't know when. Ha, ha, ha.

As Lat claimed after reading the first sentence, the passage seemed easy for her. Not only did she understand the text, but she also demonstrated her ability to go beyond the information given in the text. Sometimes she evaluated the text content and identified with the author and provided illustrations for clarification and rationales to support her stance. The absence of prior knowledge or a practical example of "extending the school year" made her interpret the concept incorrectly. However, an evaluation of the last sentence and the illustrations provided demonstrated her full comprehension of the sentence.

As Graph 5.4.5.2 indicates, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, she read it silently, attended to the key words "coronary heart disease", vocalised the words, showed disagreement with the author's opinion that most people have heard about it, and made a self-reflection:

Coronary heart disease. Um, I myself have not heard a lot about coronary heart disease and ... maybe because I have no relatives with coronary heart disease; so I ... maybe I just heard about that like "passing news" like that. So I myself ... may be included in few people who have not heard about the ... coronary heart disease.

In response to the second sentence, Lat read it silently, inferred the gist, paraphrased the sentence, made another inference that the disease was stubborn and very
dangerous, and provided an illustration:

Well, this kind of disease is ... um ... belong to a group of disease ... a group of disease ... um ... very ... um ... in Javanese ‘ndablek’ (stubborn). Ha, ha, ha. It ... it doesn't care ... it doesn't care who ... who is the victim ... um ... from what class, it ... um dari usia berapa (from what age group), like that. So maybe ... and this kind of illness is ... because of ‘ke-ndablekannya itu’ (its stubbornness) ... so it's very dangerous. Um, very dangerous, because, um, it has no mercy ... it has no mercy ... for every person. Even the president of superpower ... can be ... can be attacked ... by that disease ... although maybe he has ... a good doctor, a good ... a good scientist, um but he is still ... can be ... he can be attacked by this disease.

Moving to the third sentence, she read it silently, identified the word “primarily” as the key word to full understanding of the sentence, vocalised the word, interpreted the phrase containing the word, and correctly inferred the gist of the whole sentence:

“Primarily ...” Oh, for the old. This disease is also disregard, um, do not care about the age of the victim, though it is primarily ... mostly happen to the old people.

In order to internalise her understanding of the portions of the text already read, Lat summarised the first three sentences:

Coronary heart disease is very dangerous. It is ndablek (stubborn) ... what is it in English? It can attack everyone, old, not too old, and young.

In reaction to the fourth sentence, Lat read it silently, inferred the gist, reflected on her lack of prior knowledge on the topic, related the sentence to the previous ones, and paraphrased the whole sentence:

Um ... and the ... the cause ... the cause of the disease is actually the blocking up of the arteries, so maybe “furring-up of arteries” here is the same as the blocking-up, but I myself do not know what makes the arteries blocked. May be from the food, maybe from the life habit, maybe. This disease is ... um ... is not only no respecter of person but also for another species or every ... every animate ... animate things? Semua yang hidup (All living beings) ... can be attacked by this kind of disease.

From the following response, it appears that after reading the fifth sentence silently, Lat strived to focus on the main clause, as can be seen from the correct inference of the clause and an inappropriate paraphrase of the sub-clause. In order to support the inference, she referred to the text, made an association with the Indonesian context
and provided a relevant illustration, but which deviated from the information provided in the text:

Um, um ... although this disease has already been publicised ... by media and also there are so many doctors with improved ... with improved methods of treatment and ... etc., but um ... the number of ... people ... dead because of this ... because of this disease is still high. This is appear that ... from the text it appears that the number of people who ... who get killed or ... dead because of that disease is on the increase. So, maybe, this like what happens in our country. I think in some cases, many people still ignore about the disease. Like the "director" (of a company), um, he only sits down, never moves atau olah raga (or do any sports). That also may cause ... not only this kind of disease but maybe also another disease.

Moving to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, identified "a modern epidemic" as the key words, paraphrased the gist of the sentence incompletely, and related it to her observations of daily life in Indonesia:

Then ... this disease is called 'a modern epidemic' because, in my opinion, we are now living in a modern ... modern age. And ... I think every ... many people have heard about this disease ... about this disease, but um ... they still do not ... they heard but they "do not aware of (are not aware of) the cause of the disease, and also um, they ... just keep doing what they are doing.

In response to the seventh sentence, Lat read it silently, and inferred the gist of the whole sentence. Despite the presence of years and figures representing death rates, she did not make any mention of them at all in her inference:

And this makes um ... the number of the people dead because of the ... because of coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease increase.

Responding to the eight sentence, she read it silently, related it to the previous sentence, and inferred the gist:

From the ... from the data in ... in twenty years, there is a five-fold increase.

In reaction to the ninth sentence, she read it silently, and provided illustrations and clarification of her understanding of the text, while making an association with prior knowledge. Her understanding about the relation between coronary heart disease and cancer, which was not mentioned explicitly, was associated with her impression of the people's attitude toward the diseases. She wanted to emphasise that, rather than
seeing the threat of coronary heart disease, people still thought that cancer was the number one killer disease:

Maybe in Indonesia, the most ... cancer is still ... is still ... menakutkan (frightening) ... for some people, maybe, yeah. Maybe, maybe they still say that cancer is still the first ... the first rank ... in the first rank in cause death rate.

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Lat glanced at it, appearing to assume that she understood the gist, made an association with her background knowledge, and made a self-reflection rather than basing her response on the information from the text:

Cardiovascular disease usually attacks ... I observe that ... usually attacks um ... those from high class ... from rich people, um, maybe because um ... the eating habit, I think, is the most ... the most ... they ... "biasanya kan makanan yang daging-daging" (they usually eat a lot of meat stuff) ... makanan yang berlemak (fatty food). Yeah, from eating habit. And because ... orang semakin sejahtera (people are more prosperous). ... many people with ... with improved life expectancy, and also um ... the increase of those who now belong to high class or rich people, so the number of people ... who get killed by that disease is also increased, I think.

Retellings

A number of points can be noted in regard to Lat’s retellings. First, her retelling of Text 1 was relatively complete, covering the theme, the main idea and most (80%) of the details. Similarly, in regard to Text 2, the retelling also covers the theme, the main idea and four out of seven (57%) of the details. Second, in her retelling she did not merely restate, but paraphrased, the sentences in the text. It indicates that she did not merely memorise the text but really comprehended the essence. Third, rereading the text before the retelling, especially of Text 2, improved her comprehension of the text. For example, Lat successfully inferred and reported the essence of the last sentence, completed with illustrations beyond the information provided in the text to support her inference:

And the rise of the people dead because of the disease, may be because the number of the people also increase, so the population has increased, the people attacked by the disease also increase. And that makes the number of the people dead because of the disease also increase. And the other is the improvement in the life expectancy. Because of the improvement in the life expectancy, so um, the condition of life, the life condition is better than, is better so that people have more chance to live longer, and that
also, um, increase the number of the population. Because the number of the population 
increase, so the number of people attacked by the disease is increased, and the number 
of the people dead because of the disease is also increased. And the other factor is also 
more accurate diagnosis and death certification. From the death certification may be the 
government found that most of them, many of them are caused by the cardiovascular 
disease.

Fourth, in regard to Text 1, she justified what the reformer (Horace Mann) did, 
particularly the raising of the teachers’ salaries. Based on her observation as a part-
time teacher, she commented:

Um, there is "tendency" from the teachers, from the teachers to have 
outside work ... outside work (a side job) ... because of low salary. Many teachers do 
that and I think they should be paid higher salary so that they will focus their attention 
on their tasks as the teachers in the teaching-learning process.

Unfortunately, she could not earn the maximum score for her retelling because she 
misssed three details in Text 2, which proved her attention was more on the gist than 
details. Yet her retelling score was one of the highest in the group.

In-depth interview

In response to the question on a suitable title for Text 1 (during the discussion on test 
answers), Lat indicated her recognition of text structure. She said:

Well, in my mind I have something for the topic of the passage. And the topic of the 
passage usually is in the first sentence, or in the last sentence, or may be in the middle. 
And I think that the most suitable one is D. "The beginnings of reform in American 
education." I think it is like first sentence, in first sentence, um, in the text.

In finding the word closest in meaning to the word "sentiment", Lat argued:

I think that 'sentiment' is not the same in meaning, not exactly the same in meaning as 
the word 'opinion' but because 'sentiment' is also related with our thinking, our feeling, 
but also with our thinking, and our thinking is related to our opinion.

Lat also recognised the author's purpose of using quotation marks for the word 
'waste' in "... children ... should not 'waste' their time on education". Her argument 
was:

If I want to clarify that I didn't really mean something, usually I use a word like that,
quotation. So because the author thinks that education is not really a waste of time, to confirm that I say like that but I don’t mean like that. Some people may, some people may think like that but it is not like that. The meaning can be the opposite.

Like Yan, Lat was more successful in answering questions based on her understanding of the gist than those based on either vocabulary mastery or focus on details. For example, in answering Question 11, Lat had difficulty with the exact meaning of the word “by” in “by the eighteen century”, because the answer was very dependent on her vocabulary mastery. Like Eki, she seemed to have been strongly influenced by her observation of day-to-day practice that “power” or “authorities” is identical with government or government officials. Despite her awareness that “medical experts” could be relevant to the topic, she did not identify “medical experts” with “authorities”.

*Reading texts in a reading test*

Realising that the main task in a test was answering questions, Lat usually read the questions before reading the text. She claimed that by reading the questions, she had some idea about what to look for in reading the text. This way, she saved time.

*Reading newspapers*

When asked about the strategies used in reading newspapers in English, Lat said that she read a newspaper to learn global information. Therefore, she would simply try to obtain the main idea. She did not bother reading all the sentences. Besides, she also often heard the news from the TV programs and the Indonesian newspapers. She added she sometimes had problems related to the meaning of certain words, because she thought the words used in newspapers were different from those used in textbooks. In solving these problems, she usually guessed the meaning based on the context.

*Reading books*

When asked about the strategies used in reading books such as the ones prescribed by the lecturers, Lat said that reading the text over and over was the main strategy she
employed, and added that sentence constructions and vocabulary often posed a comprehension problem:

I usually read two times or twice, or three times. Sometimes the main idea is only short, but the sentences are long, and find that the foreign writers prefer to make sentences using many commas - too complex sentences. It's often difficult to find the main clause, the main idea. And that's why I should read twice or three times in order to really understand what it means.

In regard to solving this problem, Lat sometimes had to find another book of the same topic, in English or in Indonesian. Sometimes she found that other books were easier to comprehend, because the ways other writers write or express their ideas are simpler. Otherwise, she would discuss the book with her friends. When she found difficult words, she would guess the meaning, or refer to the dictionary when guessing did not help.
Appendix 5.6
Strategy Profile of Reader 6 (Gio)

Think-aloud protocol

As Graph 4.4.6.1 indicates, starting with Text 1, Gio read the first sentence silently, identified a problematic word (the word “desperately”), vocalised the word, reread the sentence, guessed the meaning of the word based on the context, and inferred the gist of the whole sentence:

Em, ini tentang pendidikan di Amerika ... pada ... permulaan abad ke-19. Jadi dari ini ... des ... desperately ... saya mengafirkan ... kondisi pendidikan di Amerika waktu itu sangat ... sangat ... perlu diadakan suatu reformasi. (Lim, this is about education in America at the beginning of the nineteenth century. From the word “desperately”, I interpreted it that the condition of education in America at that time very ... very much ... in need of reform.)

Following the inference, Gio associated the text with his prior knowledge and made lengthy self-reflections some of which were irrelevant and superfluous:

Amerika sudah sangat, sangat maju, sebagai sebuah wilayah yang, yang menjadi pionir dalam modernisme. Saya kira, ya, itu pendidikan di Amerika. Sebagai salah satu institusi untuk membangun di jaman yang moderen, mungkin kondisi semacam itu menuntut adanya pembaharuan dalam bidang pendidikan. Em, saya kira pendidikan di seluruh dunia dalam arti pendidikan yang formal, kemudian di-institusikan, diinstitusionalkan, itu selalu mengalami apa yang disebut, em, apa namanya, ya, cooling down itu, Pak. Jadi karena saya baca tentang buku-buku pendidikan, dan saya juga mencermati ... realitas pendidikan yang ada di Indonesia itu, kalau saya melihat persoalan yang menjadi intinya adalah dehumanisasi. Jadi pendidikan itu kan, apa namanya, em, memberi kesempatan kepada manusia untuk terlibat dalam proses menyelesaikan kebenaran, atau yang semacam itu. Dan kebenaran itu juga bisa diperdebatkan oleh siapapun juga. Makanya kalau reformasi pendidikan, saya kira memberi kesempatan kepada setiap manusia untuk berproses. Tidak ada, ya, sikap-sikap otoriter, atau yang semacam itu. Itu saya kira kaitan pertama. (America was highly advanced as a region that became a pioneer in modernism. I think that's education in America. As one of the institutions of development in the modern era, probably the condition demanded reform in education. Um, I think education all over the world, in the sense of formal education, which was institutionalised, always underwent the so called “cooling down”, Sir. As I read books on education, and I also observe reality of education in Indonesia, I observe that the main problem is “dehumanisation”. Education should, um, what do you call it, give opportunities to human beings to be involved in the process towards “truth”, or something alike. And the truth can be debated by anyone. Therefore, educational reform, I think, should give every human being an opportunity to be in the process. There should be no such authoritarian attitudes. I think that's about the first sentence.)
In response to the second sentence, he read it silently, identified and vocalised a problematic word (the word "private"), associated it with "les privat", which resulted in his interpretation of "private school" as "les privat" (private tutoring), a casual job in which once he was involved, paraphrased the following chunk, made an association with an Indonesian context, and emotional self-reflections followed:


(Then, about private schools, probably in Indonesia they are private tutoring or something alike. I have been a tutor, um, a private tutor, a few times. Um, but, oh, this proved to be only for the rich. And then, um, the public schools were very few; there were only very few public schools. Yeah, of course, in Indonesia, the so-called public schools are relatively cheaper in tuition fee than the other schools, maybe. Yeah, I think the problem is about economy, about tuition fees, maybe. If we talk about economic issues, what I have in mind is injustice. I am not jealous, but the practice is different from what the authorities say. We are fed up with slogans of justice, but where is the justice? Justice is only for the authorities and conglomerates or their children. I am still fortunate to be able to study at a state university. What about the others? I am sorry, maybe I am a bit emotional.)

He had difficulty comprehending the words "strong sentiment", but through his association with background knowledge, he managed to infer the gist of the rest of the sentence appropriately:

*Em, strong sentiment that .... Saya kurang paham ini dengan "strong sentiment". Kok 'sentiment'? Em, oh ya, supaya anak-anak yang, opa namanya, 'own help'. Em, kira-kira kalau saya pahami, yang pertama persoalan ekonomi itu, bahwa, saya kira juga sama di mana-mana, menjadi kendala, em, untuk keluarga-keluarga yang miskin dalam menyekolahkan anaknya. Dan itu selalu ... selalu menjadi tarik-menarik antara sekolah dengan biaya yang tinggi, atau orang tua itu memenuhi anaknya mencari uang untuk mendukung perekonomian keluarga.*

(Um, strong sentiment that .... I don't understand "strong sentiment". Why "sentiment"? Um, oh yeah, in order that children could help themselves. Um, in my understanding, first, that an economic problem, which I think it's the same everywhere, becomes an obstacle, um, for the poor family to send their children to school. And there is always a dilemma between sending children to school with a high cost and asking the children to work for money to support their family.)
Gio acknowledged that he did not understand the exact meaning of this sentence, but he would do his best to express what he was thinking, including his assumptions, although they might be considered irrelevant:

Tadi em ... terus terang saya tidak begitu ... tidak begitu paham, exactly ... tentang kalimat ini. Atau itu mungkin suatu kebiasaan saya, kalau ... membaca dengan ... dengan apa ... membacanya cuma at glance atau apa itu. Tapi, nanti saya akan berusaha mengungkapkan apa yang ... apa yang saya ... saya pikirkan seoptimal mungkin. Walaupun ... barangkali ... apa yang saya pikirkan itu ... terlalu banyak ke hal-hal yang bukan ... bukan pada fokus ini langsung, setapi hal-hal yang berkaitan dengan pengalaman saya atau yang telah saya banyak baca ... atau yang pernah banyak saya diskusikan dengan teman-teman.

(Frankly speaking, I did not understand the exact meaning of this sentence. Or probably this was due to my habit of reading texts only at a glance. But I will try to express as much as possible what I have in mind, although there may be too many things beyond the focus of this topic, but things related to my experience, or articles I have read, or topics I have discussed with my friends.)

Moving to the third sentence, Gio was still bothered by the word “sentiment”, attempted an alternative interpretation, reread the sentence aloud, paraphrased it, and provided an illustration. This illustration was followed by a lengthy and irrelevant self-reflection:

Tapi ... yang menggannya itu di sini ... kata-kata “sentiment” si, sejuk awal tadi . Sentimen? Mungkin apa itu, rasa dendam masyarakat, karena kalau saya melihat, dalam setiap persoalan pendidikan itu ... selalu yang menjadi sasaran atau korban adalah masyarakat. Em, nggak tahu apakah saya terlalu, em, merasa sangat empati pada masyarakat yang di manapun. Dan saat ini kita di zaman moderen, yang mana masyarakat selalu menjadi korban. "It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task." Em, ini menjadi, apa namanya, em, masalah yang dihadapi masyarakat, dan bagi reformers itu merupakan suatu keharusan, yang memang menjadi tugas mereka. Para reformers itu diharapkan mampu menyelesaikan persoalannya. Artinya itu tugas mereka, sebagai seorang yang punya kelebihan. Reformasi memang ditujukan untuk memerdekan pendidikan dan masyarakat kita. Tapi masalahnya kadang para reformer itu sendiri sering salah menafsirkan modernisasi itu. Modernisme itu kan sebuah paham pada zaman tertentu, pada periode tertentu, yang mempunyai latar belakang peradaban sebelumnya. Modernisme itu punya system tertinggi, dan system sosial sekarang ini mempunyai kemanahan-kelamahan yang mencolok, yang akibatnya bisa fatal bagi masyarakat. Kekalahan itu terletak pada kekalahan sistem berpikir dan sistem sosial. Kalau kita bicara tentang system berpikir, kita bicara tentang asumsi awal tentang apa itu manusia, apa itu alam, apa itu Tuhan. Manusia modern kadang tidak mengenal Tuhan dan memahami sesuatu seperti yang, jabatan, dsb.

(But what is troubling me here is the word “sentiment” mentioned earlier. Sentiment? Probably it was the grievance of the community, because I observe that in any educational issue, the community always becomes the target or victim. Um, I don’t know, maybe because I have much empathy on the community anywhere. And now we are in the modern era, in which community always becomes the victim. “It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task.” Um, this
became, what do you call it, a problem faced by the community; and for the reformers, it was a must, which became their duty. The reformers were expected to be able to solve the problems, which means that it was their task, as people who have advantages. A reform is intended to modernise education and our people. But the problem is that the reformers themselves often misinterpret modernisation. Modernism is an idea belonging to a certain era, a certain period of time, with the previous civilization as its background. Modernism has its highest system, and the present social system has its striking flaws, which can be fatal for the society. One of the flaws is on the reasoning and social systems. If we talk about the reasoning system, we will talk about what is man, what is nature, and what is God. Modern people sometimes do not recognise God, and they worship things such as money, position, etc.)

In response to the fourth sentence, Gio read it aloud, questioned the validity of the information that Horace Mann was a very famous person, made a self-reflection, implying he had never heard the name, paraphrased the sentence, and made another self-reflection:

“Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated.” Ini mengatakan Horace Mann seorang reformat yang sangat terkenal. Terus terang saya memperolehkan ke-valid-en informasi ini. Saya tidak tahu tulisan ini dikutip dari mana, jurnal, newspaper atau makalah atau apa. Jadi claim bahwa Horace Mann itu sangat terkenal itu, saya mendengarnya risi. Ya bisa kan, terkenal di kotanya saja? Kemudian Horace Mann merasakan em, no excuse tidak ter... termasukkan ... ya, di negara itu, for any citizen to be uneducated. Ya, persoalan tidak bersekolah. Ya ... saya kira seperti itu adalah persoalan pendidikan yang perlu diperbaiki.

(It says that Horace Mann was a very famous reformer. Frankly speaking, I question the validity of this information. I don’t know where this text was quoted from, journal, newspaper, article, or what. The claim that Horace Mann was very famous tickles my ears. It’s possible that he was famous only in his town, isn’t it? Then Horace Mann felt, um, no excuse, yeah, in that country, for any citizen to be uneducated. Yeah, the problem of not going to school. Yeah, I think this is an educational problem that must be solved.)

Moving to the fifth sentence, he read it aloud, skipped parts of the subclauses, questioned the word “superintendent”, monitored his comprehension, and paraphrased his interpretation:

“As Superintendent of ... yeah ... he initiated various changes ...” Apa ini ‘superintendent’? Em, ya. Di sini ini Pak ‘superintendent’, yang saya tidak paham sepenuhnya. Em, makna yang saya tangkap di ... sini itu, antara ini ... tahun 1837 sampai 1848, S1 Mann ini ... em ... mencatat beberapa ... perubahan ... perubahan itu juga bervariasi, ... yang em terjadi di banyak sekolah, maksud saya, ... di negara ini. (“As Superintendent of ... yeah ... he initiated various changes ...” What is this “superintendent”? Um, yeah. Hm, I don’t fully understand the meaning of “superintendent”. Um, my understanding is that from 1837 to 1848 Mann recorded a number of changes; the changes varied, and they occurred in many schools, I mean, in that country.)
In response to the six sentence, he read it aloud with pauses at the end of meaningful chunks, vocalised a phrase, inferred the gist, evaluated the content of the early part of the sentence, provided lengthy illustrations while attempting to paraphrase the sentence, associated the text with his prior knowledge, made another evaluation of the text content, and inferred the gist of the later part of the sentence:

'He extended the school year ... from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting ...' ... oh, iya. Dia "extended the school year." Em, berarti ini, ia menangkap persoalannya pada segmen atau komponen gurunya, sehingga menambah tahun sekolah, apa namanya, em, lama pendidikan dari lima menjadi enam bulan. Dan itu diharapkan bisa meningkatkan kualitas ... kualitas gurunya. Selain memperpanjang masa studinya ... juga menaikkan gajinya. Tetapi pertanyaannya di sini, masalah pendidikannya itu kan ... ada kaitan banyak aspek, tetapi kenapa Horace Mann melihat hanya satu komponen saja, yaitu gurunya. Selain guru kan juga ada siswanya, alat-alat sekolahnya, kurikulumnya, tujuan pendidikannya, kemudian ada institusi pendidikannya, dan juga ada pemerintah. Dan "raising their salaries" itu kan ya ... saya kira bisa jadi lebih baik, bisa tidak. Kalau beberapa tujuan yang saya baca, kenaikan gaji juga tidak menjamin. Apakah kalau gajinya dinaikkan, kemudian tidak diikuti kenaikan harga yang lain? Itu kan juga nanti menimbulkan persoalan. Artinya, Horace Mann ini em, menampilkan solusi yang sangat, sangat partial sekali, hanya satu komponen itu yang dipikir - guru.

(‘He extended the school year ... from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting ...’, oh, yeah. He “extended the school year.” Um, it means this, he saw the problem at the teacher segment or component, so that he add the school year, what is it called, um, the period of education from five to six months. And it was expected to improve the quality of teachers. Other than extending the period of study, he also raised the teachers’ salaries. But the problem is that educational issues are related to a number of aspects, but why did Horace Mann see only one component, the teacher? Other than the teachers, there are students, school equipment, curriculum, educational goals, educational institutions, and also the government. And raising salaries can make things better or worse. According to the articles I have read, raising salaries does not give any guarantee. Won’t raising salaries entail the rise in prices of commodities? That will also entail a problem. It means that Horace Mann’s solution was very partial; he thought only of one component – teachers.)

6[rda-vocal-infer-eval-illus-par-assoc-eval-infer]

In regard to the concluding sentence, Gio read the whole sentence aloud, identified a number of problematic chunks, and vocalised the chunks while interpreting their meaning. It can be seen from the response below that he changed the form of the text, saying “this change” instead of “these changes” as written in the text:

Although this change (for ‘these changes’) did not bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system, they at least increase public awareness as to the need for a further strengthening of the system”. Oh, ya. Jadi meskipun ... em ... perubahan-perubahan ini ... “did not bring about a sudden improvement” ... tidak ... tidak
membawa ... sebuah ... perubahan ... peningkatan yang “sudden”, yang segera bisa dilihat ... atau ... segera bisa memberesi masalah, tetapi paling tidak, dengan perubahan ini ada kesadaran ... kesadaran masyarakat ... as to the need for further ... ya ... strengthening the system. Apa yang telah dilakukan oleh reformers ini ... em ... membawa ... membawa sebuah peningkatan tetapi tidak semuanya dapat menyelesaikan masalah-masalah sistem pendidikan. Tapi paling tidak, perubahan ini menimbulkan kesadaran ... masyarakat harus akan perhnya usaha-usaha peningkatan yang lebih jauh untuk memperbaiki sistem pendidikan yang ada di ... em ... Amerika. (Oh, yeah. Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement, which could be seen instantly, which could solve the problem instantly, at least with these changes there was public awareness, as to the need for further, yeah, strengthening the system. What had been done by the reformer, um, brought about an increase, but not all of them could solve the problems of educational system. But at least these changes caused an increase in public awareness as to the need for further increase to improve education, um, in America.)

Graph 4.4.6.2 shows that, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Gio read it aloud, identified a key word, vocalised the word, reflected on the understanding of the word, and paraphrased the sentence appropriately:

There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. Um, coronary, oh, ya. Inti ada beberapa orang, sejumlah kecil orang atau masyarakat, yang belum pernah mendengar apa yang disebut penyakit jantung koroner. Barangkali begitu artinya. (There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. Um, coronary, oh, yeah. There were a few people, a small number of people or community, who have never heard the so-called coronary heart disease. Probably that’s the meaning.)

After paraphrasing the first sentence, despite his comprehension of the sentence, he questioned its construction, especially the use of “There can be” at the beginning of the text. He expected a smooth beginning, with an adverb of time or place before the phrase “There can be”:

Em, tapi saya bertanya apakah cocok katau kalimat pertama ini “There can be ....” Maksud saya mengapa ya, untuk mengapresiasi itu apakah tenang itu, apakah sudah bisa, apakah cocok, atau ‘There’ ini barangkali cocok dengan kalimat semacam ini? Mungkin, mungkin untuk lebih menghaluskan perlu disikis keterangan waktu atau di derah mana hal ini terjadi. (Um, but I am wondering whether “There can be” here is appropriate in the first sentence. I mean, why is this “introductory There” used? Does “There” here suit this kind of sentence? Maybe, to make the construction smoother. It is necessary to put an adverb of time or where this happened.)

Moving to the second sentence, he read the sentence aloud, expressed doubt about the meaning of “no respecter of persons”, but made a guess and paraphrased his
understanding:

The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Em, “no respecter of persons.” Barnakali, saya nggak yakin maksudnya apa, tapi kira-kira saja, tidak ... tidak mengenal siapa. Penyakit ini tidak mengenal kelompok, atau individu siapa pun juga. Artinya bisa menyerang siapa saja, mungkin presiden, juga bisa orang yang super-power.
(Um, “no respecter of persons”. Probably I am not sure what it means, but I guess it means “does not recognise who someone is”. The disease does not recognise any group or individual. This means it can attack anyone, maybe presidents, and also people of super-powers.)

Seeing a controversy against his own belief, Gio questioned the appropriateness of the use of the term “super-powers”, and made a self-reflection:

Tapi, apakah batul istilah super-power di sini? Dikisinya nggak cocok, em, dengan kultur saya. Bagi saya, hanya Tuhan yang punya super-power. (But, is the term “super-powers” here appropriate? The dictiohn does not suit my culture. To me, only God has super-powers.)

In regard to the third sentence, Gio read it silently, vocalised the first chunk, monitored his comprehension, read the whole sentence aloud, compared it with the previous sentence, and inferred the gist in a paraphrase:

“Primarily a disease of advancing age”, ... um, “Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-age and, in some cases, um, the young.” Kalau yang kematian kedua ... tidak mengenal kelompok, kematian ketiga, penyakit ini tidak ya, penyakit ini tidak mengenal usia, bisa menyerang em, orang yang masih muda, orang tua atau sejengh umur. Saya kira itu, untuk yang kematian ketiga.
(Primarily a disease of advancing age, um. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases, um, the young. While the second sentence says that the disease does not regard any social group, the third sentence says that it does not regard any age; it may attack the young, the old, and the middle-aged. I think that’s the meaning of the third sentence.)

In response to the fourth sentence, Gio read the whole sentence aloud, questioned the words “furring-up” in “furring-up of arteries”, analysed the words, associated the words with a word he recognised, and attempted to interpret the sentence. Unfortunately, his association of the words “furring-up” with the word “fury” was wrong, and his interpretation of the word “fury” was also wrong, so that his interpretation of the sentence was also inappropriate. Here is his comment:

The “furring up” of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species in the animal kingdom. The “furring up” ... apa itu? “Furring” itu ... “fur”. Saya jadi ... jadi ingat the title of ... apa ... a fight between em ... ini ...
Mike Tyson dan ... dan Holyfield itu kan ... "The sound of the fury". Mungkin "fur" di sini kata dasarnya "fury". Em, "fury" ... apa ... sesuatu yang menggelegar. Nggak taah apa di sini artinya ... "furring up". Ini ... the basic cause. penyebab basic-nya, yang juga diumakan ... tidak hanya di manusia tetapi di em ... animal kingdom. Itu semacam ... ya ... apa ... em ... ordinarnya species. itu apa ... ya istilah-istilah ... isilah-istilah ... saya dulu temukan di biologi di SMA itu.
(What's "the furring-up"? "Furring" is "fur". I remember the title of a fight between Mike Tyson and Holyfield, "The sound of the fury". Probably "fur" here is the root for the word "fury". Um, "fury" means "something roaring or thundering." I don't know what "furring-up" here means. This is the basic cause, which was found not only in man but also in, um, animal kingdom. That's a kind of "ordinate" of the species, yeah, the terms I learned in Biology when I was in high school.)

Moving to the fifth sentence, he read the sentence clause by clause aloud, paraphrased the first clause appropriately, monitored his comprehension, inferred the gist appropriately, and attempted to interpret the second clause inappropriately:

Although coronary heart disease “can has occurred” throughout the ages and “well known” to doctors by the eighteenth century ....” Meskipun penyakit jantung ini telah (Although this heart disease has) ... throughout the ages and well known ... doctors ... throughout the ages ... maksudnya ... mungkin sudah lama ada, dan (probably it means that the disease has long existed and) well known to doctors ... um ... by the eighteenth century. Jadi sudah diketahui oleh para ahli medis ... salah satunya dokter, kira-kira tahun ... kira-kira abad ke delapan belas.(So it has been known to medical experts including doctors around the year of ... around the eighteenth century), "... the rapid ... the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase." Em ya, "rapid advance in diagnostic" ... penelitian-penelitian terhadap penyakit jantung ini ... mengalami kemajuan yang cepat dalam memperlakukan ... memperbaiki, ya, menangani penyakit jantung ini. Di samping juga publikasi-publikasi terhadap penderitaan ini ... yang dilatih oleh media ... menjadikan penelitian-penelitian ini banyak diketahui oleh masyarakat. (Um, yeah, "rapid advance in diagnostic" ... studies on this heart disease underwent rapid progress in treating, curing or taking care of heart disease. Besides, publications on these issues by the media made these studies known by the public.)

Responding to the sixth sentence, he read it silently, identified a problematic word, read the whole sentence aloud, monitored his comprehension, vocalised some difficult words, made a guess, paraphrased the sentence, and reflected on the strategy use:

Ini apa maksudnya “authorities”? Some authorities believe that this ... this increase is real and call coronary heart disease a modern epidemic. Em, apa ini maksudnya, cardio ... cardiovascular? Mungkin istilah kesehatan. Em, tapi some authorities, itu mungkin para dokter ya, para tenaga medis, para ahli di bidang kesehatan. Mereka percaya bahwa increase diketahui em, menjadi sebuah penyakit yang tergesa itu sudah menjadi epidemis modern. Tapi nggak tahu persisnya itu. Saya, em, seringkali memahami us itu dengan cara seperti ini. Jadi tidak ... tidak perlu tahu persis apa ... makna kamus
masing-masing kata, tapi saya pahami secara keseluruhan. Kalau makronya semacam ini, OK, saya tangkap.

(What does "authorities" mean? Some authorities believe that this ... this increase is real and call coronary heart disease a modern epidemic. Um, what is meant by cardiovascular? It may be medical term. Um, but some authorities, who are probably doctors, medical staff, experts in health, believe that the increase was known, um, to be a disease whose level has become modern epidemic. But I don't know exactly what it is. I often, um, comprehend a text this way. So I do not need to know exactly the dictionary equivalent of each word, but I try to understand it as a whole. If the meaning is like this, it's OK; I understand it.)

In regard to the seventh sentence, Gio read it silently, vocalised two phrases belonging to the sub-clause, monitored his comprehension, paraphrased the sentence appropriately, evaluated the way of writing numbers/figures based on his prior knowledge, and made self-reflection:

"... according to ... in California during ..." Em ... jumlahnya ... orang yang mati ... selama tahun 42 itu delapan belas koma lima ratus sembilan puluh satu (18,591). Dan kalau dalam pemulihan bahasa inggris ... saya kira tidak pakai koma, tetapi Pak tertekik, Pak. Ya ... nggak tahu pastinya tapi ... kok ada ganjelan kalau pakai koma itu. Kalau menhadap teks, biasanya saya baca at glance, tidak terlalu bayangkan yang gini.

("... according to ... in California during ..." Um, the number of people dying during the year 42 was eighteen point five-hundred ninety one (18,591). In English, I think the number should be written with dot, not comma. Yeah, I don't know this precisely, but I feel bothered if it is written with comma. When I read a text, I usually read it at a glance and do not have to imagine things such as this.)

In reaction to the eighth sentence, Gio read it aloud, figured out the year based on the time span provided, and reflected on his puzzle about writing figures, and suggested that the author provide further explanation:

Dua puluh tahun kemudian, enam puluh dua, ... ya tahun '62, jumlahnya meningkat pesat menjadi se-ini. Yang ini 102, 478 dan 18,591 ini mungkin per sen atau apa? Maksudnya penulis mau mengatakan ini lho ada data semacam ini. Tapi data itu kan perlu dijelaskan, kemudian perlu ditafsirkan. Kemudian jumlah orang yang meninggal karena penyakit ini ... five-fold increase. Em, pastinya nggak tahu. Ya, paling tidak ada penjelasan.

(Twenty years later, so in 1962, the number increased rapidly to this. These numbers, 102,478 and 18,591, probably per cent or what? The author meant to say that there were such data. But the data need explanation and interpretation. Then the number of dying due to this disease ... five-fold increase. Um, I don't know precisely. Yeah, at least, there was an increase.)

In regard to the ninth sentence, he read the whole sentence aloud, emphasizing the phrase "more than twice due to all forms of cancer", questioned the relative meaning
of the word “at present”, attempted to paraphrase the gist inappropriately, and reflected his knowledge about the two diseases mentioned in the text:

Um, “At present the number of deaths annually from ... um ... is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer.” Jadi sekarang, 'sekarang' ini kapan? Apakah ’97, ’90-an, atau ’70-an apa ... setiap tahun. Setiap tahun ... meningkat dua kali lipat. Ya kira-kira makarnya itu lah. Kalau yang saya pahami tentang penyakit kanker itu em, lain dengan penyakit jantung. Artinya mungkin kaitannya agak jauh. (So at present, when is “at present” here? Is it ’97, the 90s, the 70s, or every year? Every year ... increased twice. I think that’s the meaning. In my understanding, cancer is different from coronary heart disease. It means that they are not closely related.)

Arriving at the concluding sentence of the text, Gio, once again, read the whole sentence aloud, monitored his comprehension, attempted to paraphrase the gist inappropriately, monitored his comprehension, claimed that the content seemed to contradict the information obtained from the previous sentences, and reflected on the strategy to be used:

“However, generally it would seem probable that population increase improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.”

Ya, pada umumnya ... em, apa ini maksudnya? Secara umum, ... pertambahan populasi memperbaiki harapan hidup ... yang lebih baik ... dan diagnosis yang more accurate dan em, ya, death certification are responsible for this rise. Em, saya tidak tahu persisnya apa ... makna kalimat ini. Harapan hidup yang lebih baik kok malah the rise in death rate? Saya kira saya butuh waktu lagi untuk memahami, membaca ini. (Teah, generally ... um, what does this mean? Generally, ... population increase improved life expectancy ... which is better, and more accurate diagnosis, and um, yeah, death certification are responsible for this rise. Um, I don’t know the precise meaning of this sentence. Why did better life expectancy cause the rise in death rate? I think I need more time to understand, to read this.)

Retellings

After rereading the whole of Text 1 before retelling, Gio acknowledged some misunderstanding while reading the text sentence by sentence. He also said that he added his assumptions to the text as the text did not explicitly spell out the information he considered necessary:

Ya. Saya rasakan ada, em, beberapa kesalahpahaman menangkap makna ketika membaca belian secara keseluruhan. Tadi ada beberapa isi yang saya sukai. Ya, dalam persepsi saya, tadi itu, menimbang tawan, menambah lama sekolah dari lima menjadi enam bulan itu, tadi asumsi saya itu guru yang sekolah, sepi, ternyata pendidikan di sana yang lima bulan menjadi enam bulan. Tadi ... lagi masalah anak-
anak yang ... yang tidak ke sekolah ... itu memang ... kondisi semacam itu memang ... memang tidak terampun, 'no excuse' ... em ... di mana anak-anak yang masihnya menjadi buruh ... anak-anak yang tidak bersekolah, maksud saya, dan itu menjadi buruh ... itu dianggap ... apa ... kalau dia masuk sekolah justru hanya membuang-buang waktu saja ... karena ... Di sini tidak dijelaskan kenapa, tetapi asumsi saya, itu menjadi tunutan keluarga untuk mendukung supply ... men-support kondisi perekonomian keluarga.

(Yes. I felt there was some misunderstanding when I had not read the text as a whole. I was wrong in a few points. Yeah, in my perception, extending the school year from five to six months was for the teacher education, but it turned out to be schooling over there which was extended from five to six months. Another point was about children who did not go to school. There should be no excuse for such a condition, where children who did not go to school because they would be laborers were regarded as wasting time if they go to school. There is no explanation why, here, but I assumed that it was the demand from the family to support the income of the family.)

Gio also considered that the text was not a serious piece of writing. He assumed that its source was from a newspaper, not a journal article or a research report. His assumption was based on the information he gathered, because, recently he liked reading serious works such as journal articles or books, not popular books or clippings, but serious books exploring problems that may offer solutions.

Not only did Gio attempt to understand the text he was reading, but he also attempted to evaluate it from the points of view of form and content:

"Em, saya tidak sempat memikirkan apakah, em, text iadi memenuhi syarat-syarat paragraf yang baik atau tidak, saya tidak sempat mengoreksi atau mengevaluasi itu, sehingga saya cuma berusaha menangkap apa yang dimain penulis dan mengomentari beberapa hal sesuai dengan pengetahuan dan pengetahuan yang saya ini saya pikirkan.
(Um, I did not have a chance to see whether the text met the requirements for a good paragraph. I did not have a chance to correct or evaluate it. I just attempted to understand what the author wanted to tell, and commented on a number of issues based on my background knowledge and experience coming to mind.)

From the retelling it was apparent that, at times, Gio recognised how he attempted to comprehend the text. In other words, he was aware of the comprehension strategies he was employing:

"Em, saya kira mungkin saya, saya membangnya itu dengan pikiran yang, dengan pertanyaan-pertanyaan awal, ini teks ini tentang apa, karena dengan tidak, di sini tidak disebutkan judulnya. Em, maaf ini, kadang kalau bicara seolah-olah saya bicara sendiri. (Um, I think, maybe, I read it with the thought, with preliminary questions, what this text is about, because the topic is not mentioned. Um, sorry, sometimes I talk as if I talked to myself.)"
Despite Gio’s ability to go beyond the information provided in the text, his retelling of Text 1 covered only the theme and a small portion (20%) of the details. For the retelling of Text 1, he scored 5 out of possible 12.

His retelling of Text 2 was worse than that of Text 1, as it contained no theme statement, an incorrect main idea, and a small proportion (40%) of the details. He claimed there was a contradiction between the information provided in the last sentence and that in the previous ones. Before retelling the content of Text 2, Gio did not seem to read the text thoroughly to scrutinise the information provided. Instead, he maintained his earlier misunderstanding of the last sentence. There seemed to be two sources of misunderstanding. First, it was apparent that he did not see the comma after the phrase “population increases” in the last sentence. Instead of reading “... generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and ... are responsible for the rise in ....”, Gio read it as “... generally it would seem probable that population increases improved life expectancy, and ....”. Second, like Tam, Gio could not accept the logic implied by the text; he believed that improved life expectancy would not increase, but decrease the death rate. In addition, while relating a text to one’s own thoughts or prior knowledge was common among the readers, Gio’s reflections of his own thoughts were sometimes more than necessary. For example, while rereading Text 2 before attempting to retell its content, he spoke of the books in psychology he had read, which needed deep contemplation. While this indicated the kind of text he was interested in, this was irrelevant to the text he was reading. This seemed to have distracted his attention from the actual information provided in the current text. Hence, he was unable to assemble fractions of the information obtained during the think-aloud session or to check his possible misunderstanding for the purpose of retelling. Consequently, his retelling of Text 2 was incomplete and incorrect. He scored 2 out of a possible 16 for this text. Thus for Texts 1 and 2 he scored 7 out of a possible 28.
In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers

Overall, Gio's answers to the multiple-choice test questions reflect his comprehensive understanding of Text 1 and improved understanding of Text 2. During the think-aloud session, he interpreted the word “sentiment” as a “grievance” of the community, because of his observation that in any educational issue, the community always becomes the target or victim. He still maintained the negative sense of the word, but chose “opinion”, “opinion with controversy”, not “disagreement” or any other options. Despite the confusion he had in the retelling of Text 2, he managed to revise his misunderstandings. For example, he remembered that cholesterol could block arteries because of the options provided. Thus, he knew that “furring-up of arteries” was the same as “blocked arteries”, not because both words contained the word “arteries”, but because Gio knew that cholesterol could “menyempitkan” (narrow down) arteries which, ultimately, would block them.

Reading texts in a reading test

When asked about his strategies used in comprehending texts in a reading test, Gio said, as he had done for this study, he read the whole text. However, he would look at the questions after obtaining some idea about the text:

Saya biasanya sudah ada gambaran setelah baca satu dua kalimat pertama dan mungkin satu dua kalimat paragraph berikutnya, atau mungkin kalimat terakhir. (I can usually obtain a picture about the text after reading the first two sentences and maybe one or two sentences of the following paragraph, or probably the last sentence).

After obtaining some idea about the text he would go back and forth from the text to the question he was working on:

Setelah ada gambaran ya bolak-balik dari text ke pertanyaan dan sebaliknya sesuai kebutuhan. Maksud saya kalau sudah yakin langsung jawab, kalau belum, hoca lagi cari jawabnya. Karena keterbatasan waktu, biasanya banyak menebak dalam tes. (After obtaining a picture, yeah, I will go back and forth from the text to the questions and vice-versa, as necessary. I mean if I am sure about the answer, I will answer it directly; otherwise, I will reread it to find the answer. As time is limited, I often make guesses in a test.)


Reading texts in newspapers

When asked about what he did when reading a newspaper in English, Gio stated that he rarely read one. In an English newspaper he often found words or terms he had never heard or read. When a problem occurred, he would just go on reading, expecting that as he was moving along he would find the solution to the problem. But sometimes it was not the case, because the more he read, the more confused he became. This happened when the theme or the topic was beyond his interest and knowledge. Knowledge of the world helped him much in comprehending the message. “Berita tv atau koran Indo biasanya sudah muat beritanya sehingga terbantu” (News from TV and Indonesian newspapers usually broadcast or published the news already so that it helped comprehending the news). Just as in reading the texts used in this study, Gio read texts in a newspaper word by word and sentence by sentence, but focused on certain words – keywords and also difficult words. When he had a problem with difficult words, he would simply guess the meaning and go on reading. Unless he had to retell or summarise the content, he would never reread a newspaper article. But when it was an assignment, he would read it over and over. He would look up the meaning of difficult words in the dictionary, if necessary.

When he read a newspaper on his own, he would choose topics in which he was interested. Unfortunately, newspapers usually present topics on politics, a subject he hated most. He was once a victim of politics, because in the early years of his undergraduate study he was involved in a student movement. His disappointment with politics made him enjoy reading books on philosophy and religion. He liked reading books better than newspapers because one book usually deals with a single subject; the further he read, the better his understanding would become. Newspapers usually present loose pieces of news, often “tanpa apersepsi, bermacam-macam judul dalam satu halaman” (unrelated topics are presented on a single page).
Reading books

As mentioned earlier, Gio liked reading books on philosophy and religion, "di mana perenungan secara mendalam dimungkinkan" (in which deep contemplation is possible). Books he did not enjoy reading are those on linguistics:

_Buku seperti punya Bloomfield dan Chomsky itu susah banget. Dibaca berulang-ulang kadang tetap nggak ngerii kalau nggak dijelaskan._ [Books like those written by Bloomfield and Chomsky are very difficult to comprehend. After reading them over and over, sometimes I still do not understand them without any explanation (by the lecturers)].

Therefore, when asked about how to solve his problems in reading books on linguistics, he said that he attempted not to miss too many classes so that he could get an alternative source of information, especially from the classes he attended.

When asked what parts of the book he would attend to before reading, he said that lecturers usually told students which chapter or part to read as a task. When he read on his own, he would look at the introduction and the table of contents to see whether he would read the whole book or just certain sections. He realised that reading the text aloud was not recommended, but he would forget it when he read on his own:

_Saya lupa siapa, tapi pernah ada dosen memberitahu kalau baca keras itu tidak baik, tapi kalau sudah baca sendiri sering lupa. Poling tidak ada teks, em, kalimat, atau bagian-nya, ...maknanya kadang saya merasa kurang yakin kalau tidak saya baca bersuara. (I forget who it was, but once a lecturer told us that reading aloud was not good, but when I read on my own I often forget it. At least there are texts, um, sentence, or its part, ... I mean sometimes I feel less confident unless I read the text aloud.)_
Appendix 5.7
Strategy Profile of Reader 7 (Tam)

Think-aloud protocol

As Graph 5.4.7.1 indicates, after subvocalising the first sentence of Text 1, Tam analysed its structure in order to be able to infer its meaning, but was obstructed by the word “desperately”. She guessed the meaning of the word, monitored her comprehension, expressed doubt about her interpretation due to a lack of knowledge about the American educational system, but successfully inferred the gist:

Em, ... ini pada awal abad ke-19 ... jadi subjeknya ... jadi sistem pendidikan di Amerika ... itu ada memerlukan reformasi. Itu pertama. Terus ... ini ada "desperately", mungkin em ... artinya kalau saya mengkonsepsikan ... mungkin itu artinya 'sangat' ... 'sangat memerlukan'. Tapi saya tidak yakin ya, karena saya tidak tahu pasti tentang sistem pendidikan di Amerika, em tapi barangkali ada perbandingan dengan luar negeri atau dengan Indonesia. Jadi ininya, reformasi diperlukan. (Um, this was at the beginning of the nineteenth century; so the subject, the subject is "the American educational system"; it needed a reform. That's the first sentence. Then, there is "desperately"; probably um, it means, from the context, it means "very much", "very much needed". But I am not sure, because I don't really know about the American educational system, um, but it may be compared with the system overseas or in Indonesia. So, basically, reform was needed.)

Moving to the second sentence, she read it silently, vocalised the first clause, revealed the strategy she meant to use, analysed the sentence by dividing it into sensible chunks, made an association with the Indonesian context, made self-reflections that were not directly relevant to the text, vocalised the main parts of the second clause, monitored her comprehension, and inferred the meaning of the whole sentence:

Private school existed, ... en kalau saya, akan saya bagi dua atau tiga kalimat saja. Ini kan "private school", "there were public schools", ... terus "children who would grow ..." dan seterusnya. Itu lebih jelas. Kalau di tempat kita, swasta biasanya untuk siswa yang tidak bisa niasuk negeri, tapi ada juga orang yang lebih cenderung memasukkan ke swasta karena mereka menganangkan itu lebih unggul kualitasnya. Otomatis untuk yang punya uang, kelas menengah ke atas. Kemudian ... "there were very few public schools ..." jadi untuk yang em... sekolah negeri, kalau di sana berarti hanya untuk siswa yang lebih ... lebih untuk orientasinya ke kerja. Jadi mereka diharapkan tidak banyak membng-buang waktu ... untuk pendidikan dan lebih cepat ke kerja.
(Private schools existed .... Um, if I were the author, I would divide the sentence into two or three sentences. They are "Private schools ...", "There were public schools ...", and then "Children who would grow..." and so forth. That's clearer. In our place, private schools are for those who failed to pass the admission test to state schools, but
there are also people who tend to send their children to private schools because they think their qualities are better. Automatically this is for the rich, the middle class and above. Then "there were very few public schools ..." ... over there there were only for students who were more work-oriented. So they were expected not to waste their time in education, but obtain a job immediately.)

Tam managed to follow the author's line of thought up to this point, but the last clause of the sentence seemed to confuse her. In the end, she managed to summarise the gist:

_Tapi ini kok masih ada ... saya bingung antara yang subjek, kemudian verb, kemudian objeknya itu. Kalau sudah gini agak sulit menggabungkannya. Em, tapi kiranya maksudnya "Sekolah swasta untuk yang kaya, negeri untuk yang mau sgera kerja, otomatis yang miskin. Aneh, yang mau kerja nggak usah repot-repot sekolah; mungkin maksudnya cukup kurus ketamplian. (But there is still ... I am confused identifying the subject, the verb, and the object. In this case, it is difficult to integrate them. Um, but I think it means 'Private schools were for the rich, and public schools were for those who wanted to work immediately, automatically they were poor. It's funny, those who wanted to work did not have to bother going to school; probably it was enough for them to take skill trainings.)_

In response to the third sentence, she read it silently, related the sentence to the previous one, monitored her comprehension, and inferred the gist appropriately:

_Selanjutnya, yang dihadapi para pembaharu pendidikan, jadi ... itu sebenarnya hal ini yang ada pada kalimat di atas. Em, alasannya mereka reformasi adalah hal di atas. (Then, what the educational reformers faced were ... actually problems mentioned in the previous sentences. Um, their reasons for a reform were problems mentioned above.)_

Moving to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, commented that it was not difficult, paraphrased the gist, showed her agreement with the reformer's idea, and questioned what the reformer did. This question indicates Tam's prediction that the next sentence would tell about what the reformer did. However, she kept wondering about the model of American educational system, since she had not heard of Horace Mann and was not familiar with the American system:

_Kalimannya tidak sukar. Jadi Horace Mann merasa tidak ada, em, pokoknya semua warga negara itu harus berpendidikan. Saya juga setuju itu. Em... saya rasa ini juga karena tadi yang di atas sudah tahu main ide-nya, mungkin di sini langsung saya bisa mengerti. Tapi apa yang dilakukan Horace Mann? Tapi intinya model America itu bagaimana, saya nggak tahu. (The sentence is not difficult. Horace Mann felt that there was not, um, in short, every citizen had to be educated. I agree to that. Um, I think this is also because I already know the main idea so that I can interpret it directly. But what did Horace Mann do? But I don't know what the American model looks like.)_
In response to the fifth sentence, she read it silently, found her prediction confirmed because the sentence explained what Mann did, questioned the word “superintendent”, referred back to the previous sentence, monitored her comprehension, and paraphrased the gist of the sentence:

Em, di sini tentang Horace Mann, yang ... superintendent, em, superintendent, Horace Mann lagi, em, mempunyai perhatian lebih terhadap pendidikan di America, dan dia di sekolah Massachusetts. Kemudian, em, dia ber, em ini, berinisiatif melakukan suatu perubahan, yang kemudian juga diterapkan di sekolah-sekolah yang lain di negara itu. (Um, this is about Horace Mann, who was superintendent, um, superintendent, Horace Mann mentioned earlier, had more attention to education in America, and he was in a school in Massachusetts. Um, then he, um, initiated changes which were then applied in other schools in that country.)

Moving to the sixth sentence, she read it more than once but kept silent. From her self-reflection on her disappointment or concern about the teachers’ duties, conditions and welfare, it appeared that while making an inference, she associated the sentence with her own experience or background knowledge:

Ya ... kita melihat bahwa ... tugas guru itu berat, ya. Jadi tidak ... bagaimana mereka bisa menyampaikan pendidikan ... em ... tidak hanya untuk menyampaikan ilmu pengetahuan, tapi mereka juga mendidik bukan hanya mengajar. Jadi guru juga menjadi dasar untuk kemajuan yang akan datang karena penggodogan sumber daya itu mulai dari penggodogan guru, sementara justru yang paling berperan tidak begitu banyak mendapat perhatian; salary-nya sudah kecil, masih banyak potongan. Itu semua orang tahu itu. Em, jadi pada dasarnya Horace mempunyai pemikiran bahwa perlu adanya peningkatan kualitas guru dan juga meningkatkan gaji mereka. (Yeah, we know that the teachers’ duty is hard. That is how they can educate, um, not merely transfer knowledge; they also educate, not just teach. So teachers are also the basis for future development because the training of human resources starts from the training of teachers. Meanwhile, the ones who play the most important role do not get enough attention; their salaries are low, yet there are still many deductions. Everybody knows that. Um, so, in principle Horace thought about the need for improving the quality of teachers and also raising their salaries.)

In regard to the concluding sentence, Tam read it silently, inferred the gist, made an association with her prior knowledge, and reflected on her personal opinion. Missing the information from the previous sentences, she monitored her comprehension, and questioned the changes Horace Mann had made:

Em, kalimat ini men-support perubahan-perubahan di atas, yaitu perubahan yang dia lakukan, meskipun itu tidak begitu banyak. memberikan hasil ... atau perbaikan yang
Tam could not internalise the changes Mann had made probably because, instead of focusing on comprehending the text, she was busy reflecting on her own thoughts. It could be seen from her responses above that she did not mention explicitly the details of the changes Mann had made. However, after restating her inference of the concluding sentence, she referred to the fifth sentence, vocalised the change she was not familiar with, monitored her comprehension, made a guess, and summarised the other changes Mann had made:

Jadi paling tidak itu bisa menimbulkan kesadaran tentang pentingnya perbaikan dari suatu sistem pendidikan. Ha, saya harus flashback lagi ke atas. Ada beberapa ide dia; yang satu ini belum saya mengerti ini "He extended the school year from five to six months." Jadi ... em ... apa dia melakukan suatu ... suatu eksperimen atau apa pada sekolah itu? Tapi yang jelas dia mencoba perubahan pada pendidikan guru nya dan meningkat gajinya. (So at least they caused awareness about the need for improvement in the educational system. He, I have to go back to the previous sentence. There are a number of ideas, but I don’t understand this one "He extended the school year from five to six months." So, um, did he make an experiment or something at this school? But it is apparent that he tried to make changes on the education of the teachers and raise their salaries.)

Graph 5.4.7.2 shows that, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Tam read and reread it silently, identified a problematic phrase, vocalised the phrase, monitored her comprehension, inferred the gist of the whole sentence, reflected on her unfamiliarity with the topic, associated the topic with her prior knowledge, made an inference about the topic, and noticed the subjective judgment of the author, based on her opinion that most people in her area had not heard about coronary heart disease:

Em ... untuk kalimat pertama, em, tidak bentuknya agak membingungkan ... "few people." Oh, jadi maksudnya ada beberapa orang yang belum mendengar tentang penyakit ini. Ini baru kali ini saya baca, tapi saya langsung ingat, oh, mungkin coronary ini "jantung koroner". Tapi saya kira lebih banyak orang yang belum dengar. (Um, for the first sentence, um, initially the form was rather confusing ... “few people.” Oh, it means there are a few people who have not heard about this disease. This is my first time to read it, but I remember right away, oh, probably this “coronary” means “coronary heart”. But I think there are more people who have not heard about it.)
Responding to the second sentence, she read it silently, identified the subject of the sentence, but considered the predicate unusual, vocalised key words while monitoring her comprehension, analysed the word the word “respecr” and related it to the known word “respect”, reread the whole sentence, and paraphrased the sentence successfully:

Em, yang di sini subjeknya jelas, cuma predikatnya kaku. Jadi “The illness ... no respecter ...”. Di sini “respecr” bukan kata baru tapi ada tambahan “er”, kemudian ada “of person”. Jadi kira-kira maksudnya penyakit ini bisa menyerang mungkin pada siapa saja dan juga mungkin pada seorang yang mempunyai kebiasaan yang besar atau mungkin bisa didap oleh orang yang ya ... orang-orang biasa. (Um, here the subject is clear but the predicate is awkward. So “The illness ... no respecter ...”. Here “respecr” is not a new word, but there is an “er” added to it, then “of person”. So I guess it means that this illness can attack anyone, someone who has great power or common people.)

Moving to the third sentence, Tam read it silently, identified a problematic phrase (the phrase “the disease of advancing age”), reread the sentence while vocalising the problematic phrase, inappropriately interpreted the word “advancing” in “a disease of advancing age” as “following” or “depending on”, interpreted the phrase accordingly, and provided an illustration to support the interpretation. Due to this inappropiate interpretation, she inferred the gist of the sentence partially incorrectly. The response was concluded with a reflection on the strategy use:

Em di sini disebut ... “the disease of advancing age”. Jadi disease ini mengikuti atau tergantung usia; semakin tua semakin mudah kena penyakit ini. Jadi seringnya itu didap oleh orang yang pada usia-usia tengah, tidak tua, tidak muda, tapi juga ada beberapa kasus yang terjadi pada pemuda. Jadi saya harus baca dulu keseluruhan, baru bisa meng-guess. (It is mentioned here “the disease of advancing age”. So this disease follows or depends on age – the older you become, there are more possibilities that the disease will attack you. So most often this disease attack people of middle age, not old and not young, but there are cases happening on the young. So I have to read the whole sentence before I can make a guess.)

Glancing at the fourth sentence, Tam identified a problematic phrase (“the furting-up of arteries”), but after rereading the whole sentence and relating it to an article she remembered reading, she guessed its meaning, paraphrased the sentence appropriately, and provided an illustration:

Em ... “the furting-up” ... mungkin saya tidak tahu tentang “the furting-up” ya, tapi kemudian setelah saya membaca ini secara keseluruhan ... dan saya menghubungkan dengan yang mungkin pernah saya baca, kalau tidak salah ini "penyempitan pembuluh darah", yang merupakan salah satu dari penyebab koroner. Em, mungkin melalui
Moving to the fifth sentence, she read it silently, identified a problem due to the length of the sentence and the presence of a number of subjects, reread the sentence silently, attempted to analyse the sentence, and provided an illustration:

Saya mengalami beberapa kesulitan karena ada beberapa subjek yang ... “The rapid advance” ... jadi beberapa subjek, jadi tidak hanya satu, jadi itu mempersulit, tapi kemudian saya berpikir tentang structure ... parallel, em, paralel subjek. Jadi untuk subjek em ... misalnya ada tiga atau dua ... harus paralel. Misal kalau bentuknya benda atau “verb+ing”, ya semua harus itu, paralel, kalau mungkin. (I have problems because there are a few subjects, such as “The rapid advance”, so there is not only one, so it makes it difficult, but then I think of parallel structure, um parallel subjects. So if there are three subjects, they must be parallel, maybe. For example, if the form is a noun or “verb+ing”, all have to be like that, parallel, if possible.)

Another source of problems Tam had was her insensitivity relating to words of multiple meanings. She did not seem to realise that the word “age” in the second sentence is different in meaning from that in the fifth sentence. In the former, the word “age” means “the number of years that one has lived”, while in the latter it means either “a very long time” or “a period in history”. This insensitivity is apparent from her paraphrase of the fifth sentence:

Em, meskipun penyakit jantung koroner ini sudah terjadi pada beberapa umur, ... jadi tingkatan umur, mungkin yang muda juga yang tua, dan juga ini sudah ... penyakit ini sudah ... dapat dikenali mungkin dideni oleh dokter sejak abad ke-18, ... (Um, although the coronary heart disease has occurred on a few ages, ... so age levels, probably the young and the old, and also this disease has been identified by doctors since the eighteenth century, ...)

Responding to the sixth sentence, Tam read it silently, reflected on her unfamiliarity with the text, monitored her comprehension, paraphrased the gist, and provided an illustration:

Dari sini mungkin pengetahuan saya tidak banyak tentang penyakit jantung koroner. Em, ... ya ... jadi beberapa ahli memang menyadari bahwa penyakit ini sudah ... sudah memang ada ... dan mereka menyebut ini sebagai suatu ... suatu wabah moderen. Mungkin ini tidak banyak terjadi pada masa lalu, tetapi dengan semakin perkembangan jaman, berbagai macam faktor yang bisa men-support orang terkena penyakit jantung
koroner. Jadi semakin meningkat angka orang yang terkena ini.
(From this, probably I don’t know much about coronary heart disease. Um, ... yeah ... so a number of experts realised that the increase existed ... and they call this ... a modern epidemic. Probably, it did not occur often in the past, but in the era of advancement, various factors increase the number of affected patients. So the number of affected people increase.)

In response to the seventh sentence, she read it silently, reread the previous sentence, identified their relation, paraphrased the sentence successfully:

Jadi, em, di atas sudah dikemukakan bahwa penyakit ini semakin lama semakin meningkat. Di sini dikemukakan faktanya bahwa pada satu jangka waktu itu sudah tingginya sekian.
(So, um, it was mentioned above that this disease developed from time to time. It is mentioned here that in a certain period of time the number is such and such.)

In reaction to the eight sentence, Tam read it silently, paying close attention to the figures, vocalised the phrase “five-fold”, analysed the phrase, compared the figures and made a simple mathematical calculation, and made an appropriate inference:

Dari angka yang ada dan, ya, “five-fold”, ..., “fold” sendiri itu “melipat”. Jadi ... mungkin jadi empat, ... empat, ... lima kali lipat peningkatannya. Jadi ... lebih banyak.
Dan ini berumber dari data yang sama, tapi setelah jangka waktu dua puluh tahun, peningkatannya sudah sebegitu pesat. (From the figures provided and, yeah, “five-fold”, ... “fold” itself means “melipat” (to fold) ... into four, four, five times. So the figure is higher. And this was based on the same data, but after a period of twenty years, the increase was very high.)

Responding to the ninth sentence, Tam read and reread it silently, vocalised the words “more than twice” and “those due to”, monitored her comprehension, and paraphrased the gist. However, she interpreted “annually” incorrectly as “continually”. Rather than thinking about the number of deaths, she thought about the disease. Therefore, her inference did not fully represent the essence of the sentence:

Em, more than twice ... those due to ... untuk yang ini, penyakit ini em, secara berkala pada ... jadi ... penyakit jantung koroner ini dua kali lipat dari ... apa ya ... yang ... yang dari kanker. Kanker itu perkembangannya pesat, dan penyakit jantung koroner ini bisa lebih cepat lagi. (Um, more than twice ... those due to ... for this one, this disease, um, continually, so coronary heart disease was twice of that from cancer. Cancer develops rapidly, but coronary heart disease can develop more rapidly.)
Arriving at the concluding sentence, Tam read it silently, and encountered a vocabulary problem as well as a problem of logic, that is, seeing the relation among components that make up the whole sentence. First, in regard to the vocabulary problem, Tam seemed to have associated the term "death certification" with a different concept, the concept within her knowledge of the Indonesian system:

*Em, di sini “death ... death certification” ... saya juga masih bingung, mungkin itu karena di luar negeri. Di tempat kita apa ya? Mungkin semacam ‘surat kematian’ atau ... ya ... seperti itu. Tapi, apa ya ... meningkatkan angka kematian karena ... jantung koroner? (Um, here, “death certification” ... I am still confused. Probably that is because it was overseas. What is it in our country? Probably it is a kind of “surat kematian” (a letter from the local or district authority stating that someone has died; this letter does not say anything about the cause of the death) or something alike. But, did it increase the number of deaths due to coronary heart disease?)*

This seemed to be a case where background knowledge did not help but, instead, it hindered comprehension. Second, in regard to the problem of logic, that “accurate diagnosis” could increase death rates seemed beyond Tam’s imagination. In her opinion, accurate diagnosis would enable accurate treatment and reduce the death rate:

*Jadi mungkin peningkatan ini juga seiring dengan perkembangan penduduk ... di mana ... em ... harapan hidupnya semakin meningkat, jadi semakin tinggi, diagnostis yang lebih ... lebih akurat, dan ... em, jadi, mungkin di sini ada ... kayaknya suatu yang berkebalikan ... yang bertentangan. Jadi em, mungkin dengan diagnostis yang tepat dalam ... mungkin ada semacam penelitian, mungkin mestinya ... pengobatan tepat, dan bisa ... menurunkan angka itu, kematian. Lho kok malah meningkatkan? (So probably this increase was also in accordance with population increase, where, um, life expectancy improved, became higher, more accurate diagnosis and, um, so probably here there is some controversy. So, um, probably with more accurate diagnosis, probably there was a kind of research study, the treatment should be more accurate and could decrease the number of deaths. But why is it said to increase death rate?)*

Retellings
Tam’s retelling of Text 1 was relatively complete, covering the theme, the main idea and most (80%) of the details. As stated above, during the think-aloud Tam did not seem to comprehend the essence of extending the school year. She was silent about it during the retelling, which confirmed her doubt about its meaning. This might be due to the absence of background knowledge or examples of extending the school year in the Indonesian context. In addition to the retelling, Tam also commented on the use
of the term “reform” in the text. In her opinion the term “reform” was bombastic, and she suggested the term “innovation” instead.

In regard to Text 2, there were three sources of confusion that made her retelling of the text inappropriate. First, Tam knew during the think-aloud session that the text said few people had not heard about coronary heart disease but, in her opinion, many still had not heard about it. It seemed to have been this opinion that developed and dominated her following thoughts so that in the retelling of the text she said that there were still many people who had not heard about the disease. Second, in the think-aloud session she misunderstood the phrase “a disease of advancing age”, which she interpreted as a disease depending on age - the older one became, the greater the chance the disease would attack her/him. Despite being given an opportunity to reread the text before the retelling, her misunderstanding of the phrase was retained. Third, similar to the first source of confusion, during the think-aloud session Tam comprehended that “accurate diagnosis” could increase death rates, but in the retelling she expressed her belief that accurate diagnosis would enable accurate treatment and reduce the death rate. She concluded that improved life expectancy and more accurate diagnosis would decrease death rate. Therefore she suggested that people should change their life style in an effort to keep fit which, ultimately, could be expected to reduce the death rate from the disease:

Dari ini saya kira orang perlu perubahan gaya hidup untuk menurunkan angka kematian. Dulu orang jalan kaki, sekarang naik lift dan jarang olah raga. Orang mengagumi fast food dan menganggap tempe dan sayuran sesuai yang tidak moderen. (Observing this phenomenon, I think people need to change their life style. People used to walk, but now they take a lift and rarely do sports. They admire fast food and think that bean-cakes and vegetables are not modern stuff.)

Consequently, her retelling contains only the theme, most (71%) of the details, and an illustration on the people’s diet, without the presence of the main idea of the text.
In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers

When asked about the reason for choosing Option A – The Beginning of Reform in American Education - for the topic of the passage (Text 1), Tam skimmed the whole text over and over, looked at the question and the options provided, vocalised portions of the text again (particularly the beginnings of the first and the second paragraphs) before she finally chose Option A. While the process of regression (rereading the whole or portions of the text) before deciding the topic was supported by observation of the researcher, Tam claimed that the topic chosen was based on her inference after reading the whole text. Meanwhile her statement that the word “sentiment” means “opinion” was based on the context in which the word was used. In regard to the use of quotation marks for the word “waste” in line 4 of Text 1, Tam knew that the public thought that education was a waste of time and money but Horace Mann did not think so. To emphasize the author’s support for Horace Mann and her criticism of the public, she put the word “waste” between quotation marks. In regard to Question 9, the topic of Text 2, she considered that the passage talked only about one disease, coronary heart disease, despite the presence of “cancer” in the text. She did not consider “cancer” significant, nor did she notice the presence of the plural morpheme “s” at the end of the word “disease,” so she chose “Diseases of the heart” for the topic. An interesting thing to note is that during the think-aloud session, the retelling and the test, Tam interpreted “advancing age” or “advanced years” as “depending on age” (in accordance with age). Thus, “a disease of advancing age” implied that the older one became, the greater the possibility that the disease would attack her/him. The discussion and rereading of the text finally made her come to an inference that “Primarily a disease of advancing age …” meant that the disease could attack anyone (the old, the middle age and the young), but it attacked mainly the old. Like a number of other informants, Tam also thought that the word “authorities” as used in Text 2 referred to “government officials”. The reason given was similar, except that Tam added that they were from Health Department:

"Government officials" saya kira lebih luas, bisa menteri, polisi, dokter, pengas
administrasi rumah sakit, dan tenu saja menteri kesehatan. (I think the term "government officials" has a broader sense; it may include ministers, policemen, doctors, administrative staff of hospitals and, of course, the minister of health.)

Observations

It can be seen from the observation notes that Tam did a lot of regressing or referring back to the previous portions of the text. For example, when she questioned the word "superintendent" (Text 1), she said "Horace Mann tadi ..." (Horace Mann mentioned earlier) while her eye fixation moved to the upper left side of the page. Similarly, she read the following sentence more than once and kept silent, so that the researcher had to raise the TALK sign to remind her to keep reporting her thought processes.

Reading in a reading test

To Tam, reading the options in a multiple-choice test often led to a better understanding of the text, as (one of) the options often provided an alternative cue, especially when a straight forward interpretation was difficult to achieve. In her opinion, reading questions and the options provided before reading the text could save time. She did not have to focus on details that were not relevant to the questions, if the questions did not ask for details. When the question, for example, was about the meaning of the word "sentiment" as used in Text 1, she would reread particularly the sentence containing that word plus the next or the previous sentence. But when the question was about the topic of the passage, she would read and reread the whole text:

*Tet itu kan biasanya terbatas waktu; nggak bis kita baca semua berulang-ulang. Sudah dibaca semua ternyata pertanyaannya hanya menanyakan "sentiment", rugi waktu kita. Kalau baca pertanyaan dulu kan taku, oh topik, jadi ya harus baca semua. (Time is limited in a test; you cannot read the whole text over and over. If you read the whole text over and over and the question is about the word "sentiment", you waste time. If you read the questions first you will know, oh, the question is about topic, so you must read the whole text.)*

Reading newspapers

Tam admitted that she rarely read a newspaper in English, because she knew the news would be similar to that in the Indonesian newspapers or that on television. She usually read an English newspaper for improving language mastery, not for news.
When asked about the strategies used, she said:

_Saya biasanya baca seluruh teks, tapi tidak serius, em, seperti baca buku. Asal tahu sedikit-sedikit, ya sudah. Kalau ada kata sukar, ya, ya, dikira-kira aja. Dan biasanya memang banyak kata-kata yang tidak biasa kita gunakan di kelas. Bahkan topik saja, em, kadang sudah sulit diartikan._ (A usually read the whole text, but not as seriously, um, as reading books. As long as I know a bit of its content, it is okay for me. I will just guess their meaning if there are difficult words. And usually there are many words that we do not use in the classroom. Even the topics are usually difficult to interpret.)

Reading books

As stated above, reading books, especially the ones prescribed by the lecturers, was a serious undertaking. The goal was to understand the content and it was often followed by a task to summarise its content or to be able to lead a classroom discussion.

Reading and rereading were usually her main strategies:

_Kalau baca buku terpaksa harus tahu isinya karena sering ada tugas menurut atau memimpin diskusi. Lha kalau nggak tahu artinya kan repot. Kalau sudah begini saya harus baca berulang-ulang, nggak bisa tidak. Sekatipun kata-katanya sudah tahu, saya tetap harus baca berulang-ulang._ (In reading books I must understand their content as it is usually followed by an assignment, summarising or leading a discussion. It would be a disaster if I did not know the meaning. In this case, I have to read it over and over; there is no other alternative. Although I know all the words, I have to read the text over and over.)
Appendix 5.8
Strategy Profile of Reader 8 (Lia)

Think-aloud protocol
As Graph 5.4.8.1 shows, when reading, Lia did not merely translate the text, but she made every effort to get the meaning or the gist of the text. For this purpose she looked for the key word(s) in the sentence or the text she read. For example, in her attempt to comprehend the first sentence of Text 1, she identified the words “the educational system” and “reform” as important words in the first sentence, or at least they were “cues” she attended to. She understood the sentence was about “educational system” and, therefore, she attempted to focus her thought on education, educational systems or schools. Seeing the word “reform” at the end of the sentence, she wanted to know what it meant in the educational system. She might have thought that she had misunderstood the sentence and, therefore, she reread it. She read the sentence over and over but did not seem to find what it meant. In fact, she would not find the answer right in the first sentence, but she kept focusing on this sentence:

Um, I must read it again and again, I think. It talks about educational system, so I must imagine about education, or educational system or about schools. Um, here the word ‘reform’, I think, I should think what is meant by the word ‘reform’ in the educational system. When I read a sentence I think I must understand what it is and, maybe, if necessary ... well, I’ll read it again, I think.

As she was silent for over fifteen seconds, the researcher raised the TALK sign. Her comment indicated that, despite the phrase “the American educational system”, which was spelled out clearly in the text, her thought was somewhere else. She either thought that the text was about the educational system in Indonesia or made an association with the context of education in Indonesia. From her comment, the former seemed to be the case:

"Jadi di sini sepertinya kalimat ini menunjukkan bahwa sistem pendidikan di Indonesia itu juga perlu perbaikan. Di sini ada kata ‘desperately’, tentu saja di sini ada sesuatu yang ‘rusak’ atau bagaimana sistemnya itu. Jadi saya ingin lagi, ya, setelah kalimat ini ada apa. Kenapa mesti ada ‘reform’? Pasti kalimat berikutnya itu harus ada alasan, kenapa. (Thus, here, this sentence seems to indicate that the educational system in Indonesia also needs reform. Here there is the word ‘desperately’, which indicates that there must be something wrong in the system. So I want to know what comes after this"
sentence. Why should there have been a ‘reform’? There must be a reason in the next sentence.)

The word “desperately” gave her an impression that something was wrong in the educational system. Only then was she curious about what happened next – why there should be a reform. She predicted that the next sentence would provide reasons for reform. However, before moving to the next sentence she reread the first sentence and realised that the context was American, not Indonesian. Therefore, she apologised for her misunderstanding: “Maaf. Ini di Amerika, ya?” (Sorry. This is in America, isn’t it?)

Moving to the second sentence, she found that her prediction was confirmed – that the next sentence provided a reason for the need of reform – that is, private schools existed but only for the rich. She could easily understand the second reason, that is, that children who would be laborers or worked in the farm should prepare themselves for their life’s work, but it seemed that it was due to an association she made with the Indonesian context. She justified the text content, because this was what happened in Indonesia. She added that in order to overcome this problem, the Indonesian government set up a compulsory educational system in which all children had to complete junior high school (nine years of schooling). Despite her recognition that the text was in the American context, from her question “Is it also like this in America?” she seemed to keep falling back to the thought that the text was all about the Indonesian educational system.

Consistent with her claim that she had to understand the gist of what she read, Lia reread the previous sentences when she found a problem understanding the subsequent sentences. She seemed to make good use of her knowledge of text structure. A “what, why and how” scheme was always in her mind while reading, directing her search for answers. She understood that the text was about educational system (the what), that there had to be problems or reasons for reform (the why), and that there had to be some solution to the problem (how the reform was carried out):
By relating the first two sentences to the third one, she inferred that the third sentence represented the solution to the problem (the how) - that educational reformers focused their attention on people who were not aware of the need for education. It was apparent, then, that she thought in the Indonesian context because she did not know exactly what had happened in America:

"Ini saya kira ada hubungannya dengan Amerika sadi, ya Pak, walaupun saya kadang nemikirkan dia di Indonesia." (This may be related to the American context, Sir, although I sometimes think about it in the Indonesian context.)

While searching for further information on "the how" (the solution to the problem), Lia expressed her relief, noting that the fourth sentence talked about the answer she had been waiting for. Her paraphrase of the sentence proved her understanding:

"Nah ini bagus sekali ini ada seseorang yang berpendapat bahwa ini tidak termaafkan kalau di republik, di negara itu, ada penduduknya yang tidak sekolah. Sesudah saya tangkap kalimat ternyata tidak begitu sulit." (Wow, this is very good. There was someone who thought that there was no excuse if in a republic, in that country, there were citizens who did not go to school. Upon understanding the meaning, after all, the sentences are not difficult.)

Moving to the fifth sentence, Lia identified “Superintendent of Education” as a government body or something alike. She was not sure about it, but she thought it was related to Horace Mann. What she was sure of was that Horace Mann committed himself to the reform. She wondered how he did it, and said that she needed to reread the sentence. After reading it over and over and related it the previous sentence, she learned that “Superintendent of Education” referred to Horace Mann himself. From her sentence analysis she inferred that the main point was that Horace Mann made “various changes”, while the next part of the sentence behind the comma “modified” or “provided further information” about the changes, because it was in the Past Tense:

“Superintendent of education”? Saya karang tahu, tapi yang jelas dia itu punya ide untuk reformasi ini, melalui apa ya? Saya baca lagi. (What’s this, “Superintendent of Education”? Probably a government institution or something alike. I don’t know. I think it has something to do with Horace Mann. Was he one of the “Superintendents of education”? I don’t know, but apparently he had an idea for the reform. Through what was the reform made? I’ll read it again.)

Ya memang kadang sulit ya Pak. Ini kalimat diawali dengan keterangan itu, bukan subjeknya. Saya harus baca ulang.
Yeah, it is difficult, indeed, Sir. This sentence is started with an adjunct, not with a subject. I have to reread it.

Em, jadi orangnya itu. Kemudian ada koma di belakangnya itu saya kira menerangkan ‘changes’ (which were soon matched ...). Jadi ... Superintendent of Education itu menang Horace Mann. Kemudian dia melakukan ... ‘changes’, dan di belakang koma itu menerangkan various changes.
[Um, so that is the person. Then there is a comma behind it; I think it modifies ‘changes’ (which were soon matched ...). So ‘Superintendent of Education’ here refers to Horace Mann. Then he made ‘changes’. And the part behind the comma modifies ‘the various changes’.

Then she predicted that the next sentence would talk about how the changes were:
Karena dia melakukan changes, kalimat lanjutannya saya kira adalah penerapannya, ya Pak? (As he made changes, I think the next sentence is the application, right, Sir?)

Upon reading the sixth sentence, she read it silently, reread it aloud while identifying details of the changes Horace Mann made. She considered “He extended the school year from five to six months” funny, but her paraphrase indicated that she understood that it meant adding the existing number of school days. She expressed her agreement on the importance of improving teachers’ quality, and made an association with the Indonesian context when teachers’ salaries were mentioned:

Em..., menarik sekali ya Pak ini, terutama yang ini: Dia menambah jumlah hari siau apa, itu dalam satu tahun. Saya kira nggak apa-apa, cuma nanti bagaimana selanjutnya. “He improved the teachers’ quality ... by instituting teacher education ... and raised their salaries ...”. Ha ini memang banyak komentar kan. Perbaikan kualitas guru memang penting. Kalau di Indonesia, untuk guru itu salary-nya very very low.
(Em, it’s very interesting, Sir, especially this one: He added the number of days, or something alike, in one year. I think it’s all right, but what’s next? “He improved the teachers’ quality ... by instituting teacher education ... and raised their salaries ...”. Indeed, there are a lot of comments on this. The improvement of the teachers’ quality is very important, I think. In Indonesia, the teachers’ salaries are very low.)
After witnessing the changes Horace Mann made, Lia predicted that the next portion of the text would talk about the result of the reform. Upon reading the concluding sentence, she confirmed her prediction and commented:

Ya to, Pak. Saya sudah menduga, di sini akhirnya hasihnya inisiatif Horace Mann ini. Jadi improvement-nya itu mungkin tidak begitu terasa langsung, em, tetapi itu sudah mempengaruhi awareness of the public raji. (Isn’t it right, Sir? I already thought the text would finally talk about the result of Horace Mann’s initiatives. Thus the improvement might not be felt directly, but the changes had an impact on public awareness.)

As Graph 5.4.8.2 indicates, identifying key words was a strategy Lia used effectively, particularly in regard to the initial section or the first sentence of Text 2. As soon as she read the words “heart disease” at the end of the first sentence, she predicted that the remainder of the text would talk about health or something alike:

"Um, I think it is about health problem atau apa. The first sentence, "heart disease", Ini yang saya tangkap dari kalimat pertama. Saya kira belakang-belakang nanti juga tentang seperti ini." (Um, I think it is about health problem or something alike, as the first sentence mentions "heart disease". This is what I understood from the first sentence. I think the rest will also deal with something similar.)

Lia seemed to see the verb forms used in the text as a means of identifying what the text would be about. From the verb forms she predicted that the text dealt with current issues:

Yang tadi kan pakai Past Tense, kalau yang ini kan Present. Jadi saya kira masalah kini, masalah yang baru-baru.

(The previous text was in the Past Tense, while this one is in the Present Tense. So this text must deal with current issues.)

However, her paraphrase of the first sentence indicates that she missed the negative marker “not” in the first sentence. The sentence reads “There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease”, but her paraphrase says:

Jadi sedikit sekali yang tahu atau pernah mendengar tentang penyakit jantung koroner.” (So there are only few people who know or have heard of coronary heart disease.)

In response to the second sentence, Lia read and reread it silently, attended to and vocalised the words “respecter” and “presidents of superpowers”. She reread the,
sentence, attempted to see how the vocalised words were related to the others in the sentence. She said that she had to think the sentence over and over before finally paraphrasing the gist, which indicated her understanding of the sentence:

Jadi penyakit ini attack tidak hanya orang-orang biasa tapi juga orang superpower bisa terkena. (Thus, this disease attacks not only the ordinary man but it may also attack people of the superpowers.)

Responding to the third sentence, she read it silently, identified keywords, reread the sentence while vocalising the key words “young” and “middle age” in the third sentence, Lia inferred from the context that they are related to ages, that is, the ages of the people attacked by the disease: the old, the middle age, and the young. However, this seemed to be beyond her expectation. Making an association with the information she had learned, she predicted that the disease would attack the rich and the big-bellied. Referring to the text, she found her prediction disconfirmed:

Em, young, middle age. Ini kaitannya dengan umur. Yang ada pada bayangan saya orang-orang kaya, paruh baya dan gendut-gendut, gitu. Karena yang pernah saya dengar, penyakit jantung itu mungkin karena kebanyakan lemak atau bagaimana, ya Pak ya? ... karena kebanyakan lemak, karena penyempitan pembuluh darah, jadi kan juga karena makanannya terlalu terjamin atau gimana, gitu. Tapi di sini ternyata tidak disebut orang gendut atau kaya. (Um, young, middle age. This is related to age. I was thinking about the rich, the middle-aged and the big-bellied, because I heard that heart disease might be due to too much fat, or something else. It was due to too much fat, the blocking of the arteries, thus it was also due to rich food. But fat or rich people are not mentioned here.)

Moving to the fourth sentence, Lia questioned the meaning of the words “the furring-up”. She decided to skip the phrase, but noted that this was the basic cause of the coronary condition. She read the sentence over and over and analysed the sentence. She noted that the phrase before the first comma, the “furring-up of the arteries”, was the cause of the disease. She knew the meaning of “arteries”, and she knew that the cause of disease was “penyempitan pembuluh darah” (the blocking of the arteries), yet she failed to infer that “the furring-up of the arteries” was the same as “the blocking of the arteries”. Rereading the sentence, she paraphrased that “furring-up of the arteries” could also happen to animals.
In response to the fifth sentence, which was a 45-word sentence consisting of the main clause and sub-clauses, Lia read it silently, paraphrased the first clause, subvocalised the rest of the sentence, reread the sentence, monitored her comprehension while vocalising a number of key words, attempted to identify the main clause, attempted to paraphrase the gist of the whole sentence unsuccessfully, got frustrated with the complexity of the sentence construction, kept monitoring her comprehension but her confusion persisted. She had difficulty identifying the reference for the word "it" in "... has made it appear to be on the increase" when she questioned "Um, the increase of what?" After rereading the sentence, she finally inferred that it was the disease, probably the number of patients, that increased:

*Ini meningkat ini mungkin penyakitnya itu? Iya, mungkin ya? Walaupun sudah ada seperti ini, penyakitnya itu tetap meningkat, entah itu jumlah yang sakit, entah apapun, gini ya, Pak, ya? (Probably it is the disease that increased. Yeah, is it possible? Although there have been such things, the disease increases, be it the number of the patients, or something else. Is that right, Sir?)*

Responding to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, reread it aloud, and confirmed her inference of the previous sentence that "it" referred to the coronary heart disease, expressed her relief, and paraphrased the gist:

*Ah, betul. Jawabnya kebetul di sini. "Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a 'modern epidemic'." Ini berarti "it" itu refers to "coronary heart disease." Mungkin ada masalah sekarang. Jadi peningkatan penyakit itu memang ada. (Ah, it's right. The answer is here. "Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a 'modern epidemic'." This means that "it" refers to "coronary heart disease." There is no problem now. So the increase of the disease did exist.)*

In regard to the seventh sentence, she read it silently, related it to the information from the previous sentence, inferred the gist, and provided an illustration to support the inference:

*Ini lebih dijelaskan lagi di sini. Ini dilaporkan bahwa di California selama tahun 1942 itu ada 18,391 yang mati. Ya. Ini penguat untuk kata-kata sebelumnya, maksudnya dibuktikan dengan data ini, death certificates issued in California during 1942. (This is illustrated more clearly here. It was reported that in California during 1942 18,391 people died of the disease. Yeah. This supported the previous sentence, in the sense that it was proved by the data, death certificates issued in California during 1942.)*
Responding to the eighth sentence, Lia read it silently, established its relation to the previous sentences based on the figures presented in the sentence, and inferred the gist appropriately:

**Selanjutnya, ini yang lebih menguatkan lagi, atau semacam bukti, bukti bahwa memang disease itu suatu modern epidemic, karena 20 tahun berikutnya jumlah kasus sudah meningkat lima kali lipat, "a five-fold increase", meningkat lima kali lipat. (Then, this further supports or provides further evidence that the disease was a modern epidemic, because twenty years later the number of cases showed a five-fold increase.)**

In reaction to the ninth sentence, she read it silently, inferred the gist, read it aloud, attempted a more elaborated inference, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, commented on the length of the sentence, reread and analysed it, and finalised her inference:

**Kemudian, em, peningkatanannya besar sekali. "At present, the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due all forms of cancer." Berarti malah cardiovascular itu, penyakit yang lebih berbahaya daripada kanker. Karena the number of deaths dari ini tiap tahun itu dibandingkan dengan yang kanker, sebenar, jumlah kematian per tahun dari yang berpenyakit cardiovascular itu ... dua kali lipat ... daripada yang terkena kanker. Ini panjang sekali kalimatnya. Jadi harus dipisahkan. Ya saya kira sudah ketemu, bahwa yang kena penyakit jantung ini dua kali lipat dari yang kena penyakit kanker, kematiannya. (Then, um, a very big increase. "At present, the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due all forms of cancer." It means that cardiovascular disease is more dangerous than cancer, because the number of deaths annually compared with those of cancer, wait a minute ... the number of deaths annually due to cardiovascular disease ... is twice ... those due to cancer. The sentence is long, so that it must be analysed. Yeah, I know, now, that the deaths due to cardiovascular disease are twice, in number, those attacked by cancer.)**

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Lia read and reread it silently, attempted a paraphrase while vocalising a number of words, subvocalised the sentence, identified a difficult term, reread the sentence and attempted to interpret the term, reattempted to finalise the paraphrase of the whole sentence, evaluated the text content, identified a logical problem, reread the sentence, and completed the paraphrase, reread the sentence, and expressed her disagreement with part of the content:

**Kalimat terakhir, em, ... "However, generally it would seem ..." Ini bertanggung jawab pada ini. Yang bertanggung jawab itu apa? Peningkatan ..., em, ya, ... "death certification", em, ... "penyertifikatan", ya, mungkin semacam data, ".. are responsible for this rise." "Accurate diagnosis" itu juga ... bertanggung jawab. Tapi kalau "life expectancy" koyaknya nggak pas. Kenapa? Sebentar. Kalau peningkatan jumlah
penduduk dan death certification,... dan diagnosis yang akurat ... dan data kematian, ya, menurut beranggung jawab terhadap peningkatan agka kematian, tetapi "life expectancy" kenapa beranggung jawab terhadap ini? Jadi misalnya ini yang "life expectancy" ini nggak usah ada tentu saya kira saya setuju. Kalau yang "accurate diagnosis" itu juga menurut ya, menambah raih-rai. ... Tapi kalau "life expectancy" itu terna gimana bisa nambah, saya nggak tahu.
(The last sentence, um, ... "However, generally it would seem ..." This is responsible for this. What is responsible for what? The increase ... um, yeah, "death certification," um, ... "certification". Yeah, it is a kind of data. ... are responsible for this rise." "Accurate diagnosis" is also responsible. But "life expectancy" does not seem right. Why? Wait a minute. Population increase and death certification ... and accurate diagnosis, yeah, may be responsible for the increase of this disease death rate, but why is "life expectancy" responsible for the rise. If "life expectancy" were not included, I would agree on this. "Accurate diagnosis" could probably increase the death rate. ... However, I don’t know how "life expectancy" could increase death rate.)

Retellings

Lia’s retelling of Text 1 was relatively complete, covering the theme, the main idea, and 80% of the details. She comprehended the text quite well. However, like Yan, she questioned the logical relation between the changes Horace Mann made and the result suggested:

Kenapa masyarakat bisa sadar, ya, padahal hanya ada apa ... perubahan waktu belajar, mutu guru ditingkatkan, gajinya dinaikkan, tapi kok di belakang ada ketidadaan masyarakat tinggi? Ini kok saya tidak bisa menemukan kaitannya ke Pak apa ini bentu atau nggak? (How could public awareness increase, yeah, while there were only changes in the length of study, improvement of the teachers' quality and the rise in the teachers' salaries. But how could the public awareness increase? I could not find their relation, Sir. Is this correct?)

Lia’s objection was that she did not see anything done to public awareness, but it suddenly increased. This indicated that Lia read critically. Despite her attempts to understand the meaning of the text (intended by the author), she made her own judgment whether she could accept all the information presented. Lia’s objection may be justified because her impression on this point is similar to Yan’s:

Tadi dari the second sentence dari bawah, itu kan baru peningkatan lama belajar, kemudian peningkatan gaji guru, tapi kenapa kalimat terakhir ini sudah kesadaran masyarakat itu sudah meningkat?
(The second sentence from the bottom mentions only the extension of the length of study and the rise in teachers’ salaries, but why does the last sentence mention the increase of public awareness?)
Lia’s retelling of Text 2 was almost complete, covering the theme and most (86%) of the details, but the main idea was incomplete, missing one of the probable factors causing the disease death rate increase. She just mentioned three of the factors: more accurate diagnosis, population increases and death certificates. Meanwhile, the only detail she missed was that the number of deaths due to coronary heart disease was twice those due to cancer. In fact she did not mention the figures showing the death rate increase, because she did not like memorising them, but she managed to obtain the gist:

_Kemudian bahwa penyakit ini disebut penyakit epidemik moderen. Kenapa? Karena yang ditemukan di California itu berapa ... saya tidak suka mengingat data itu. Tapi setelah 20 tahun ternyata meningkat lima kali lipat. (Then this disease was called a modern epidemic. Why? Because it was found in California that the number was ... I don’t like memorising the data. But after twenty years the increase was five-fold.)_

It was revealed from her retelling of Text 2 that Lia interpreted the term “life expectancy” as “gaya hidup” (life style). Thus her use of the English term “life expectancy” throughout the think-aloud session was because she did not know its Indonesian equivalent. She remembered the term, but she did not mention it as one of the probable factors causing the death rate increase because she did not agree that “life expectancy”, which she interpreted as “life style”, could be a factor causing death rate increase:

_Tadi kalimat terakhir menyebukan juga “gaya hidup” (life style), tapi saya tidak jelas hubungannya apa.(The last sentence also mentioned “life style”, but its relation to the sentence was not clear to me.)_

This may revise Ericsson’s (1984:183) claim that if information is recalled from memory, then it must have been heeded, or Clark and Clark’s (1977) and Taylor and Taylor’s (1983) suggestion that recalling the meaning or the gist of, a phonological representation (in the case of listening) or, a visual representation (in the case of reading), indicates comprehension, or Morrow’s (1988:128) argument that because retelling can indicate readers’ assimilation and reconstruction of text information, it can reflect comprehension. Lia’s statement above showed that retelling reflected both comprehension and miscomprehension.
**In-depth interview**

There are two points worth noting from the discussion of the test answers. In regard to Question 5 (What are “reformers” in line 6?), Lia’s comments show how strong the influence of background knowledge on reading is, so that Lia was unable to see the information provided by the text proportionally:

> In my opinion is that they (reformers) are the government who concern about educational system in America. They are not ‘People who try to change things for the better’. ‘People who try to change things for the better’, no, I think. Because if they are not the government, they will not have influence on the change of the educational system, I think.

This response was most likely to be based on Lia’s observation on day-to-day practice in Indonesia that any important decisions made in education were always top-down in nature, coming from the government officials. Unfortunately, in defining the term “reformers”, Lia could not get away from the thought that only people who work for the government had “influence” or authority to change things for the better. However, unlike some other readers, as Text 2 talked about health issues, she knew that the word “authorities” refer to “medical experts”, not the others:

> I don’t think it is police, government officials, or demographers, because the text does not what, does not relate to any politic issues. It is about health, so it is medical issue.

Lia was good in the text comprehension, but was often misled by the options in the multiple-choice test. Therefore, while her retelling score was high, her test score was just a little above average.

**Observations**

The researcher’s observation note indicates that Lia pointed at the text while reading and rereading the texts (8 times for Text 1 and 13 times for Text 2). She vocalised a number of key words or difficult words, but she read aloud the whole sentence only twice, once for Text 1 and once for Text 2. Considering that both pointing at the text and vocalising or reading the text aloud were meant to focus her attention on the text, the low frequency of her vocalisation was compensated by her high frequency of pointing at the text.
Reading newspapers in English

In regard to reading a newspaper article in English, Lia attempted to understand the gist of the article from the title, the topic sentence(s) in the paragraph(s), or other resources. For example, she came to understand the information in the news article because she read or heard the news from other resources (Indonesian newspapers and television and radio broadcasts). These Indonesian resources often made her feel no urgent need for reading newspapers in English.

Reading texts in a reading test

In reading texts in a reading test, she usually glanced at the questions first before reading the text, in order to save time. She argued that reading the questions first could direct the reading of the text, in the sense that she would read for the purpose of searching answers to the questions posed.

Reading books

In reading books prescribed by the lecturers, she usually looked for the gist, as she would normally be required to make a summary of the content. Her main problem in reading books was the subject content. She usually had difficulty reading books on subjects beyond education or language education. In this instance vocabulary and her limited general knowledge often hampered comprehension. In dealing with such textbooks, she had to make great use of a dictionary, or discuss the content with friends or others who were familiar with the topic.
Appendix 5.9
Strategy Profile of Reader 9 (Fer)

Think-aloud protocol
As can be seen from Graph 5.4.9.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Fer read it silently, reflected on his comprehension of, and interest in, the sentence, indirectly inferred the gist, anticipated the content of the whole text as indicated by his questions on “what” and “who”, and expressed interest in the selection:

*Em, saya pahami sepenuhnya kalimat ini, tidak begitu mengalami kesulitan. Em, mengenai ist nuemang saya jadi tertarik ini untuk menahami atau untuk mengetahui ... seberapa em ... pendapat ini. ... Di sini kan disebutkan bahwa sistem pendidikan di Amerika itu perlu ada reformasi. Ini reformasi ini ... reformasi yang kayak apa, dan siapa yang mengungkapkan perannya itu, tampaknya menarik.*

(Um, I understand this sentence fully; it is not difficult. Um, in fact, I want to find out the true idea here. It is mentioned that the American educational system needed reform. What was this reform about, and who expressed that it was needed? It sounds interesting.)

In response to the second sentence, he read it silently, monitored his comprehension, and claimed that he needed to reread it, as he was still confused due to the complexity of the sentence. He called the sentence “mbulet-mbulet” (winding/complicated). He needed to see which was the main clause and which was the subclause(s). He noticed at least one difficult word, i.e. the word “sentimen”, but it did not affect his comprehension. He questioned whether the word was the same as the word “sentimen” in Indonesian, but he did not want to make any decision on it yet. After rereading the sentence he found that his anticipation of the content was confirmed, paraphrased the gist properly, stated that in-place of the word “sentiment” he would use the word “pendapat” (opinion), but wondered whether that was what the author meant:

*Ini, saya tahu bahwa kenapa tadi dikemukakan perlu reformasi. Itu ternyata di sana ... itu sekolah-sekolah itu waktu dulu, sekolah swasta maksudnya, hanya didirikan bagi orang-orang kaya. Kemudian sekolah yang umum atau sekolah negeri kalau di sini, itu ... em ... sangat sedikit. Dan ada pendapat... katanya ... kalau besok itu mau jadi pekerja kasar atau istilahnya laborer atau kalau sini ‘buruh’ lah ... itu kenapa harus susah-susah ... sekolah. Tapi nggak tahu, apa benar apa nggak pendapat ini.*

(I know now why a reform was needed. It turned out that the private schools at that time...
were only for the rich, and there were only very few public or state schools. And there was an opinion that if they wanted to be laborers, they would not have to bother going to school. But I don’t know whether this opinion was justified.

Moving to the third sentence, he read it silently, identified new information, monitored his comprehension, paraphrased the gist of the sentence, and reflected on his doubt about the appropriateness of his inference:

Em, ... ooh. Dari sini dapat keterangan baru itu. Sebenar ... Ternyata yang diriformasi itu pendapat umum yang berasal, yang mengatakan bahwa ... itu tadi ... buruh itu ... wla ora ndadi nganggo sekolah. Ha, itu ternyata. Topi nggak tahu, apa benar apa nggak.
(Um, ... oh, I found new information from this. Wait a minute. ... It was the public sentiment that needed to be reformed, the sentiment that in order to be laborers children did not have to go to school. That’s it. But I don’t know whether it is correct.)

Responding to the fourth sentence, he read it silently, found his earlier question about “who” was answered, and paraphrased the gist:

Em, sayang tahu bahwa orang yang paling besar peranannya itu, Horace Mann. Memnun dia ... itu harus di semua republik, mungkin maksaanya negara, negara bagian di sana itu tidak boleh ada yang ... tindahnya kalau di sini itu ... buta aksara atau apa ... tidak dapat pendidikan, gitu. (Um, I know the person with the most important role was Horace Mann. To him, in all “republics”, probably it means “states”, no one was allowed to be, using the term here, “illiterate”, deprived of education.)

Associating the text with educational conditions in Indonesia, he laughed cynically, provided an illustration, and reflected on his concern about the condition of the Indonesian educational system:

Kalau begini ini sama dengan yang di ... ini, yang sekarang baru digalak-galakkan itu ... apa ... paket belajar atau sekarang sistem pendidikan dasar 9 tahun. Kalau informasi ini benar, kita harus malu. Ha, ha. Kenapa? Ini di Amerika itu sudah abad ke-19 ... awal, kita baru sekarang. Ha, ha, memalukan.
(Then it is the same as what is being promoted here, what is it, learning package or now the so-called the nine-year primary education. If this information is true, we should be ashamed. Ha, ha. Why? It happened in America at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but we are just doing it now. Ha, ha, it’s shameful.)

In response to the fifth sentence, he read it silently, identified a problematic word (the word “superintendent”), reflected on his disappointment due to forgetting the meaning of the word, guessed the meaning of the word, monitored his comprehension, attempted to paraphrase the gist, anticipated the text content by
questioning what the reformer did, and lingered on his curiosity about the meaning of the word “superintendent”:

Saya kok lupa kata “superintendent” ini. Jabatannya Horace Mann itu apa, mungkin dekan atau ... apa? Dia itu em ... membuat perubahan-perubahan. Ya nggak tahu perubahannya kaya apa. Tapi disebutkan di sini bahwa ... em ... perubahan itu bisa diterapkan atau “matched” di sekolah-sekolah yang lain. Ini menarik, tapi saya lupa “superintendent”. Itu menggenggu, Pak. Kalau di rumah biasanya saya cari kamus. Cuma ini lho, mosok aku ra ngerti “superintendent”.
(I forget this word “superintendent”. What was Horace’s position, maybe a dean, or what? He, um, made changes. I don’t know what the changes looked like. But it is mentioned here that the changes could be applied or “matched” in other schools. This is interesting, but I forget the word “superintendent”. It’s bothering, Sir. At home, I would look it up in the dictionary. Only this, why don’t I know the word “superintendent”.)

Moving to the sixth sentence, he read and reread the whole sentence silently, paraphrased the sentence, inferred the gist, and kept reflecting on the problematic word from the previous sentence:

Oooh, saya kira ini “superintendent” tadi membuat perubahan lamanya pendidikan, dulu lima ... diubah jadi enam bulan, kali ada peningkatan kualitas guru-nya, diberi rasa superintendante itu mungkin pejabat tinggi. Tapi persisnya apa belum tahu.
(Oh, I think the ‘superintendent’ made a change on the length of the period of education; it was changed from five to six months. Then there was an improvement of the quality of teachers, and so forth. It means that “superintendent” is a high-ranking official. But I still don’t know its precise meaning.)

In response to the concluding sentence, he read the sentence once, returned to the beginning of the passage, skimmed the whole passage while struggling to find the meaning of “superintendent”, and paraphrased the sentence:

Ternyata nggak saya temui apa “superintendent” itu sampai terakhir ini. Yang terakhir ini hanya menyebutkan perubahan itu memang tidak bisa dirasakan secara cepat, tapi lambat laun, ginu. Yang bisa kita lihat, ada kesadaran dari kalangan masyarakat bahwa sistem pendidikan di atas tadi ternyata perlu, benar perlu perbaikan itu. Jadi yang sudah dilakukan oleh Horace Mann itu perlu didukung atau diperkuat lagi.
(Up to the end of the passage I cannot find what “superintendent” is. The last sentence only mentioned that the changes could not be felt instantly, but slowly, step by step. What we could see was the public awareness that the educational system really needed improvement. Thus, what Horace Mann has done needs support or further strengthening.)

As indicated by Graph 5.4.9.2, glancing at the first sentence of Text 2, Fer seemed to make an association with his pre-established knowledge about the subject,
interpreted the sentence contrary to its intended meaning, and reflected on his comfortable feeling with the text, without realising that he had missed the word “not” in the sentence so that his paraphrase was inappropriate:

"Em, pertama ini langsung bisa saya tangkap langsung bahwa ini membicarakan penyakit jantung koroner. Itu disebutkan em, hanya beberapa orang yang tahu. (Um, once I read I can understand it right away that it’s about coronary heart disease. It is mentioned that only a few people know about the disease.)"

Moving to the second sentence, he read it silently, identified a problematic word (the word “respecter”), vocalised the word, monitored his comprehension, reread the sentence, and found that the word was followed by phrases containing contrasting concepts (“presidents of super-powers” and “the ordinary man in the street”). Using his common sense, he inferred that “no respecter” implied the sense that the disease “tidak pandang bulu” (did not care about a person’s social status):

"Pertama saya lihat ... ‘respecter’ ... ‘no respecter’ ... itu em ... apa itu artinya, ya? Terus saya baca lagi ... di belakangnya, ada “presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man on the street.” Hoa itu kan kira-kira dari presidennya negara super-power sampai orang-orang biasa di jalan biasa kena penyakit itu. Berarti kan ... ‘respecter’ ... itu ya kalau di-Indonesiaan bisa berarti itu ‘tidak pandang bulu’.

(First, I saw the words “respecter ... no respecter”. What do they mean? I reread it, and behind it I found the phrase “presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man on the street.” Ho, this means from presidents of superpowers to the ordinary man in the street can be attacked by the disease. In Indonesian, it means that the disease “does not care about a person’s status.”)

In response to the third sentence, he read and reread it silently, analysed the sentence and saw that its structure was unusual as it started with an adjunct “Primarily a disease of advancing age, ....”. After reading and rereading the whole sentence, and in light of the cues in the form of the age category: “middle age”, “the young” and “advancing age”, he inferred the gist appropriately. To confirm his understanding, Fer provided an illustration that “middle age” meant “between the ages of thirty and forty”.

In reaction to the fourth sentence, he read and it silently, identified a difficult phrase, vocalised the phrase, associated it with his prior knowledge, attempted a paraphrase of the first half of the sentence, monitored his comprehension, and inferred the gist of
the second half of the sentence:

Saya nggak tahu artinya ... "furring-up of arteries". Kalau 'arteries' itu ... saya pernah dengar dalam belajar biologi waktu SMA, artinya pembuluh arteri. Tapi nek kon njelaskan ya lupa. Tapi itu ternyata menjadi penyebab utama apa ... jantung koroner tadi. Nggak tahu itu 'furring up' itu 'furring up' apa. Yang jelas itu terjadi tidak cuma pada manusia, tapi juga pada binatang.

(I don't know the meaning of "furring-up of arteries". I heard the word "arteries" in a Biology class when I was in high school. But I forgot the explanation. Anyhow, it is the main factor causing coronary condition. I don’t know what “furring-up” means. Apparently, it happens not only on human beings but also animals.)

In regard to the fifth sentence, he read it silently, paraphrased the sentence chunk by chunk while monitoring his comprehension, reread the sentence, and finalised the response with an appropriate inference:

Itu ternyata sudah lama ditemukan, em, oleh dokter pada abad 18. Itu kan berarti tahun 1700 sekian ke atas. Tapi kenapa baru ... baruakhir-akhir ini ya ... penyakit itu mulai di ... kedatangan penyakit yang besar, atau 'increase'. Itu ternyata karena ... dulu publikasinya kurang. Juga ada kata metode diagnostic dan ... treatment ... ya, apa istilahnya ... pemberian treatment ... yang lebih baik. Ee ... maka baruakhir-akhir ini ... mulai terlihat peningkatan. Jadi meningkatnya karena pengaruh ... publikasi, dan faktor lainnya.

(The disease has been known to doctors for a long time, in the eighteenth century. It means in 1700’s. But why has it appeared to be on the increase only recently? The publication in the past proved to be insufficient. It was also due to better diagnostic methods and treatment. Um, ... therefore, the increase has only appeared recently. So the increase was due to the effect of publication and other factors.)

Responding to the sixth sentence, Fer read it silently, identified a problematic word (the word “authorities”), guessed its meaning based on the context, paraphrased the first half of the sentence, provided an illustration to support the paraphrase, identified another problematic word (the word “cardiovascular”), associated the word with his prior knowledge, and identified its reference, which he understood as referring to the word “heart.” Then he was frustrated by the word “epidemic” because he felt he knew the word, but was unable to define it. After rereading the sentence, he guessed the meaning of the word, and inferred the gist of the whole of the sentence successfully:

Ini “authorities” ... “authorities” ... penguasa ... pihak pemerintah negaranya, ... mungkin departemen kesehatan, dsb., mungkin rumah sakit ... itu ... em ... percaya adanya kenaikan jumlah, jumlah em ... orang yang mengidap penyakit jantung koroner itu ... memang benar-benar nyata. Artinya memang sekarang masyarakat yang terkena itu
mengalami kenaikan dalam jumlah. Dan bahkan menyebut penyakit itu tadi ... "cardiovascular". Apa ya? Ini istilah saya ... saya sering dengar itu tetapi em ... saya belum tahu artinya. Ternyata dari sini bisa tahu ... "cardiovascular" itu ... jantung koroner. Nah ini disebut sebagai epidemik modern. Apa itu? Sering dengar, tapi nggak ingat artinya. Em, yang bangsa penyakit ... em ... yang menyerang orang banyak, mungkin. Tapi itu modern. Jadi penyakit ini menyerang banyak orang pada zaman moderen ini.

(This "authorities" ... "authorities" ... it must be the government, ... maybe the Department of Health, or maybe hospitals. They believe that the increase of the coronary heart disease patients is real. It means that there is an increase in the number of people affected by the disease. An they call the disease "cardiovascular." What's this? I often hear this term, but I don't know its meaning. Here, "cardiovascular" proves to be the same as "coronary heart." And this is called modern "epidemic." What's this? I often hear this word, but I can't remember its meaning. Um, it's a kind of disease that attacks many people, maybe. But it is modern. So this disease attacks a great number of people in the modern era.)

In regard to the seventh sentence, he read it silently, identified a key word ("California"), which made him assume that the author of the text was an American, and paraphrased the sentence appropriately:

Em, dari sini saya tahu bahwa ini ternyata ... artikel ini ... ditulis oleh orang Amerika. Ini disebukan bahwa orang yang mas karena penyakit ini, berdasarkan catatan yang di California, ... selama tahun '42 saja sudah mencapai itu sekitar 20.000-an kurang sedikit.

(Um, from this I know that this article must have been written by an American. It is mentioned that the people dying of the disease, according to the record in California, ... during 1942 alone, reached approximately 20,000.)

After reading the eighth sentence silently, he inferred the gist, reflected on his strategy use, identified a difficult phrase ("a five-fold"), monitored his comprehension, made a tentative inference based on the context, provided an illustration, made another reflection on his confusion, monitored his comprehension, reread the sentence, and confirmed his previous inference:

Em, 20 tahun kemudian ternyata ada kenaikan. Saya langsung saya lihat angka-angkanya, saya perbandingkan. Nggak hoca keseluruhan pun ... em ... saya langsung paham. Tahun '42 sekian, terus bawahnya ada sekian. Terus di belakangnya ... "a five-fold", ... ha ini nggak tahu saya. Apa ini? Tapi ya kira-kira peningkatan dari 18,391 pada '42, lalu 20 tahun berikutnya, tahun '62, ada peningkatan sampai 102,478 yang mott. Ha itu, nek detung nanti pahai matematika disebut "a five-fold increase." Tapi "a five-fold" itu apa ora ngerti. Oh ... kira-kira ... five ...oh, ya, lima ... lima kali lipat, mungkin ya. Ya, "lima kali" ... ya, "lima kali lipat."

(Um, twenty years later there was an increase. I directly looked at the figures and compared them. I didn't read the whole sentence, but I could understand it. In '42 there was such a number, and another number followed. Then, behind it, there is "a five-fold." I don't know this. What is it? But probably it is an increase of deaths from 18,391
in '42 to 102.478 twenty years later, in '62. If it is calculated mathematically, there will be "a five-fold increase." But, I don't know "a five-fold." ... Oh, probably, ... five ... oh, yeah, "five times", probably? Yeah, "a five ..." ... yeah, "five times", yeah, "a five-
fold.")

As the ninth sentence also dealt with the number of deaths, after reading it silently, reflected on his comprehension of the text, paraphrased the sentence successfully, vocalised a key word ("twice") to support his paraphrase, and analysed the sentence into chunks while interpreting it chunk by chunk in order to confirm his paraphrase of the whole sentence:

Ooh, tahu sekarang. Ini, ini jumlah kematian tiap tahun ... yang disebabkan oleh penyakit jantung koroner ... itu ternyata dua kali lipat dari yang disebabkan kanker. Ha ini ada "twice", ... terus ada kata-kata "cancer", "cardiovascular", dan "a number of deaths.", kan sudah tahu, jumlah yang mati. Itu ada "cardiovascular" ya berarti kan ... mesti yang disebabkan oleh cardiovascular. Itu ... more than twice ... lebih dari dua kali. Terus di belakangnya ada "cancer". Ha berarti terus lebih dari dua kali yang disebabkan kanker.
(Oh, I know now. The number of annual deaths due to coronary heart disease turned to be twice those due to cancer. Here, there is the word "twice", then there are the words "cancer", "cardiovascular", and "a number of deaths". I know this, the number of those who died. There is "cardiovascular", so it means (those who died) due to cardiovascular. There is "more than twice" followed by "cancer". So it means "more than twice those due to cancer.")

Reading the concluding sentence, Fer said he did not have any problem with the words, reread the sentence over and over, identified a logical problem, monitored his comprehension, evaluated the text content, and made a self-reflection:

Penyebab nailnya angka kematian karena jantung koroner kan bukan karena angka harapan hidup tambah, bukan karena populasi meningkat, bukan karena diagnosinya semakin baik. Ya, kan, kalau menurut saya. Tapi kalau ... kalau mau dikatakan bertanggungjawab kok kelihatannya nggak Pak. (The causes of the coronary heart disease death rate increase were not improved life expectancy, population increase, or more accurate diagnosis, were they? Yeah, that's in my opinion. But if it was said that they are responsible, I don't think they are, Sir.)

Retellings

Fer's retelling of Text 1 was fairly complete, covering the theme, the main idea and 80% of the details. However, he earned a score of only 2 instead of a full score of 3 for the main idea, because he did not explicitly mention Mann's disagreement with public opinion. He kept talking about his concern over his forgetting or inability to
find the exact meaning of the word “superintendent”, but this concern was unnecessary because he proved to be able to get the gist without knowing the exact meaning of the word. As revealed in the think-aloud session, Fer seemed to want to know everything about the text so that sometimes he made a simple matter complicated. For example, despite his understanding of the explicit term “extending the school year”, initially he questioned whether extending the study period from five to six months was per semester or per year.

Like Eki, Fer often associated the conditions mentioned in the text with those in Indonesia. For example, he agreed with Mann on raising the teachers’ salaries. In this regard, he had sympathy with the teachers so that he tolerated the Indonesian teachers who were moonlighting due to the low standard of salaries. In concluding the retelling of Text 1 he restated his embarrassment that Indonesia was 200 years behind America in the educational system:

_Ini ternyata ada sedikit kesamaan ini dengan yang ada sekarang di Indonesia. Bedanya di artikel ini pada awal abad ke-19. Kan sekarang ini sudah tahun 1997, sudah abad ke-20 abis. Berarti ... tertinggal hampir dua abad Indonesia itu dibandingkan dengan Amerika. Pandangan kalau bahwa “nek nanti jadi buruh, rasah ndadak sekolah”, kalau di Indonesia sudah hilang lama, ya Pak, tapi penerapan sistem pendidikan guru-nya itu saya kira Indonesia itu tertinggal dua abad. (There seems to be a similarity to what happens in Indonesia now. The difference is that in this article, it happened at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is 1997 now; we are at the end of the twentieth century. It means that Indonesia is left two centuries behind America. It's true that the opinion "to be labourers children do not have to go to school" has long gone but, in regard to the application of such a system of teacher education, Indonesia is left two centuries behind.)"

Fer’s retelling of Text 2 was almost complete, covering the theme, the main idea, and most (80%) of the details. In addition, he also provided illustrations to support his understanding of the text. Despite his comprehension of the text, his logic made him disagree with the author on the causes of the increase in the death rate from coronary heart disease:

_Yang saya masih heran itu kenapa catatannya semakin baik, eni ... diagnosisnya juga semakin baik, kok malah membuat nafkinya angka kematian. Itu yang saya sedikit masih bingung ... sudah saya otak-otak ... kenapa belum ketemu. Diagnosis makin baik mestinya pengobatan lebih baik dan angka kematian turun, saya kira. (I am still wondering why better records and more accurate diagnosis make a death rate increase.)"
In-depth interview: Discussion on the multiple-choice test answers

Consistent with his comprehension of Text 1 during the think-aloud session, he managed to answer all the questions related to Text 1 correctly. The reason he provided for choosing an answer to a question confirmed his full comprehension of the text. For example, in regard to why the word “waste” was put between quotation marks (Question 4), his response indicated that not only did he recognise the function of the punctuation marks but he was in the same opinion of the author that education was “not a waste” of time.

In regard to Text 2, Fer did not seem to notice tricky points in a multiple-choice test. For example, in regard to Question 8, first, he did not seem to notice the plural morpheme “s” in the word “Diseases” and read the option “Diseases of the heart” as “Disease of the heart”. Second, he did not seem to realise that, despite their different portions, the text talked about two diseases, coronary heart disease and cancer. Therefore, he was confident that the main topic of the text was Option A (Diseases of the heart). In regard to Question 11, Fer knew that the word “by” in “by the eighteenth century” means “before”, but he was distracted by the option “In the eighteen century”.

As with other informants’ responses, Fer’s observation of day-to-day practice in Indonesia had a deep influence on his text comprehension. He saw that “authority” was always attached to the government or government officials:

*Ya. Siapa lagi kalau nggak Babe? Authorities in ya mesti orang-orang pemerintah, kan? (Yeah, who else if it was not Big Daddy? Authorities must be government officials, mustn’t they?)*

Babe (Big Daddy) was a nickname given to Suharto, the president of Indonesia from 1966 to 1998, who had succeeded in establishing in many Indonesian people’s minds
that, during his reign, government was identical with authority.

Reading a text in a reading test
He worked on the test for six minutes (average time = 8 minutes), which indicated that he was confident that he had done his best in the think-aloud and retelling tasks. However, he spent a long time (1 hour 47 minutes) on the think-aloud and retelling tasks. He claimed that in a reading comprehension test he usually tried to find the gist or what the text was about before looking at the questions. He said that looking at the questions before reading the text could be helpful but also harmful, because the distracters in a multiple-choice test could mislead his comprehension of the text. Once he comprehended the text, there would only be a few questions for which the answers needed rereading of the text. He usually read the text sentence by sentence but with a greater speed because of the time limit set for the test.

Reading newspapers
In reading newspapers or magazines Fer usually read for the gist and did not bother about the exact meaning of unfamiliar words in print, unless there was a task related to the reading. If he had to summarise or translate a news article, for example, he would make every effort to comprehend the text content in detail. However, the gist was what he looked for when reading newspapers on his own. Consequently, skimming was his major strategy, and only occasionally would he read and reread portions of the article intensively. That Indonesian newspapers and mass media published similar news aided Fer in comprehending newspapers in English. This shows that Fer relied on other sources of information or prior knowledge in comprehending texts in newspapers.

Reading books
In Fer's opinion, unlike newspapers, books usually deal with serious topics which need deep scrutiny. Unlike when reading newspapers, he needed as much information as possible from the text using as much prior knowledge as possible in reading books.
While reading books in Indonesian, with minimum language barriers, still needed serious effort, reading books written in English demanded more effort. Fer usually tried to find what the book was about, which could be found in the introduction. Only then would he start with the chapters. Consistent with this, when he was asked to read two paragraphs in the introduction chapter of The Learner-Centred Curriculum (Nunan, 1988:2), he skimmed the preface of the book before reading the paragraphs assigned. If, upon the completion of reading he still had problems comprehending the content, he would reread the difficult sections. While reading, he often made notes or marks on the relevant pages in pencil, which could be erased later. He hated reading books with notes or marks in ink made by other readers, because he thought that they could disrupt his understanding of the original message intended by the author(s).
Appendix 5.10
Strategy Profile of Reader 10 (Eba)

Think-aloud protocol

As can be seen from Graph 5.4.10.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Eba quickly read and reread the whole sentence, sounded out the phrase “desperately in need”, and correctly inferred the essence of the sentence in English:

From this sentence I can conclude that the educational system in America in the beginning of the nineteenth century was not, um, very good. Maybe the system, many people think that the system was a failure, and that the system is to be reformed.

Moving to the second sentence, she read it silently, said that she would report in Indonesian, reread the sentence chunk by chunk and paraphrased it appropriately chunk by chunk as well, and made a self-reflection to confirm her understanding:

Em, ada sekolah swasta tapi sangat mahal dan untuk orang-orang yang sangat kaya. Public school itu ada beberapa, tapi tidak begitu diperhatikan dan tidak baik sistemnya. Itu karena ada anggapan bahwa anak-anak kelas bawah yang ... mereka ... orang menganggap akhirnya akan menjadi buruh saja. Mereka tidak perlu membuang waktu untuk mendapat pendidikan yang lebih baik, tetapi lebih baik bersiap-siap untuk pekerjaan kasar. Pekerjaan kasar tidak kan perlu pendidikan yang tinggi-tinggi. (Um, there were private schools but very expensive and just for the very rich. There were a few public schools, but they were not well attended and its system was not good. It was due to an assumption that children of the low class would finally only be laborers. They should not waste their time on better education, but should get ready for manual labor. Manual labor did not need high education, did it?)

In response to the third sentence, Eba read it silently, identified a problematic phrase (“set about”), vocalised the phrase, correctly guessed its meaning, and paraphrased the gist of the whole sentence:

Em, set about? Ya, mungkin “menetapkan” atau “berusaha”. Topi saya kira maksudnya ada beberapa reformers yang berusaha memperbaiki system pendidikan di Amerika. (Um, set about? Yeah, perhaps “decided” or “attempted”. But I think it means there were a few reformers who attempted to improve the educational system in America.)

Responding to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, vocalised the phrase “in a republic”, made an association with the previous sentence, and paraphrased her
inference:

Selanjutnya, ... in a republic, di Amerika maksudnya, ... walaupun ada pendapat umum seperti di atas, kemudian ada beberapa orang berpendapat bahwa itu tidak benar. Jadi sekitop orang harus mendapat ... mempunyai hak untuk mendapatkan pendidikan. (Then, ... in a republic, it means in America, despite the public opinion mentioned earlier, there were a few people who considered the opinion wrong. So everyone should get ... have the right to education.)

Following this inference, Eba made self-reflections on her knowledge about American history:

Saya rasa, em, pada saat itu, em, ini ada hubungannya dengan, em, segregated school system, em, pemisahan antara orang hitam dan orang kulit putih, di mana mereka berbeda dalam beberapa hal dalam education system, begitu. Ini juga perlu direformasi. (I think, it was related to the segregated school system that time, um, the separation of the black from the white, in which they were different in some aspects in the educational system. This also needed reform.)

Responding to the fifth sentence, Eba read it silently, identified the years as a key time reference, associated the years with the segregated system, reread the sentence, vocalised a difficult word, related it to the previous sentence, paraphrased the gist while questioning the meaning of the word “superintendent”, and guessed the meaning of the word:

Kalau mengingat tahunnya 1837-1848, ini masih masa pemisahan hitam-putih. Horace Mann mulai berbagai macam perubahan yang segera “matched” ... saya pikir “diikuti” sekolah-sekolah lain di sana. Pada saat itu Horace Mann itu “Superintendent” of Education. Saya tidak yakin, tapi mungkin orang Depdikbud atau Kmir, gitu.

(Considering the years, 1837 to 1848, this was still the period of black-white segregation. Horace Mann started various changes which were soon “matched” ... I think that were soon “followed” by other schools over there. Horace Mann was “Superintendent” of Education that time. I am not sure, but perhaps he was someone from the Department of Education or Regional Office of Education, I think.)

Moving to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, identified a problematic phrase (“extended the school year”), associated it with the Indonesian context which resulted in a misinterpretation of “month” for “year”, questioned the word “instituting”, guessed its meaning, summarised the content of the whole sentence, and made self-reflections on the teachers’ welfare:
He extended the school year, em, mungkin "wajib belajar", di tempat kita sekarang sembilan tahun, di sana dari lima menjadi enam tahun, saat itu. Kemudian "instituting" ... mungkin "mendirikan" pendidikan bagi guru. Jadi dia menambah jangka waktu wajib belajar, mendirikan sekolah guru dan menaikkan gaji. Saya kira di mana pun kita main mus mai major, pendidikan harus baik. Untuk itu guru sebagai soko guru pendidikan kesra-nya ya harus diperhatikan.

(He extended the school year, um, maybe "compulsory education", which is nine years for us now, over there was from five to six years, that time. Then "instituting" ... perhaps "established" teachers' colleges. So he extended the length of compulsory education, established teachers' colleges, and raised salaries. I think, anywhere, if you want to make a progress, education must be good. Consequently, as the main pillars of education, teachers' welfare must be taken care of.)

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Eba read it silently, reread it chunk by chunk and interpreted the chunks, and justified the content of the text:

"Em, walaupun ... em ... usaha-usaha ini tidak ... hasilnya tidak dapat secara ... terlihat secara cepat dan nyata ... dalam peningkatan ... sistem edukasi di Amerika ... em, this effort telah berhasil meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat tentang perubahan mempunyai sebuah ... em ... sistem pendidikan yang kuat, karena dasar pendidikan yang kuat akan memperkuat negara. Saya pikir begini.

(Although the results of these efforts could not be seen immediately and clearly in the improvement of the American educational system, these efforts had increased public awareness as to the need for a strong educational system, for a strong educational system would strengthen the country. I think that's it.)

Starting with the first sentence of Text 2, as indicated by Graph 4.4.10.2, Eba read it silently first, then read it aloud, inferred the gist while predicting what the whole text would be about, associated the text with her prior knowledge, and made a self-reflection:

"Um, for the first sentence, "There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease." Um, from the sentence I can conclude that this text will talk about heart disease. Mering saya dengar, penyakit jantung koroner akhir-akhir ini menjadi penyakit pembunuh nomor satu di dunia. (I often heard that coronary heart disease has recently turned to be the number-one killer disease in the world.)

In reaction to the second sentence, she read it silently once, reread it silently, vocalised the phrase “no respecter”, reread it again and paraphrased the gist, and related to her background knowledge while providing an illustration in support of her paraphrase:

"Em, penyakit jantung koroner ini ... tidak memilih orang ... untuk yang terkena. Jadi ... siapa saja bisa terkena, ... em ... terutama orang-orang yang ... tidak memperhatikan kesimbangan gizi. (Subvocalising portions of text). Jadi ... bagi orang-orang yang tidak
mempertimbangkan gizi yang seimbang atau ... hidup yang seimbang, tidak peduli apa jabatannya, tetap terkena.
(Um, coronary heart disease ... is not selective in its attack. So it may attack anyone, especially those who do not care about the nutrition balance. So those who do not consider balanced nutrition or balanced life, regardless of their positions, they will be affected by the disease.)

In relation to the third sentence, she read and reread it silently, paraphrased the whole sentence, monitored her comprehension, and restated the paraphrase of the last chunk of the sentence:

Em, penyakit ini ... biasanya ... menyerang orang-orang yang ... umurnya cukup tua, mungkin ... di atas setengah baya. Tapi juga sering menyerang em, orang-orang setengah baya juga, dan juga, em, orang-orang yang masih muda. Em, ... ada beberapa kiasus yang, em, tentang dapat menyerang anak-anak muda.
(Um, this disease usually attacks old people, maybe above the middle age. But it often attacks, um, the middle age, and also the young. Um, ... there were cases about the disease attacking the young.)

Responding to the fourth sentence, she read it silently once, reread it, identified an unfamiliar phrase, "furring-up of arteries", vocalised the phrase, provided its Indonesian equivalent and an illustration based on her background knowledge, and paraphrased the rest of the sentence:

Um, the next sentence ... "the furring up of arteries". I am not sure the meaning ... what's the meaning of "furring up" but ... I think in Indonesian it means ... "penyembatan" (blocking-up). Penyakit jantung koroner disebabkan oleh penyembatan pembuluh darah. Memang dari yang saya dengar, kalau penyakit jantung itu kebanyakan disebabkan oleh penyembatan pembuluh darah di jantung. Jadi ini 'the furring up' itu mungkin karena, em, kalori, em, lemak. Em, penyakit ini, selain umurnya ditemukan pada manusia, tetapi juga bisa ditemukan pada hewan-hewan, in animal kingdom.
(The coronary heart disease is caused by the blocking-up of arteries. As a matter of fact, from what I heard, the coronary heart disease is mostly caused by the blocking-up of arteries in the heart. So the furring-up of arteries is, perhaps, due to, um, calories, um, fat. Um, this disease, other than generally found in human beings, can also be found in animals, in the animal kingdom.)

Moving to the fifth sentence, Eba read it silently, commented on the length of the sentence, analysed the sentence, monitored her comprehension, reread it while vocalising a number problematic words or phrases, questioned the sentence construction, expressed comprehension problem, reflected on her comprehension
strategies, provided an appropriate interpretation of the sentence chunk by chunk while monitoring her comprehension, and finalised the response with an appropriate inference of the whole sentence:

_Il'_ long sentence, _dan masih ditambah “Although” sampai “century”, sama ini “_has made it appear to be on the increase”. Saya pikir kalimat ini kok ... belum selesai sudah berhenti. Nah, saya pikir saya belum bisa ini. Jadi saya mengulangi lagi, dengan membaca lebih cermat, word by word, sehingga saya dapat memisahkan subyeknya mana, kata kerjanya mana, yang clause-nya mana, dst.

_Em, walaupun sebenarnya ... kalimat ini menyatakan bahwa penyakit jantung koroner itu sudah ada ... sejak zaman dahulu, ... dan bahkan sudah ... dokter-dokter sudah ... zaman abad ke-18 itu sudah ... mengetahui bahwa penyakit ini sudah umum, tetapi akhir-akhir ini ... kelihatannya penyakit jantung ini ... seperti ... penyakit ini meningkat ... yaitu disebabkan karena adanya ... em ... kemajuan yang pesat dalam bidang diagnosta, metode diagnosis dan ... improved treatment itu adalah ... perawatan yang dilakukan, ditambah dengan ... em ... maraknya pemberitaan dari media, sehingga orang-orang mengganggap bahwa penyakit jantung koroner ini ... baru ... baru meningkat akhir-akhir ini. Berarti banyak orang yang mungkin menganggap bahwa penyakit jantung ini ... meningkatnya baru akhir-akhir ini._

_(This is a long sentence, coupled with the clause from “Although” up to “century” and this chunk, “has made it appear to be on the increase”. I think this sentence is not yet complete but has ended. Well, I think I haven’t got the idea yet. So I have to reread it, looking closely at the sentence, word by word, so that I can analyse which is the subject, the verb, the clause, and so forth._

_Um, although actually ... this sentence states that coronary heart disease has existed ... since a long time ago, ... and doctor in the eighteenth century already knew that the disease had been common, but it has appeared to be on the increase recently ... because of ... um ... advancement in diagnostic methods, improved treatment, widespread publication by mass media, so that people think that coronary heart disease has been on the increase recently. It means that many people think that the disease that has been on the increase recently.)_

In response to the sixth sentence, Eba read the whole sentence silently, reread it while vocalising a number of words, attempted to interpret these words, paraphrased the gist of the sentence, and inferred the author’s implied opinion, but approved the authorities’ belief:

_Em, some authorities, saya pikir pemerintah, atau, mungkin, departemen kesehatan. Em, menurutnya, peningkatan penyakit jantung koroner itu benar-benar ada. Penyakit ini, yang mereka menyebutnya em, coronary inti cardiovascular disease ini, akhir-akhir ini meningkat dari, em, maka ini sebagai wabah modern, epidemic yang modern. Em, based on this sentence, saya pikir the writer here stated that the increase is not ... real. Jadi peningkatannya itu sebenarnya tidak sebesar, tidak sebesar yang dibayangkan karena sebelumnya sebenarnya penyakit ini sudah umum, tapi karena belum ada adanya teknologi yang modern untuk mendiaagnosta dan ditambah media, ... tapi saya pikir mungkin juga._

_(Um, some authorities, I think it’s the government or the Department of Health. Um, they say that the increase of the disease really occurred. The disease, which they call cardiovascular disease, has increased recently and, therefore, they call it a modern_
epidemic. Um, based on this sentence, I think the writer here stated that the increase was not ... real. So the increase was not as fast as they imagined it to be, because before that the disease had been common, but due to the absence of modern technology to diagnose the disease and the media to publish it, ... but I think it’s possible.)

Before finalising her inference, Eba provided an illustration, and reflected on her own opinion about the cause of the disease:

*Orang sekarang kadang gaya hidupnya, gisinya, tidak seimbang, dengan adanya “junk food”, um, yang dijual di mana-mana, itu kan bisa meningkatkan kadar kolesterol, Pak. (The life style of the people today, the diet, is sometimes imbalanced, with the junk food, um, sold everywhere. It can increase the cholesterol level, can’t it, Sir?)

Responding to the seventh sentence, Eba read it silently, went on to the eighth sentence and vocalised the last phrase – “a five-fold increase”, signaled her comprehension, and summarised the gist of the two sentences:

*Kalimat selanjutnya, em, five-fold increase, em, ya. Ini mengatakan banyaknya orang yang meninggal karena penyakit ini ... di California pada tahun 1942 adalah 18.591, yang kemudian mencapai 102.478 ... dua puluh tahun kemudian, juga di California, yang meningkat lebih dari lima kali lipat. (The next sentence, um, “five-fold increase”, um, yeah. This says that the number of people dying of this disease in California in 1942 was 18.591, which then reached 102.478 twenty years later, also in California, which means more than a five-fold increase.)

In reaction to the ninth sentence, she read and reread it silently, monitored her comprehension, paraphrased the gist, related it to her comment on the first sentence (that coronary heart disease was the number-one killer disease), and found her opinion confirmed:

*Dan pada saat ini, jumlah kematian, jadi angka kematian per tahun dari penyakit jantung koroner ini dua kali, lebih dari dua kali kelipatan kematian, angka kematian yang dilakukan oleh kanker. Tapi angka-angkanya tidak disebutkan di sini. Jadi kalimat nomor satu tadi, pembunuh nomor satu, jadi prediksinya benar. (And at present, the number of deaths, so the number of deaths annually due to the coronary heart disease, is twice, is more than twice of the deaths, the death rate due to cancer. But the figures are not mentioned here. So my comment on the first sentence, that the disease was the number-one killer disease, is confirmed.)

In response to the concluding sentence, she read it while subvocalising a number of words, reread the whole sentence, inferred the gist, paraphrased the sentence, and summarised her previous inference:
Retellings

Eba’s retelling of Text 1 was comprehensive, covering the theme, the main idea, and most (80%) of the details. Her self-reflection on school segregation was repeated in the retelling. In regard to public sentiment she asserted that “it was impossible for children from the lower class to increase their welfare, to move up to a higher class.”

Despite being given the chance to reread the text, Eba’s impression on the first sight of the sixth sentence of Text 1 did not change. Her “schema” about the change of the length of compulsory education in Indonesia, from six to nine years, did not appear to allow any room for school year extension from five to six months. Instead, she read “Horace Mann extended the school year from five to six years”, making one correct point missing from her retelling. However, her comment beyond the information provided in the text is worth a point:

I think this is, um, very natural for educational system to be through some changes ... because ... as you see that life is changed, ... people also change. That’s why that educational system needs ... disesuaikan dengan (to be suited with) changes. People have to ... sadar (be aware) that education is hak (the right of) everyone. We should not think, “Kamu berasal dari kelas bawah, kamu tidak bisa naik.” Tidak. Yang penting kalau dia mau mau belajar, ya biar dia maju. (“You are from the lower class, so you cannot move up.” No way. The important thing is that if he wants to learn, then let him advance.)

Her retelling of Text 2 was almost complete, covering the theme, the main idea, four out of seven (57%) of the details. However, a number of relevant illustrations beyond the information given in the text should be rewarded. For example, concluding her retelling, she made an appropriate hypothesis why the sharp increase of the coronary heart disease death rate was felt only recently:
Eba's integration of information making up the theme of the text earned her a full score of 4 for the theme. Other than being aware that there were two diseases discussed in the text, she also managed to integrate the piece of information printed in the early part of the text and that in the ninth sentence. Most other readers mentioned only either one, or both but at different parts of the retelling.

A point worth noting was that as in the think-aloud session, in rereading the text before retelling, Eba read aloud key words or portions of the text she considered important. She found new information during rereading — information she did not identify during the think-aloud session. She compared the information in the concluding sentence and that in the fifth sentence, and identified a difference. In her opinion, the difference was that the fifth sentence talked about the increase in the coronary heart disease cases, while the concluding sentence talked about the increase in the disease death rate. In her words, the former was the cause, while the latter was the effect. This was something other informants did not seem to notice:

_Em, ini “... are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate, ... death rate,” em, tapi di atas em, saya kira “it, em, it ... has made it appear to be on the increase.” Kalau kita lihat, ini kan yang atas ini yang “on the increase” itu coronary heart disease, sedangkan yang bawah, yang bawah, em, karena “... are responsible for ... death rate,” jadi bicara “death rate”. Jadi memang sebab-akibat tapi nggak sama. Nggak sama, ternyata._

(Um, this “... are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate, ... death rate,” um, but in the sentence above, um, I think “it, um, it ... has made it appear to be on the increase.” If we look closely at the sentence above, what was “on the increase” was coronary heart disease, while in the last paragraph, um because it says “... are responsible for ... death rate”, so it talks about death rate. Thus the two sentences have a cause and effect relationship, but they are not the same.)
In-depth interview

The interview proved to confirm, support, or complement some of the strategies described in the think-aloud protocol section. While in the think-aloud protocol how Eba integrated the information from different parts of the text was still limited, in the retellings and in the interview, her information integration was apparent. For example, in response to Question 1 (Text 1), she integrated the information from at least three different parts of the text:

Saya pikir, sudah mengatakan dari sini bahwa pada awal abad ke-19 the American educational system ada beberapa orang yang merasa bahwa itu perlu dibah. Horace Mann ini orang yang meng-”initiate” reformasi tersebut. Dan pada kalimat yang terakhir ini dikatakan bahwa walaupun tidak membawa manfaat yang secara langsung, tetapi sudah meningkatkan “awareness”. Jadi setelah ini ada kemungkinan yang kedua, yaitu reformasi selanjutnya. Saya kira itu.

(1) I think, it has been said here that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were a few people who felt that the American educational system needed changes. (2) Horace Mann was a reformer who initiated the changes. (3) And it is said in the last sentence that although these changes did not bring about direct benefits, they already increased awareness. Thus, after this there could be the second possibility, that is the next reform. I think that’s it.

The discussion in the in-depth interview also indicated that, unlike most informants, Eba was aware that Text 2 dealt with two diseases: coronary heart disease and cancer.

This also indicated her close attention to forms so that she noticed the difference between “Diseases of the heart” (Option A of Question 9) and “Disease of the heart,” a single disease - coronary heart disease - discussed in the text:

Um, because if I chose “Diseases of the heart”, um, I think no. The text only talks about one disease, ‘coronary heart disease’. I chose ‘Fatal diseases’, because that heart disease has become, um, the number one cause of death in the world. Coronary heart disease merupakan salah satu penyakit yang fatal, yang menyebabkan kematian. Padahal dalam teks itu ada disebut “cancer” juga. (Coronary heart disease is one of the fatal diseases, which causes death. Meanwhile, cancer is also mentioned in the text.)

Observations

The observation notes indicated that on many occasions, especially by the time Eba, who wore glasses, read portions of the text aloud, she held the test paper closer to her eyes or left it on the desk while moving her face closer to the paper. These portions of the text were usually those identified as problematic or those needing close attention.
Appendix 5.11
Strategy Profile of Reader 11 (Yun)

Think-aloud protocol

Graph 5.4.11.1 shows that, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Yun read the whole sentence silently, inferred the gist, questioned the meaning of the word “desperately”, and inferred its meaning based on the context:

(From the first sentence, I guess the text is about education, educational system in America. There is a difficult word “desperately”. Then, um, the content is about the educational system that needed improvement. I inferred this from the word “reform”. Perhaps this “desperately”, perhaps the condition was more demanding, as can be seen from the phrase “in need of reform”.)

Moving to the second sentence, she read the sentence clause by clause and directly interpreted each clause. While reading the first clause, she vocalised the word “existed”. She questioned this word, but paraphrased the clause appropriately as:

Keharadaannya mungkin diakui, sekolah swasta itu, tetapi hanya bagi orang-orang yang kaya. (The existence of the private schools was recognised but only for the rich).

Similarly, she also vocalised the word “waste” and interpreted its meaning from its context properly:

Mungkin mereka, apa ya, memandang bahwa pendidikan itu hanya membuang waktu saja. Ha, yang paling penting bagi mereka adalah kekayaan. (Perhaps they viewed education as merely wasting time. The most important thing for them to do was working.)

Then she related the text content to the condition in Indonesia, and reflected her own thought:

Ini ada hubungannya dengan keadaan di tempat kita juga, sekarang ini. Di masyarakat kita juga berkembang suatu pendapat untuk apa sekolah tinggi-tinggi, tapi ada fenomena, em, mungkin banyak sarjana yang menganggu. Ini masalah, kan? It is related to the condition in our place at present. In our society there is an opinion
developing as to whether it is necessary to go to higher education, while many university graduates are unemployed. This is problematic, isn’t it?)

Occupied by her thought about the conditions in Indonesia, she read the third sentence silently, and interpreted it. It was apparent that her paraphrase represented a mixture of this thought and the gist of the sentence:

_Em, bagi mereka, bagi masyarakat kita dan juga tugas para reformer, kalau di Amerika, mungkin pandangan, em tugas atau task mereka adalah bagaimana dapat pekerjaan dan dapat uang untuk menghidupi keluarga._

(Um, to them, to our society and the task of the reformers in America, perhaps their view, their task was how to get a job and money to support their family.)

In regard to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, identified a key phrase, inferred the gist appropriately, and reflected her reason why she came to this inference:

_Di sini ada educational reformer. Mungkin adanya masalah yang mungkin merupakan tanggung jawab dari orang-orang yang berhubungan dengan pendidikan. Dalam kalimat ini, Horace Mann, sebagai penjahat dalam bidang pendidikan, itu berpendapat bahwa tugas warga negara itu harus mengenyam pendidikan. Di sini tadi saya mengaitkan “uneducated” dengan hak-hak warga negara. (Here, there is an educational reformer. Probably there was a problem which probably became the responsibility of people related to education. In this sentence, Horace Mann, a reformer in education, argued that every citizen had to enjoy education. Here, I related “uneducated” with the rights of the citizens.)

In response to the fifth sentence, she read it silently, identified a problematic word (“superintendent”), vocalised it, provided her interpretation of the word, and paraphrased the gist of the whole sentence. Despite the presence of the name of the place and time reference, Yun did not make any mention of these details at all:

“... superintendent ...”. Sebagai “superintendent” ... sebagai seorang yang ... penting dalam bidang pendidikan, ia mengusulkan adanya perubahan; sistem pendidikan itu hendaknya diubah agar ada peningkatan dalam bidang pendidikan. (As superintendent, as an important person in education, he proposed changes; the educational system should be changed in order to improve education.)

Responding to the sixth sentence, she read the whole sentence silently, identified a problematic word (“extended”), vocalised the word, guessed its meaning based on the Indonesian context, paraphrased the first clause, identified two key phrases (“improved quality of teacher” and “raising their salaries”), interpreted the sentence
chunk by chunk, associated it with her knowledge of the topic, and inferred the gist of the sentence:


(He “extended”, maybe “increase” or “broaden” from five to six months; I mean the compulsory study, the length of the study period from six to seven months. And also the teachers were improved and the teachers’ salaries were raised. From the phrase “improved quality of teachers”, I am wondering how you could expect students to have high quality if the teachers themselves were not qualified. Next, “raising their salaries” was related to their welfare. So in order to insure that they could work seriously, their welfare had to be guaranteed.)

In response to the concluding sentence, she read it silently, reread it while vocalising the words “although”, “did not bring about” and “public awareness”, related “public awareness” to “public sentiment” mentioned in the previous sentence, monitored her comprehension, associated the sentence with the previous sentences, interpreted the sentence chunk by chunk, and reflected on her strategy use:

Dari ini “Although ...” meskipun perubahan ini “... did not bring about” ... mungkin perubahan ini tidak membawa perubahan yang ... em, peningkatan yang “suddenly” ... yang cepat, yang tiba-tiba, dari kata “suddenly”, bagi sistem pendidikan, tetapi paling tidak meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat akan keperluan untuk memperkuat sistem pendidikan. Dan “public awareness” ini saya hubungkan dengan tadi, tentang kurangnya pendidikan masyarakat, pada kalimat-kalimat sebelumnya tadi.

(From this, Although ... although these changes ... did not bring about ... perhaps these changes did not bring about improvement suddenly, quickly, for the educational system, at least they increased public awareness for the need to strengthen the educational system. And I related this “public awareness” to the lack of public education, mentioned in the previous sentences.)

Starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Yun read the whole sentence, identified key words (“coronary heart” and “disease”), related them to the information she had obtained from television and newspapers, made an inference, and predicted what the text would be about:

Dari kata-kata ini saya menarik kesimpulan text ini mungkin tentang penyakit jantung koroner. (From these words, I conclude that this text would probably be about coronary heart disease.)
In regard to the second sentence, she read and reread it silently, expressed difficulty understanding the phrase “no respecter”, related it to key phrases (“presidents of super-powers” set in contrast with “the ordinary man”), and correctly inferred the author’s message:

"Penyakit ini bisa menyerang siapa saja, dari "presidents of super-powers" sampai "the ordinary man" di sini berarti maksudnya itu siapa saja dapat terkena" (This disease can attack anyone, from "presidents of super-powers" to "the ordinary man" hence it means that anyone can be affected.)

In response to the third sentence, she read it silently, questioned the word “primarily”, provided a tentative interpretation of the word, and paraphrased the whole sentence:

Dari kata “primarily”, “yang kebanyakan”, mungkin ya, kebanyakan ini, penyakit ini dari para usia lanjut, tapi sering juga menyerang ada yang “middle-aged” ini, dan bahkan pada remaja. (From the word “primarily”, perhaps it means “mostly”, this disease mostly attacks the advanced age, but it often attacks the middle-aged and even the young.)

Responding to the fourth sentence, Yun read and reread it silently, identified a key phrase (“the basic cause”), vocalised the phrase, inferred the gist of the sentence, reflected on her strategy to arrive at the gist (associating the topic with her Biology class and inferring the gist of the text):

Dan “the basic cause”, penyebab utama dari penyakit jantung koroner ini dari adanya penyumbatan pembuluh darah, dan juga dienukan pada species dari binatang. Jadi em, pertama dari membaca ... membaca kalimannya ini. Sesudah itu saya mengambil kata kunci ya dari "the basic cause" ini. Kemudian saya hubungkan dengan ... penyebab utamanya "the furring-up of arteries". Dari yang saya tahu, dari pelajaran Biologi waktu di SMA penyebab utamanya adalah penyumbatan pembuluh darah. Jadi "furring-up of arteries" kemudian saya artikan "penyumbatan pembuluh darah". (And "the basic cause" of coronary heart disease was the blocking-up of arteries, which was also found in animals. So, um, first I read the sentence. Then I took the keywords "the basic cause". Then I related it to the basic cause "the furring-up of arteries". From what I learned from the Biology class at Senior High School, the basic cause was "blocking-up of arteries". Then I interpreted "furring-up of arteries" as "blocking-up of arteries".)

Moving to the fifth sentence, Yun read it silently, expressed difficulty understanding the sentence construction, and reread the sentence. Using her knowledge of syntactical analysis, she inappropriately expected a construction with the word “but”
(to indicate a contrast) in the later part of the sentence, as the sentence started with the word “Although”. Her expectation being unfulfilled, she monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, returned to and skimmed the previous sentences, and formulated her paraphrase without considering the word “although”. As a result, she failed to see what appeared to be on the increase:

*Em, pertama, kalau dari “Although” ini agak sulit. Saya ambil dari “the rapid advance ....” Ya, karena ini ada “... has made it appear to be on the increase ....”, jadi ya intinya metode diagnosa, kemudian pengobatannya, nampaknya semakin meningkat. Soalnya dari awalnya “Although” kan biasanya itu belakangnya berlawanan, tapi kan di sini tidak ada “but”-nya. Saya menghubungkan dengan tadi, penyakit ini menyerang orang dari berbagai usia, dan sudah diketahui oleh dokter pada abad ke-18. (Um, first, it was difficult if I had to start from the word “Although”, so I started from “... the rapid advance ....” Yeah, as here there is “... has made it appear to be on the increase ....”, so the essence of the whole sentence is that the diagnosis methods and the treatment appeared to be more and more increasing. The problem is that the sentence starts with “Although”, which is usually followed by a contrast; however, there is no “but” used here. I related this to the previous section which says that the disease attacks people of various ages and that it has been known to doctors in the eighteenth century.)*

In response to the sixth sentence, Yun still carried her misinterpretation of the previous sentence with her. This can be seen from her inappropriate inference in regard to what was on the increase:

*“Some authorities” mengatakan bahwa peningkatan dalam pengobatan dan metode diagnosis ini memang nyata, dan memandang penyakit jantung koroner atau “cardiovascular” itu sebagai penyakit atau wabah penyakit yang moderen. (Some authorities say that the increase in treatment and diagnostic methods is real and view the coronary heart disease or “cardiovascular” disease a modern epidemic.)*

Moving to the seventh sentence, she read the whole sentence silently, identified a key phrase (“The number of people dying”), vocalised the phrase, inferred the gist, and commented on the large number of deaths:

*“The number of people dying ....” Kalimat ini menyatakan jumlah orang yang mati karena penyakit jantung. Di situ dicantumkan jumlahnya 18,591. Jumlah ini termasuk besar, karena tadi merupakan penyakit yang menyerang semua orang. Mungkin tidak terdengar atau gimana sehingga jumlahnya juga mencapai jumlah cukup besar. (“The number of people dying ....” This sentence tells about the number of people dying of heart disease. It says the number was 18,591. This is a big number; because, as mentioned earlier, the disease could attack all people. Perhaps it was not detected so that the deaths reached that big number.)*
Responding to the eighth sentence, Yun read the it silently, identified a problematic phrase ("more than a five-fold increase"), vocalised the phrase, compared the figure in the sentence with that in the previous sentence, analysed the phrase, guessed its meaning, and paraphrased the gist of the sentence successfully:

"... more than a five-fold increase." Kalimat selanjutnya menyatakan jumlah orang yang meninggal karena penyakit jantung dua puluh tahun kemudian tercatat meningkat menjadi seratus dua ribu empat ratus tujuh puluh delapan, jadi lebih dari lima kalinya, five-fold increase. Artinya "fold" saya sebenarnya kurang tahu, tapi saya kira-kira "lima kalinya" meningkat. Saya lihat dari jumlah ini, 18,000 ke 102,000 sekian.

("... more than a five-fold increase." The next sentence says that the number of people dying of heart disease twenty years later increased up to 102,478, so more than five times, five-fold increase. Actually I don't know the meaning of "five-fold", but I just guessed it was a five-time increase. I see from these figures, 18,000 to over 102,000.)

In response to the ninth sentence, Yun read and reread it silently, identified key words ("At present" and "annually"). vocalised the words, provided their tentative meanings, and reread and correctly paraphrased the sentence:

At present, untuk sekarang, annually, dari kata "annual" itu kan tiap tahun, jadi rata-rata angka kematian tiap tahunnya karena penyakit itu lebih dari dua kali, dua kali, mungkin lebih dari dua kali ... yang karena berbagai macam penyakit kanker. Jadi untuk sekarang, jumlah kematian setiap tahunnya karena penyakit jantung itu lebih dari dua kali yang karena disebabkan kanker.

(At present, for now; annually from the word annual or every year; so average annual death rate due to this disease is more than twice, twice, maybe more than two times ... those due to cancer. Thus for now, annual death rate due to heart disease is more than twice those due to cancer.)

In response to the concluding sentence, Yun read it silently, monitored her comprehension, and reread it over and over, but found it difficult to understand. She tried to relate it to the sentence starting with "Although" (the fifth sentence), but she failed to see their relation. She knew all the words, except "death certification", but she felt that her logic seemed to obstruct her comprehension of the sentence. Consequently, she made an inappropriate inference followed by a reflection on her strategy:

Em ... apa ini ... em. Sebenarnya kata-katanya saya tahu; ini apa ini "death certification"? Ini saya nggak tahu. Apanya ini yang sulit? Kalau tadi "Although ..." em, tapi kok lain dengan ini. Ini sama sulitnya seperti tadi. Ini gimana, ya? Kalau population increase, tambahnya penduduk don, em, ... mungkin juga, tapi karapun hidup yang lebih baik kok bisa nambah death rate. Sulit ini. Saya perlu baca lagi.
(Um ... what’s this? ... um. Actually I know the words; what is this “death certification”? I don’t know this. What makes it difficult? Earlier there was “Although ...”, um, but it’s different from this one. They are equally difficult. How about this? Population increase and, um, maybe it’s true, but how can “improved life expectancy” increase death rate? It’s difficult. I need to read it again.)

Retellings

Yun’s retelling of Text 1 was brief but relatively comprehensive, covering the theme, the main idea and 60% of details. The details she did not mention were the extension of the school year, when and where Horace became superintendent of education, and that the changes he made were applied in other school districts around the country. While the extension of the school year was explicitly mentioned in her think-aloud protocol, the other two details were not present in the think-aloud protocol. In regard to Yun’s responses, it may be said that she did not retell what she did not attend to in the think-aloud session. It was not clear whether her disregard of these details in the think-aloud protocol was due to comprehension problems or because she considered them unimportant.

Yun’s retelling of Text 2 was brief and incomplete, covering the theme, but missing the main idea and including 60% of the details. As she failed to understand the sentences containing the main idea, her attempt to reconstruct the message did not represent the one in print. Her inappropriate inference of the last sentence was as follows:

It also reported that there need improvement in life expectancy, and also accurate diagnosis, the method to overcome the problem, that is, um, the rise of the death rate because of the coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease, which was more dangerous than cancer.

Yun’s protocols showed that extra reading time given before retelling did not make her comprehension in the retelling better than that in the think-aloud session.

In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers

Most of Yun’s reasons for choosing answers to the questions were consistent with her responses during the think-aloud and retelling sessions. One point worth noting of
Yun’s responses during the discussion of the test answers was her strategy to come to her interpretation of the word “initiated” (in Text 1). She related the word “initiated” to the word “initial” which she had learned in the Phonetics class. She remembered that some phonemes could have an initial, medial or final position. As “initial” meant beginning, “to initiate” meant “to begin” or “to start.” Thus “initiated” is the same as “started.” This was an interesting process of deduction, which also represented transfer of learning:

I know that from the word ‘initial’ means in the beginning. ‘Initial position’ means in the beginning. From Phonetics, sounds can have initial, middle or final positions. Initial, initiate, begin, start, right?

Observations
The observation notes showed that she marked or made notes on difficult portions of the text. In fact there were a number of underlines and circles she made on both Text 1 and Text 2. In regard to Text 2, it seemed that she had not attempted hard enough to analyse the complex sentences before making an inference.

Reading texts in a reading test
When asked about the problems she had in reading texts in a reading test, she mentioned that long and complex sentences confused her:

“Saya kadang masih bingung kalau ada kalimat panjang dengan koma-komanya yang banyak seperti pada bacaan kedua tadi. Bingung cari kalimat intinya apa.” (I am still confused with long sentences with many commas like the ones in Text 2 I had earlier. I was confused with finding the main clause.)

In real reading tests she usually skimmed the text first to get some idea about it, and only then did she look at the questions (despite one of her teachers’ suggestion to start a test by reading the questions). Then she would reread the text or parts relevant to the questions. It is interesting to note that when the text was short, Yun would read the whole text closely as she predicted that details would be asked in the questions. But when the text was long, she would only skim and look for key words as she predicted that with long texts the questions would usually be more general. Thus
skimming the whole text and scanning key words would be more productive or beneficial.

*Reading newspapers*

When asked about problems she encountered in reading newspapers, she said that there were usually many words she did not understand, and the style was different; for example, the topics were often ambiguous as they were often incomplete sentences. Unfamiliar topics would be most difficult to read. However, with familiar topics, she was usually aided greatly by her prior knowledge and information from other mass media resources. Generally she would read every word in the sentences at least once, and read the difficult portions over and over in order to comprehend the gist.

*Reading books*

When asked about the problems she had in reading books, especially the ones recommended by the lecturers, she mentioned that sometimes the subject was beyond her background knowledge. For example, while Linguistics was already a difficult subject, the chapters assigned to read were often much more difficult than the lectures themselves. There were so many difficult terms used that looking them up in a general dictionary did not help. Also complex sentences still confused her. Her main strategies were to read the text closely, reread the difficult parts, underline or mark them, make side notes or definitions of the difficult words or terms, make a summary in either Indonesian or English, discuss portions of the chapters with friends, and ask questions in the next lecture, where possible.
Appendix 5.12

Strategy Profile of Reader 12 (Acı)

Think-aloud protocol

As can be seen from Graph 5.4.12.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Acı read aloud the adjunct of time, subvocalised the rest of the sentence, successfully paraphrased the gist, predicted the content of the next sentence(s), made an association with her prior knowledge, and reflected on her own opinion:

In the beginning of the nineteenth century .... When I read this sentence, I think, the American educational system, still in condition that need to be improved. There maybe something happen to them so they need to adjust to the new challenge of the world, so they need to reform their educational system, because educational system is a very important part of ... in the country, just like what happen in Indonesia. Now we have to also, in some cases, to reform the educational system.

Moving to the next sentence, Acı read the first half of the sentence aloud, subvocalised the rest, commented on the length of the sentence, reread the sentence, vocalised the first phrase, subvocalised the rest, associated the text with her prior knowledge, made an appropriate inference, and reflected on her evaluation about the content of the text:

Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were ... children .... , this sentence is a little bit too long for me ... so I have to read it more than once. Private schools ... yeah ... OK. So there are, I think, for this sentence, I can, , conclude that there are still, , separation between the rich and the poor, because gap, gap between the rich and the poor, so that the rich, only the rich can get very good schools; they can go to school but the poor cannot, just because there is a feel that the poor should not waste their time in, in go, to go to school, because they will be, laborer, and so they just need to go for their future life of work. Yeah, I think this is, this is normal because maybe the poor do not have enough money for paying the school fee. That also happens anywhere when the education still, requires a lot of money. Yeah, I think so.

In response to the third sentence, Acı read it aloud, skipping the word she was in doubt about, and identified the relation between the sentence and the previous ones:

It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set ... task”. Yeah, this is just the conclusion of ... or the reason why the American educational system should be reformed.
Moving to the fourth sentence, Aci read aloud the main clause and part of the sub-clause, monitored her comprehension, read the rest silently, paraphrased the sentence, and inferred the gist:

*Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic. Yes, I think Horace Mann ... the most famous of the reformers say that everybody has the right to get education. So education is for all people.*

Responding to the fifth sentence, Aci read aloud almost the whole sentence, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence silently, identified an unfamiliar word ("superintendent"), guessed its meaning based on the context, provided a reason for her guess, and paraphrased the last clause of the sentence successfully:

*As Superintendent of Education in the state of Massachusetts, initiated various changes, which were soon matched in other school districts. Wait a minute. Um, I don’t know what is the meaning of 'superintendent', but this is maybe one of the important persons in the education department or something ... because he has important position so he had the power to change the condition, soon matched in other school districts. And the changes were not only used in Massachusetts but also in other districts around the country.*

In response to the next sentence, she read it aloud and paraphrased it chunk by chunk, showed agreement with the author on the text content, related the content to the Indonesian context, and made a self-reflection:

*He extended the school year from five to six months ... extended the school year ... instituting teacher education ...? Yes, this is very important ... in this sentence I can prove that ... some of the changes ... the ideas of him is that he changed the school year from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by educating ... ‘instituting’ ... instituting teacher education ... yeah, make ... make a good institution for teachers ... and raising their salaries. Yes, this is important because this also happens here the teachers still very low salary and this is motivates them to do their best ... which ... ha, ha.*

Arriving at the concluding sentence, she read it aloud while skipping one word she could do without, showed agreement with the text content, and provided a supporting argument while paraphrasing the sentence chunk by chunk:

*Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement in the ... system, they at least increased public awareness as to the need for further strengthening of the system. From this sentence, yeah, this is normal that a change will not, will not improve, everything very quickly but they, they should wait for the process, the process, but at least it, it opens public awareness that they need to, to improve the condition of*
the educational system in America. Yeah, I think that, that what I can say for this text.

As Graph 5.4.12.2 shows, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Aci read the early part of the sentence silently but read the later part aloud, and paraphrased the gist:

"... not heard of coronary heart disease. Yeah, the sentence states that the coronary heart disease is a very common disease, so lots of people have ever heard about this."

Moving to the second sentence, she subvocalised the sentence (most probably attempting to comprehend and internalise the gist), related it to her background experience, paraphrased the sentence, vocalised portions of the sentence, monitored her comprehension, and evaluated the content based on her prior knowledge:

Yeah, the illness is ... it ... it ... it can attack every people in the world. It doesn't look at the position of the person. Yeah, I think this is ... this is a common disease because lots of people died because of this disease and my father also, not died but he has this disease. He had two times operation of heart ... no respecter of persons ... presidents of super-powers ... Yeah, I agree ... this statement because, ... yeah.

Responding to the third sentence, she read silently, vocalised two key phrases, monitored her comprehension, paraphrased the sentence, provided an inference for clarification, related the text to her prior knowledge, and provided an illustration to support her inference:

"Primarily a disease of ... some cases ...", OK, , I think this sentence means that ... the coronary heart disease is um ... usually ... is basically um ... the disease of old people but it also ... nowadays it also attacks the middle age and young people also. Maybe this is um ... the text wants to give us information about um ... this disease um ... is ... becomes ... extended. I know because when I ... um ... when I ... when I was in Jakarta to ... the job company of my father, I also seen ... saw some babies who had heart disease.

In response to the fourth sentence, Aci read it aloud, commented on the content, questioned a phrase ("furring-up of arteries"), guessed its meaning based on context, attempted to provide clarification but cancelled it, and inferred the gist:

The "furring up" of arteries which is the basic cause of coronary conditions is also found in other species in the animal kingdom. Oh, this is something new for me. I don't know that, um, it also found in other species in the animal. I thought it only attacked um ... the ... people. But I don't know the meaning of the "furring up". "... furring up of arteries, which is the basic cause ...." But I can guess that, um, this is the problem of ... which is cause the ... the coronary heart disease. This is something to do with the medical science. "... the basic cause of coronary conditions ... furring up .... Maybe like
... I don't know, um, is also found in other species. But I know that this is the cause of the coronary condition.

In reaction to the fifth sentence, Aci read it silently, reread it aloud while skipping familiar words or phrases, offered a tentative inference, monitored her comprehension (as seen from her rereading the text), commented on the complexity of the sentence, questioned her inference in regard to what was “on the increase”, and reflected on her strategy use:

Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and ... the eighteenth century, the rapid advance ...”. Um ... this sentence um ... tells ... tells us that there is improvement in medical field ... and also ... in the publicity which is make the coronary heart disease ... I mean ... increase ... I mean ... the treatment ... I mean the hope to ... untuk sembuh (to recover from the illness) ... is in increase. Yeah, the sentence is a little bit too long and the last ... the last sentence is ... a little bit confusing for me ... “... has made it appear to be on the increase”. I am not sure whether this is the increase on the treatment or the increase of the number of the people who have the disease. Yeah, usually I keep reading, I keep reading, but I don't know whether I keep do this here or not. OK.

Arriving at the sixth sentence, Aci read it silently, attempted to find the answer to “what was on the increase” but found that it was not in the sentence, reread the sentence aloud, kept on reading the next (the seventh) sentence, found the answer to the question, returned to the sixth sentence, and inferred the gist of the first clause of the sentence:

Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease ...” ... Oh, I think this is the increase of the number of the people because the next sentences ... tell us a lot about the number of the people who got the disease.

Reading the seventh sentence, Aci related the information to that in the sixth sentence, noticed an inconsistency, revised her previously confirmed (correct) inference of the sixth sentence, attempted an alternative inference, and provided an illustration to support her inference:

OK. Um, but I think this is not the increase of the number of the people because the previous sentence, previous words, is about the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment. So maybe this is, um, about the way the doctors handle this disease, so, um, the disease is on the increase. Maybe people pay more attention to this and also with attention to the publicity given by the media. That's why a lot of people
pay attention to this disease, and it also make, um, the doctors also, um, think about it, about this disease very intensively; they improved their diagnostic methods and treatment.

Returning to the sixth sentence, she reread it, paraphrased the gist, questioned the meaning of the word “epidemic”, offered a definition, and made a confusing inference of the whole sentence:

Um, this sentence tells the readers that the coronary heart disease, or they also call it cardiovascular disease, as a modern epidemic. I don’t know what is the meaning of “epidemic”, but maybe this is ... it has something to do with, um, something like virus or something which is just modern and there has ... the doctor has ... has not found the ... the medicine yet. I mean the best medicine which is ... which can kill the disease very well.

Moving to the seventh sentence, she read it silently, identified and vocalised key words and phrases, and inferred the gist:

The number of people dying of this disease ... 1942 was eighteen thousand five nine one (18,591). So there are a lot of people dying of this disease.

In response to the eighth sentence, she read it silently, inferred the gist of the main clause, jumped to the ninth sentence and read it aloud, monitored her comprehension, returned to the eighth sentence and reread it aloud, questioned the phrase “a five-fold increase”, guessed its meaning, provided the phrase with its Indonesian equivalence, and related the sentence to the previous ones to provide an argument for the inferred gist:

OK, so twenty years later the number of the people dying of the disease is risen very ... very quickly. It means that there are more and more people dying of this disease. “At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer.” “... the number of deaths annually from ... twice those due to all forms .... Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths has risen to one hundred and two thousand, more than a five-fold increase.” I don’t know what is the meaning of “five-fold increase” but we can guess that this is, maybe, in Indonesian, maybe, “lima kali lipat” (five-fold). Yeah, this is the very surprising number but I think, maybe, because this disease is just what they call “modern epidemic” and the cause of this disease also happen to lot of people so that the number of the people who have this disease increase ... increase in more than a five-fold increase.

Arriving at the ninth sentence, she read it aloud and inferred the gist of the sentence, related it to the previous sentence, provided an illustration to confirm her
comprehension, questioned the meaning of "due to", guessed its meaning, and confirmed the gist of the whole sentence:

At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. Um, this text is trying to compare this cardiovascular disease to cancer. Maybe the disease which is regarded as um... a dangerous disease too, cancer, and... in practice cardiovascular disease is more than twice... is more than twice... due to all forms of cancer. Yeah, there are lots of kinds of cancer and this disease is more than twice. So many... so many people are dying of the cardiovascular disease. I am not sure what is the meaning of 'due to' here but I can guess this is the comparison of cardiovascular disease with cancer.

In response to the concluding sentence, Aci read it aloud, monitored her comprehension, attempted to infer the gist, reread it silently while vocalising a number of key words, questioned parts of the content of the text, expressed her comprehension of the text but kept questioning the logic of the text content (two of the four causes of the increase of death rate):

"However, generally it would seem probable that population increase, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise...". "...population increase...". Yeah, this is about the reason... the cause... the cause of the... the increase of the people who died... who were dying of the cardiovascular. "... population increase...". Um, it is... it is difficult for me to understand the... the last two um... reasons: improved life expectancy and more accurate diagnosis, and death certification as the cause of the rise of a cardiovascular disease death rate. Um... if the population increase I can understand, but these two... still with confusing for me. Why improved life expectancy can... are responsible for the rise in cardiovascular disease. Life expectancy, I think, tingkat harapan hidup yang lebih baik (improved life expectancy). Um, yeah, that's all.

Retellings

Before retelling Text 1, Aci glanced at some points in the text, reread it thoroughly, subvocalised some points, most probably in an attempt to internalise the main idea or important points in the text to retell. Her retelling was comprehensive, covering the theme, the main idea and, (despite her forgetting the only person’s name in the text – Horace Mann), she mentioned all (100%) of the details. In addition, she also related the text to her observation about the present condition of education in Indonesia. For example, she mentioned the obligation for school children in a school district to wear uniform shoes, which resulted from hidden motives of collusion and corruption in the provision of the shoes. She also mentioned a shameful case in which some schools
were obliged to buy videotapes although these schools did not have any video players.

In regard to Text 2, her retelling was reasonably good, covering the theme, the main idea, and 60% of the details. Aci related the text to her knowledge and observation about the coronary heart disease in Indonesia, which led her to a biased inference about who could be affected by the disease. She also provided an argument to support her inference:

This coronary heart disease can attack, um, or could ... a person with very good position or even the common people - people on the street, even president or something, they can also have this disease. My personal comment on this ... that it is very dangerous disease so we have to be aware of this, um, in Indonesia, I think this disease mainly attacks those of rich people ... although my father is not a rich ... person. Ha, ha, ha. But most of them, I think, and maybe because ... the reason ... the cause of the heart disease is because they lack of from movement, or they just ... they're doing ... yeah, they just ... maybe they just sit behind the table ... the rich people ... and they eat a lot of food ... um ... with ... lemak (fat), yeah. Yeah, I think that's all for now.

*In-depth interview: Discussion on test answers*

When asked about the title for the text she chose “The beginnings of reform in American education” because the result achieved was merely raising public awareness. She considered that this must have been the initial stage of a long process.

The discussion also proved that Aci guessed the meanings of unfamiliar words based on context. For example, she was not sure about the exact meaning of the word “sentiment” in Text 1, but the sentence sounded logical when she replaced the word “sentiment” with the word “opinion.” Like a number of other informants (Fer, Tam, Lat, Tin, Eba and Eki), Aci thought that the word “authorities” was always related to “government” or “government officials.” This was due to the practice in every day life in Indonesia in which the government or government officials exercised a high degree of authority. This indicated how background knowledge and experience strongly influenced a reader’s thought in the comprehension of a text.
Observations

Few observations were made about Aci's task performance. When a comprehension problem occurred Aci kept on reading. It appeared that she predicted that the solution to the problem would be found in the next parts of the text, or could be inferred by the aid of the next parts of the text.

Reading texts in the reading test

As the observation showed, in the reading test she read the questions first before reading the texts. Her reason was that she would know what to look for in reading the text, and that pre-reading the questions would save time. This strategy shows that Aci was highly familiar with dealing with reading comprehension texts.

Reading newspapers

When asked about the strategies used in reading newspapers, Aci claimed that she tried to understand the sentences as a whole and translate them in her mind into Indonesian. As the gist was all she was looking for, she did not bother analysing the sentences, such as finding the subject, the predicate, and so forth, despite her admission that long and complex sentences still posed a problem for comprehension. For Aci the main purpose of reading a newspaper in English was to improve her English mastery. In this regard, she said:

I read The Jakarta Post because I want to become familiar with some words, some expressions used in the newspaper. I know that the words that are used in the newspaper are sometimes very special. Just like the headline like this is ... it needs a short expression which is interesting, which is ... um ... which can attract people, which can motivate people to read, and I want to know that. And it also ... the language of academic ... like academic languages ... formal language.

As proved by her reading a newspaper article, she claimed that her main problem in reading a newspaper was her limited vocabulary. She therefore attempted to solve the vocabulary problem by guessing meaning based on context:

Yeah, just like what I've told you, by guessing the meaning, or sometimes I ignore it if it doesn't disturb my understanding of the text. But I know, at least I know I get familiar with the ... with the words, with how it is used in the sentence and I can guess the
meaning. I can guess it from the context, because in this text I just mentioned that some countries are going to help Indonesia, so it means that the condition is dangerous, is bad. So I can guess from that.

In addition, she activated her knowledge about text structure. She claimed that the first sentence in the newspaper usually gave the most important point in news. Her newspaper reading was usually helped by the information she obtained from television, radio or Indonesian newspapers. Therefore, if the news was interesting, she would read Indonesian newspapers, which were much easier to find and to comprehend.

Reading Books

When asked about the strategies used in reading books she said:

Usually I look at the table of content first, I look at the preface, I look at the objective of the writer, when they ... when the writer writes the book, what he wants, what he intends to do. Usually I read the title or the subtitle so I can get the ... what the chapter is about. Yeah, I look at the whole, the whole concept, um, I try to ... to relate it to the ... to another ... another ... another part of that paragraph, maybe ... it maybe that, um, the paragraph which supported or it gives more information for the previous one.

Her main problems in reading books were her limited vocabulary and long and complex sentences. To overcome the problem of limited vocabulary, she would guess the meaning based on context. In regard to long and complex sentences, she had to analyse them, read them over and over, and look for the main subject and predicate as well as the headword of a phrase. If the problem persisted, she would translate the text.
Appendix 5.13
Strategy Profile of Reader 13 (Sur)

Think-aloud protocol
As can be seen from Graph 5.4.13.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Sur read it silently, identified a problematic word (the word “desperately”), made self-reflection on the problem, paraphrased the sentence, reflected on the strategy use, and restated the paraphrase:

Di sini saya menjumpai kesulitan ini “desperately”, tapi kalau secara keseluruhan kalimatnya, saya tidak. Ini menjelaskan bahwa pada awal abad ke-19 itu sistem pendidikan di Amerika itu em ... memerlukan pembaharuan, reformasi. Jadi saya cara memahaminya “desperately” itu saya ... saya hilangkan. Tapi saya pikir, ... kalimat pertama itu mengaitkan seperti itu. Jadi pada awal abad kesembilan belas, pendidikan di Amerika menuntut reformasi

(Here I have a problem with the word “desperately”, but, as a whole, I have no problem understanding the sentence. It tells us that in the beginning of the nineteenth century the American educational system needed reform. So, my way of comprehending this sentence is by dropping the word “desperately”. But, I think the first sentence says so. So in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American education demanded reform).

In regard to the second sentence, he read the whole sentence silently and reread it chunk by chunk as can be seen from his interpretation. Despite his doubt about the meaning of the word “sentiment”, he interpreted it appropriately as “pendapat” (opinion). His doubt can be seen from the use of the word “sentiment” instead of “pendapat” in his responses in Indonesian. Before moving to the third sentence, he returned to the first sentence, glanced at the second sentence, related the sentences to his prior knowledge and provided a tentative inference:

Dari kalimat yang pertama dan kedua tadi saya mendapat gambaran bahwa sistem pendidikan di Amerika pada awal abad ke-19 itu masih belum tertata dengan baik, mungkin hampir sama dengan negera kita waktu masih penjajahan Belanda. Pendidikan itu hanya dipergunakan bagi orang-orang yang mampu. Jadi kalau yang orang-orang kecil itu ya cuma diarahkan untuk bekerja.

(From the first and the second sentences, I got an impression that the American educational system at the beginning of the nineteenth century was not well organised yet. Probably it was similar to that in our country during the Dutch colonization. Education was only for the rich. The ordinary people were directed only to be laborers.)
In response to the third sentence, he read it silently, related it to the previous sentences and to his prior knowledge, and paraphrased the gist of the sentence and the paragraph:

"Keadan tadi, di mana private school itu cuma diperuntukkan orang kaya yang mungkin sama dengan keadaan kita pada masa penjajahan, mendorong para pembaharu pendidikan itu untuk mereformasi sistem pendidikan tadi. [The condition mentioned earlier, in which private schools were only for the rich, a condition similar to that during the colonisation period (in Indonesia), motivated the educational reformers to reform the system.]

Moving to the fourth sentence, Sur read it silently, attempted to paraphrase the sentence, monitored his comprehension, continued the paraphrase, related the sentence to his background knowledge and the content of the early part of the text, and inferred the gist:

"Horace Mann, salah seorang yang mendukung reformasi tadi, menyatakan atau merasakan bahwa, em, tidak bisa ditawar-tawar lagi dalam republik tadi seluruh warga negaranya itu harus. ... em,... harus, ... setiap warga negara itu harus mendapatkan pendidikan. Kalau dibandingkan dengan situasi di Indonesia sebelum kita menapai kemerdekaan, perasaan Horace Mann itu mungkin sama dengan jiwa Kartini; yaitu bahwa tiap warga negara itu, laki atau perempuan, harus berpendidikan... (Horace Mann, one of the supporters of the reform, stated or felt that there was no excuse that in a republic every citizen had to, ... um, ... had to, ... get education; so every citizen had to be educated. Compared with the situation in Indonesia before independence, Horace Mann’s feeling was probably the same as Kartini’s spirit, in that every citizen, male or female, had to be educated. Note: Kartini was an Indonesian heroine for women emancipation movement.)

In response to the fifth sentence, Sur read it silently, claimed to have a problem with the word “superintendent”, guessed its meaning based on the context, monitored his comprehension, reread the whole sentence, confirmed his interpretation of the word “superintendent”, and inferred the gist of the sentence:

"Dalam kalimat ini saya mendapatkan kesulitan kata “super ... superintendent.” Tapi tampaknya dia itu adalah orang yang bertanggung jawab dalam bidang pendidikan di Massachusetts yang menawarkan perubahan yang kemudian juga dilaksanakan di sekolah-sekolah lain di negara tsb. Em, karena membuat berbagai perubahan yang kemudian juga dilaksanakan di sekolah-sekolah lain di negara tsb. Em, ... jadi benar dia itu orang yang bertanggung jawab tentang bidang pendidikan di Massachusetts. (In this sentence, I had a problem with the word “superintendent.” But he seemed to be a man who was responsible for education in Massachusetts who offered various
changes which were then carried out in other schools in the country. Um. ... so it is true that he was a man who was responsible for education in Massachusetts.)

Skimming the sixth sentence, he claimed that there was no problem with the vocabulary, paraphrased the sentence chunk by chunk, questioned the meaning of the phrase "instituting teacher education", and guessed its meaning based on the context. Relating the sentence to the fifth sentence, he paraphrased the sentence, related it to his prior knowledge, evaluated its content, justified what the main figure in the text did, and provided a rationale for his justification:


(From the point of vocabulary, there is no problem. The first paragraph already mentioned that most people were directed to working. Here Horace Mann reformed the system by extending the study period and improving the quality of teachers. Probably the study period that time was felt inadequate so that it was extended from five to six months. At least students got more chances to learn more knowledge. Then it was also supported by the quality of teachers. Frankly speaking, I don’t know this, “instituting teacher education”. Probably it means providing further education to improve their quality of teaching. So Horace Mann dealt with the problem from two different angles - the students and the teachers. In addition he also raised the teachers’ salaries. This was important to motivate performance. With low salaries, probably extending study hours would be useless because the teachers would teach reluctantly.)

For the last sentence, Sur read it silently, paraphrased the sentence, inferred the gist of the sentence, and completed the paraphrase:

Dari kalimat terakhir, dikatakan bahwa ternyata, em, apa yang dilakukan Horace Mann tadi tidak memperlihatkan hasil yang bisa dilihat secara langsung. Jadi kalihatannya itu kurang berhasil. Tapi paling tidak, telah membuka kesadaran masyarakat akan kembali, em, perluinya untuk melakukan reformasi dalam bidang pendidikan tadi.

(From the last sentence, it was said that, in fact, what Horace Mann had done did not show any result that could be directly observed. So it seemed unsuccessful. However, at least, it had opened public awareness as to the need for carrying out the educational reform.)
As Graph 5.4.13.2 indicates, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Sur skimmed the sentence, related the sentence to Text 1, made an inference, predicted that, unlike Text 1, Text 2 would be difficult because the theme was about health, which was beyond his field of study, questioned the word “coronary”, vocalised parts of the sentence, made an inference, and unsuccessfully paraphrased the sentence:

*Em, berbeda dengan teks yang pertama tadi, teks kedua ini saya langsung dapat gambaran bahwa ini lebih sulit. Kalau yang pertama tadi itu masih terkait dengan pendidikan, yang kedua ini saya baru membaca kalimat yang pertama saja sudah mendapatkan kesan ini akan sulit, dari kalimat “There can be a few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease.” Kemungkinan ini berhubungan dengan bidang kesehatan, yang sangat jauh dari apa yang saya geluti sekarang. Dari kalimat pertama langsung ada satu kata yang saya tidak mengerti yaitu kata ‘coronary’. Tapi maksudnya mungkin ‘Cukup banyak’ orang yang belum mendengar tentang ‘heart disease,’ ‘coronary heart disease.’ *(Um, unlike the first text, this second text directly gave me an impression that it will be more difficult than the first one. While the first text still has something to do with education, this second one, from the first sentence, “There can be a few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease,” I already got an impression that it will be difficult. Probably it deals with health, which is beyond what I am studying at the moment. From the first sentence I already found a word I don’t know, that is the word “coronary”. But perhaps the sentence means “There are quite many people who have not heard about heart disease, coronary heart disease.”)*

Moving to the second sentence, Sur read it silently, expressed his incomprehension of the sentence, read it aloud, monitored his comprehension, vocalised a difficult phrase, guessed its meaning, attempted to paraphrase the whole sentence, related it to the first sentence, restated his paraphrase, reflected on his impression of the text, and related it to his prior knowledge:

*Kalimat kedua ini saya juga kurang mengerti. “... no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man ... man in the ...” Em, “no respecter”...”. Jadi penyakit tadi itu dalam menyerang tidak memandang orang. Kalau kalimat pertama bicara bahwa penyakit “hati koroner” telah dikenal banyak orang, kalimat kedua ini mengatakan penyakit ini dalam menyerang itu tidak memandang orang. Mungkin dia akan menyerang presiden negera yang kuat, adikusuma, atau orang-orang biasa yang di jalanan-jalan. Tadi saya itu membayangkan sultunya dulu, mungkin agak jauh dari saya, tapi setelah saya lihat, oh ya, ini tentang penyakit “huti koroner”. Terus saya ingat pernah sedikit-sedikit membaca hal seperti ini. Jadi ini yang kemungkinan membantu bagi saya untuk pemahaman kalimat ini.* *(In this second sentence, I don’t understand “... no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man ... man in the ...” Em, “no respecter”...”. So the disease did not see persons to attack. While the first sentence said that many people had heard about coronary heart disease, the second sentence stated that, in its attack, this disease did not care about the persons. It may strike presidents of super-...)*
powers or the ordinary man in the street. Earlier, I imagined how difficult the text would be, but after reading the second sentence and found that it was about “coronary liver” disease, then I remember that I once read a little about this. This probably has aided my comprehension.

In response to the third sentence, he read it silently, reread it aloud, guessed its meaning, reflected on his strategy use, reread it chunk by chunk while paraphrasing the gist, provided an illustration, and continued with the paraphrase of the sentence:

“Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-age and ...” Jadi penyakit ini terutama ... menyerang emi ... orang-orang yang sudah berusia lanjut ... advancing age. Tapi terus terang ini saya cuma menebak. Saya terus terangnya juga kurang tahu. “It also frequently attacks ...” tapi juga menyerang orang yang masih setengah umur. Kebanyakan ... jadi kemungkinan penyakit ini menyerang orang-orang yang sudah lanjut ... tua, tadi, tapi dalam beberapa kasus ... penyakit ini juga menyerang ... orang-orang muda, ... jadi orang-orang yang berumur sedikit dua lima ke bawah. Jadi tidak ... tidak terutup kemungkinan bahwa kita juga akan menderita sakit “hati koroner” ini.

(Pro this disease primarily attacks the advancing age. But, frankly speaking, I just guessed. Frankly speaking, I don’t know this. But it also attacks the middle age. So, perhaps, this disease attacks the advancing age, but in some cases it also attacks the young, people of about twenty five or younger. So the chance is open that we will also suffer from this “coronary liver” disease.)

Responding to the fourth sentence, Sur read it aloud, identified a difficult phrase (“furring-up of arteries”), reflected on the problem, vocalised the phrase, reread the sentence, identifying the function of the phrase in the sentence, paraphrased the gist of the sub-clause, reflected on his problem about the topic, and tentatively paraphrased the gist of the whole sentence, despite his claim that he still could not understand the meaning of the difficult phrase identified:

“The furring-up of arteries which is the ... cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species in the animal kingdom.” Ini terus terang kalimat yang ked ini saya kurang mengerti kata “furring-up ... the arteries”. Jadi “furring-up the arteries” ini menjadi penyebab mendesar dari kondisi coronary tadi. Ya, penyakit hati koroner sendiri saya kurang mengerti. Tapi di sini bahwa “the furring-up the arteries” yang jadi penyebab utama dari kondisi coronary tadi, juga ditampilkan dalam “species ... species in the animal kingdom.” Bangsa binatang atau apa ini, nggak saya pahami. Kalimat ini saya tidak mengerti.

(“The furring-up of arteries which is the ... cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species in the animal kingdom.” Frankly speaking, I don’t understand the words “furring-up of arteries” in the fourth sentence. So the “furring-up of arteries” is the basic cause of coronary conditions. Yeah, I don’t know about the coronary “liver” disease itself, but “the furring-up of arteries”, which is the basic cause of the coronary conditions, is also found in other species in the animal kingdom. I don’t understand whether it is a kind of animal or something else. I don’t understand this sentence.)
Moving to the fifth sentence, he read it silently, attempted to paraphrase it (but seemed puzzled and reread the sentence silently, as seen from the researcher’s observation note), monitored his comprehension, reread it aloud, attempted another paraphrase, monitored his comprehension, identified a difficult word (the word “treatment”), continued the paraphrase while guessing the meaning of the word “treatment”, which was acceptable, despite his concern about its exact meaning:

_Kalimat ini mencerminkan tentang, em, “Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and well known to doctors in the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, had made it appear to be on the increase.” Jadi ini mencerminkan bahwa sebenarnya penyakit ini telah dikenal bertahun-tahun oleh ... dokter. Jadi pada abad ke-18 mereka sudah mengerti dan “the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods” dan apa yang dilakukan oleh dokter untuk melawan, em, menangkal penyakit tsb. telah didukung oleh peningkatan metode diagnosis serta ‘treatment’. Em, ‘treatment’ ... ini saya agak sulit. Saya sebenarnya sudah biasa dengan vocab ini, em, tapi ternyata di sini saya agak sulit. Jadi publisitas dari media tadi sebenarnya ... juga mendukung apa yang dilakukan dokter ... untuk mencoba mencari solusi untuk menanggulangi penyakit tadi. Jadi dilakukan dengan peningkatan yang cepat dalam metode diagnosis serta peningkatan perawatan bagi penderita. ‘Improved treatment’ saya artikan seperti itu. (This sentence talks about “Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and well known to doctors in the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, had made it appear to be on the increase”. So this tells us that the disease had been known by doctors for years. They already knew this in the 18th century and what the doctors did to fight against the disease was supported by improved diagnostic methods and, em, this word “treatment” is difficult to me. This word is familiar to me, but it is difficult in this context. So, publicity given by the media actually also supported what the doctors had done to overcome the disease. So it was done by fast improvement in diagnostic methods and improved treatment on the patients. I interpreted “improved treatment” this way.)

In his attempt to comprehend the sixth sentence, Sur read it silently, reread it aloud, identified difficult words and the source of difficulty, attempted to paraphrase the sentence, used it to confirm his understanding of the fifth sentence, and continued his paraphrase of the second sentence successfully:

“Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a ‘modern epidemic.’ Jadi beberapa orang yang ... berkasara peraya bahwa, em, peningkatan dalam menangani penyakit ‘hati koroner’ tadi adalah nyata, dan ... menganggap penyakit ‘hati koroner’ ... penyakit cardiovascular ini sebagai epidemik moderen. Ini saya tidak tahu artinya karena seperti itu tadi vocab yang berhubungan dengan keselakan saya kurang mengerti. Ternyata kalimat yang ke-6 ini cukup membawa makna untuk kalimat kelima. Ternyata kalimat kelima itu mengemukakan bahwa penyakit ‘hati koroner’ ini jumlahnya terus meningkat. Tapi para
In response to the seventh sentence, he read it silently, related it to the two previous sentences, confirmed his understanding of the previous sentences based on figures provided in the seventh sentence and, in the light of this understanding, Sur paraphrased the seventh sentence with ease:

"Ha, ternyata kalimat ke-6 di sini dapat membantu saya untuk memahami kalimat yang pertama. Dan ini juga didukung oleh kalimat yang ke-7. "The number of people dying is ... of this disease, according to death certificate issued in California during ...." Ha ini juga menunjukkan fakta mengapa dikatakan penyakit hati koroner tadi meningkat, yaitu jumlah orang yang meninggal karena penyakit tadi di California, berdasarkan dari kartu yang diberikan untuk kematian, atau surat kematian, pada tahun 1942 itu berjumlah 18.591. Ini juga mendukung pemahaman saya untuk paragraf yang ke-2 ini. (Ha, the sixth sentence proved to aid in my understanding of the fifth one, and this is also supported by the seventh sentence. "The number of people dying is ... of this disease, according to death certificate issued in California during ...." Ha, this provides facts why it was said that the coronary "liver" disease increased, that is, the number of people dying of the disease in California, based on the death certificates issued in 1942 was 18,591. This aided my understanding of this second paragraph.)

Moving to the eighth sentence, he read it silently, provided his interpretation, related it to the sixth sentence while reflecting on the strategy use, and confirmed his interpretation:

"Terus dua puluh tahun kemudian itu ternyata sudah meningkat lagi menjadi 102.478, atau lebih dari ... lima kali peningkatannya. Itu ... itu kalau saya hubungkan ... saya hubungkan dengan kalimat yang kedua tadi kan benar. Jadi penguasa telah menyatakan bahwa ... em ... penyakit hati koroner tadi disebut sebagai "cardiovascular disease" atau epidemik moderen. Itu karena jumlahnya yang meningkat tadi. (Then twenty years later, the number has risen again to 102,478, or more than a five-fold increase. It is true if I relate it to the second sentence. So the authorities already stated that the coronary "liver" disease was called "cardiovascular disease" or "modern epidemic." That was due its increasing number.)

Reaching the ninth sentence, he read it silently, reread it aloud, and provided a correct interpretation:
Arriving at the concluding sentence, Sur read it silently, reread it aloud, attempted to
paraphrase the gist of the sentence, identified a difficult phrase (“life expectancy”),
inferring its gist, reread the whole sentence silently, and continued paraphrasing the
gist of the sentence:

Terus ... kalimat yang terakhir ini, “However, generally it would seem probable that
population increase, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death
certification are responsible for this rise.” Em, ... maknanya yang bisa saya tangkap, itu
... Jadi ... peningkatan dari jumlah, jumlah penduduk ... serta ... “life expectancy”, ya,
opanya hidup, giu, serta diagnosis yang lebih tepat, dan, em, ... itu semua kemungkinan
ada kaitannya dengan peningkatan angka kematian dari penyakit “hati” koroner itu.
(Then, this last sentence, “However, generally it would seem probable that population
increase, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification
are responsible for this rise.” Em, in my understanding. ... So the increase in
population and “life expectancy”, yeah, something related to life, and more accurate
diagnosis, and, em, all of these are probably related to the rise in the death rate due to
coronary “liver” disease.)

Retellings

Sur’s retelling of Text 1 was systematic, neat and relatively complete, covering the
theme, the main idea and 80% of the details. In addition he also went beyond the
information given in the text by providing (1) summaries and (2) evaluation of the
text, as can be seen in the following:

(1) Secara keseluruhan bacaan ini tentang situasi atau kondisi pendidikan di Amerika
itu dulu bagaimana, pada awal-awal paragraph, dan kemudian reformasinya itu
bagaimana, pada berikutnya. (As a whole, the text is about the situation or condition of
education in America in the past, in the early part of the paragraph, and then about how
the reform was conducted, in the next part.)

(1) Horace Mann itu melakukan reformasi dari dua sisi, yaitu dari sisi siswa atau anak-
onak dan dari sisi guru. (Horace Mann made a reform from two sides, that is, from the
students’ or children’s side and from the teachers’ side.)

(2) Apa yang dilakukan Horace Mann memang tepat, sesuai tuntutan saat itu. Mungkin
sama dengan tuntutan kita di sini sekarang. (What Horace Mann did was right, in
accordance with the demand that time. Probably it is the same as our current demand (in Indonesia).

Sur's quality of the retelling of Text 1 also matched his comprehension during the think-aloud protocol session, which confirmed his comprehension of the text.

In regard to Text 2, Sur stated in his retelling that he knew very little about coronary heart disease. This statement is supported by the fact that he translated "coronary heart disease" as "penyakit hati koroner" (coronary liver disease). However, he demonstrated his good comprehension of the text during the think-aloud session. Unfortunately, his retelling of the text was incomplete, covering the complete theme and 57% of the details, but missing most elements of the main idea. In regard to the main idea, he just mentioned that the rise in the number of human beings could be an influential factor in the rise of the disease death rate.

In-depth interview: Discussion on test answers

From the interview it was revealed that Sur recognised one of the various orthographic means an author used to express an idea. For example, he knew that the author disagreed with the public sentiment that education was a "waste" of time from the fact that the word "waste" was written within quotation marks. Sur thought that the quotation marks were used to emphasise the "incorrect" public sentiment.

The interview also confirmed the responses in the think-aloud protocol, which indicated that Sur solved most of his vocabulary problems by "guessing meaning based on the context". For example, he came to comprehend the words "desperately," "sentiment," "initiated," and "matched" (in Text 1) and "no respecter of persons", and "treatment" (in Text 2) through guessing based on the context.

Observations

There were a number of activities that could not be detected through the think-aloud or interview protocols. For example, after reading the first sentence of the second
paragraph of Text 2 silently, Sur attempted to interpret its meaning, but cancelled the plan, made regression, and reread the sentence aloud before making another attempt to paraphrase the gist. The activities carried out before rereading the sentence aloud could not be detected without the aid of this observation note. This appears to indicate the importance of multiple viewpoints in data collection and analysis.

Reading texts in a reading test

When asked about the problems he faced in reading texts in a reading test, he considered vocabulary as the main source of the problems. In addition, he also mentioned unfamiliar topics. This matched his claim in the think-aloud protocol that Text 2 was more difficult than Text 1 because the latter was about education, the field of study he was undertaking, while the former was about health, a topic beyond the everyday issues he dealt with. The claim that Sur was not familiar with the topic was proved by his Indonesian translation of "penyakit hati koroner" (coronary liver disease) for "coronary heart disease". Indeed, the English word "heart" can have more than one meaning in Indonesian. In the phrase "broken heart" the word "heart" is equivalent to "hati" (an abstract "heart"), but in "coronary heart disease" the word "heart" is equivalent to "jantung" (a concrete "heart", part of our body). Meanwhile, the word "hati", when used to refer to a concrete part of our body, is equivalent to the word "liver" in English. If he had heard much about the disease, at least he would have given it the correct Indonesian equivalent, "jantung koroner", instead of "hati koroner." However, apart from the name of the disease, Sur’s comprehension of Text 2 was good. In a reading test he usually read the text quickly to get the gist, read the questions to see what to look for in the text, and returned to the text to find information needed to answer the questions.

Reading books

When asked about the problems faced in reading books, particularly textbooks assigned by the lecturers, Sur considered vocabulary to be the main source of his comprehension problems. He solved the vocabulary problems by guessing the
meaning based on context, or looking the difficult words up in the dictionary when the words hindered comprehension. In addition to vocabulary, like a number of other informants, he mentioned that books on linguistics were loaded with difficult concepts. For example, a definition of a concept often included other concepts with which he was not familiar. As a result, to understand one definition he had to find the meaning of other definitions first. He claimed that an important factor that aided the comprehension of a book was prior knowledge of the subject.

Reading newspapers

Sur stated that he read a newspaper in English because he wanted to compare it with what he had read in Indonesian. As he usually read just in order to obtain the gist, he would not go into details, because he would find problems if he did so. His main problem was that he would find many words with which he was not familiar. As the gist was all he needed, when confronted with a difficult word, he would just guess its meaning based on context.
Appendix 5.14

Strategy Profile of Reader 14 (Tin)

Think-aloud protocol

As can be seen from Graph 5.4.14.1, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Tin read it silently, identified a difficult word, reflected on her strategy in dealing with this word, attempted to paraphrase the gist of the sentence, and reflected on her strategy use:

Em, kalimat pertama ini mengatakan bahwa di awal abad ke-19 pendidikan di Amerika itu perlu dilakukan suatu reformasi atau pembaharuan, gitu. Sepertinya sistem pendidikannya tidak sesuai lagi dengan, em, kebutuhan sehingga diperlukan pembaharuan. Biasanya kalau ada kata-kata yang saya tidak tahu tapi sepertinya tidak mempengaruhi arti, itu saya just leave it out. Kaia "desperately" saya tidak tahu, tapi kalau misalnya saya tuapi, sepertinya, em, artinya masih bisa diinterpretasi, dan itu memang intinya itu.
(Um, the first sentence said that in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American education needed reform or innovation. It seemed that education system no longer met the demand so that it needed reform. Usually when there is a word that I don’t know but it does not obstruct my inference of the gist, I will just leave it. For example, I did not know the meaning of the word “desperately”, but if I disregard the word, the sentence still makes sense, and it is the essence of the sentence.)

Moving to the second sentence, she read it silently, provided a paraphrase, identified an unfamiliar word, related the word to the Indonesian non-cognate, related the sentence to her background knowledge and experience, provided an illustration, and made an inference:

Ini sepertinya kok ada dua karbu, sekolah swasta dan public school ... mungkin diartikan sekolah negeri. Sekolah swasta ini hanya untuk orang kaya, sedangkan sekolah negeri yang hanya beberapa ini ada, mungkin untuk anak-anak yang biasa-biasa saja. Ini sepertinya erjadi juga di sini, karena sekolah swasta biasanya mahal. Sekolah negeri sedikit karena ada "the strong sentiment" ... kok sepertinya ada, apa ya, yang "sentimen", nggak senang terhadap sekolah umum, dan mengatakan "Sebaiknya kamu nggak usah sekolah saja. Itu hanya buang-buang waktu." Makanya public school itu cuma sedikit.
(It seemed there were two sides: private schools and public schools which probably mean state schools. The private schools were for the rich while the public schools which were only few were probably for the ordinary people. This also happens here (in Indonesia), because private schools are expensive. Public schools were few due to the strong sentiment ... it seems there were people who were "sentimen", disliked public schools, and said "You should not go to school as it is only wasting time." Therefore there were only few public schools.)
In reaction to the third sentence, Tin read it silently, related it to the previous sentence while subvocalising parts of the sentence, paraphrased the gist, related the content to the current Indonesian context, and reflected her judgment on the matter:

Dan, ya, oleh karena ada sentimen bahwa anak yang tidak mampu itu sebaiknya tidak usah sekolah, siap-siap kerja saja, makanya diadakan reformasi atau pembaharuan sistem pendidikan di Amerika itu. Saya pikir memang ada kesamaan dengan pikiran orang-orang di sini sekarang, khususnya yang tinggal pelosok. Pendidikan dianggap hanya membuang wong, sedangkan kalau kita bekerja kita dapat uang. Meskipun sekarang sudah ada wajib belajar 9 tahun itu.

And, yeah, due to the sentiment that the poor should not go to school but prepare themselves for work, instead, reform or innovation was carried out on the American educational system. I think this was similar to the (Indonesian) public opinion at present, particularly in the rural areas. Despite the nine-year obligatory education coming into effect now, education is considered wasting money, while working enables us to earn money.

Moving to the fourth sentence, she read it silently, commented on the ease of the text comprehension, paraphrased the gist, evaluated the content, and provided an illustration:


(Um, this sentence is crystal clear; I know almost every word. There was a famous man named Horace Mann. He thought that there was no reason for any citizen to be uneducated. So his principle was that everyone must be educated. Yeah. But it is true. At least, if you were a little bit educated, you would not be easily cheated, would you?)

In response to the fifth sentence, she read it silently, paraphrased the main clause (the second chunk of the sentence), identified a difficult word, guessed its meaning (incorrectly), and completed the erroneous paraphrase, reread the first chunk of the sentence while vocalising a difficult phrase, guessed its meaning, monitored her comprehension of the whole sentence, and reflected on her comprehension strategies:

Di sini Horace Mann tadi mengajukan beberapa perubahan, mungkin beliau memberikan pandangan tentang beberapa perubahan yang lalu di "matched" ... disesuaikan, gitu, yan segera bisa sesuai dengan sekolah-sekolah di seluruh negara itu. Em, "superintendent of education" ... "superintendent" ... Ini saya nggak tahu artinya. Tapi tampaknya dia orang penting di dunia pendidikan, gitu, sejak tahun 1837 sampai 1848. Kata "matched" di sini saya hanya tahu yang berarti "bersesuaian". Jadi perubahan-perubahan yang Horace Mann kemukakan itu mungkin akan bisa sesuai dengan sekolah-sekolah yang ada di semua distrik di negara itu. Tentunya itu. Saya
Moving to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, attempted a paraphrase, identified a difficult concept, made self-reflection on the problem, proposed a tentative meaning, and related the concept to the Indonesian context:

"Em, perubahan tadi ialah dengan menaikan gaji guru dan membantu pengajaran pada guru-guru untuk meningkatkan kualitas guru. Saya tidak tahu maksudnya "He extended the school year from five to six months." Diartikan itu bisa, tapi maksud yang dianggap kok saya belum paham. Dahulu sekolah itu hanya lima tahun, kemudian dijadikan enam tahun, mungkin. Untuk meningkatkan pendidikan, lamanya pendidikan itu sendiri ditambah, mungkin. Kalau di sini mungkin seperti wajib belajar yang dulu enam tahun sekarang sembilan tahun.

(Um, the changes were by raising the teachers' salaries and educating them to improve their quality. I don't know what is meant by "He extended the school year from five to six months." I can translate it, but I don't understand the intended message. Perhaps, schooling used to be five years but was changed to six years, then. To improve the quality of education, the length of schooling itself was extended, perhaps. Probably it is like the extension of obligatory education (in Indonesia) from six to nine years.)

In response to the concluding sentence, Tin read it silently, identified a problematic clause, attempted to paraphrase the whole sentence, monitored her comprehension, reread the whole sentence, summarised the gist, and provided an illustration to justify the content:

Meskipun perubahan-perubahan itu diadakan, tetapi hasilnya tidak bisa langsung tampak dalam waktu cepat. Namun perubahan tadi bisa meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat, untuk mengubah pandangan masyarakat terhadap pendidikan itu.

Tadinya saya tidak tahu ini yang terakhir ini. "... they at least increased public awareness as to the need...." Ha ini "... as to the need for further strengthening of the system." Ini yang saya artikan "paling tidak untuk meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat ... tentang sistem pendidikan yang lebih ketat. Jadi perubahan yang ini tidak langsung terlihat hasilnya. Perubahan suatu sitim itu pasti step by step, sampai nanti nampak hasilnya.

(Although the changes were made, the results could not be seen instantly. But the changes could increase public awareness, to change the public view on education. At first I did not know this last clause "... they at least increased public awareness as to the need ... as to the need for further strengthening of the system." I interpret it as "At least to increase public awareness about a more strict educational system." So, the changes did not bring about observable results. The change of a system must be step by
As Graph 5.4.14.2 shows, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Tin read it silently, related it to her background experience, paraphrased the sentence incorrectly, provided a rationale to justify her paraphrase, and reflected her opinion on the topic:

*Kalimat ini tentang penyakit jantung koroner, yang mungkin hanya sebagian orang saja yang tahu tentang ini. Menurut pada kenyataannya hanya sedikit orang saja, hanya orang-orang tertentu saja yang tahu tentang penyakit jantung koroner. Sebab di masyarakat itu yang namanya penyakit jantung hanya diartikan penyakit yang mematikan. Hampir semua orang itu kalau tidak diketahui penyebab yang jelas, bagaimana dia itu meninggal, biasanya dikatakan penyakit jantung, sebab kalau jantung berhenti pasti meninggal. Ya. (This sentence is about coronary heart disease, about which only few people know. In fact only few people, only certain people know about coronary heart disease. The public only know that heart disease is a fatal disease. When someone died and the cause of the death was not known, they would say that it was due to heart disease, because if the heart beat stopped, the person would die. Yeah.)

In response to the second sentence, she read it silently, identified a difficult phrase, reflected on the problem, reread the sentence while vocalising the phrase, attempted a paraphrase of the sentence, vocalised the phrase, reflected on her comprehension strategy, and inferred the meaning of the sentence successfully:


(I really don't understand this sentence. I don't know this, "respecer"... "no respecer of persons." But it seems that heart disease cannot attack ... is no respecer of persons. Probably everyone can be attacked by the disease, regardless of who one is. Yeah, I know the meaning of the words, but the sentence construction is difficult. The difficult words are "respecer" and then "the illness may strike ...." This is a complex sentence. So I have to see how the components are related. But the essence is that the disease may attack any person. Even presidents who have superpowers and the ordinary men can be affected.)

Responding to the third sentence, Tin read it silently, identified a difficult phrase, vocalised the phrase, questioned the relation of the phrase to the rest of the sentence, identified the main clause, read it aloud, paraphrased it, reread the difficult phrase...
aloud and questioned its reference, leaving the question unanswered while expecting further information from the next sentences:

Di kalimat ini, yang membikin saya bingung, keterangan "Primarily the disease of advancing age ...." ini mengacu ke keterangan di mana? Kalau ini saya tahu "... it also frequently attacks the middle-age and in some cases the young." Maksudnya bahwa semua umur bisa ... bisa terkena penyakit jantung, tidak hanya orang yang middle-age, tapi juga orang muda pun bisa kena. "Primarily a disease of advancing age ...." ini yang saya kurang mengerti mengacu ke mana. Biar ini saya tinggal dulu, mungkin nanti ada keterangan lain di kalimat berikut.

(What made me confused from this sentence was this "Primarily the disease of advancing age ...." Where does this refer to? This one I know, "... it also frequently attacks the middle-age and in some cases the young." It means that people of all ages can be affected, not only the middle age and the young. "Primarily a disease of advancing age ...." I don't know what this one refers to. Let me leave it for the time being, maybe there will be further information in the next sentences.)

In reaction to the fourth sentence, Tin read it silently, reread it while vocalising the difficult phrase, paraphrased the gist of the sentence while leaving the difficult phrase unresolved, considering that it could be a medical term, and made an appropriate inference:

"The furring-up of arteries ...." Ternyata jantung koroner ini disebabkan oleh adanya suatu "furring-up arteries." Em, 'furring-up' itu juga hanya saya lakukan karena mungkin istilah kedokteran, yang kalau diterjemahkan malah lucu. Jadi sebab utamanya adalah suatu "furring-up" pada arteri. This "furring-up arteries" bukan hanya di manusia, tapi binatang pun juga bisa kena. Jadi mungkin binatang juga bisa kena jantung koroner. ("The furring-up of arteries ...." Coronary heart disease proved to be caused by "furring-up of arteries." Um, I just leave this "furring-up" as it is because it may be a medical term, which would sound funny if I translated it. So the basic cause is "furring-up" of arteries. This "furring-up of arteries" occurs not only on man but also on animals. So, probably animals can also get coronary heart attack.)

Moving to the fifth sentence, Tin read it silently, identified the comprehension problem, reread the sentence, mistook the word "ages" (periods in history) for the one used in the previous sentence (the number of years one has lived), attempted to established relations among parts of the sentence, vocalised problematic parts, attempted to infer the gist unsuccessfully, unsuccessfully re-analysed the sentence to find the subject of the main clause, and finalised the inference of the gist unsuccessfully:

Kalimat ini sudah panjang, banyak komanya, banyak keterangannya. Kesulitan yang saya hadapi di sini menghubungkan kalimat antara kata yang satu dan kata yang
Moving to the sixth sentence, Tin read it silently, reread it while vocalising a number of problematic words, attempted a paraphrase, associated a problematic word ("authorities") with her prior knowledge, and inferred the meaning of the word:

*Sebagian orang-orang tertentu meyakini bahwa penyakit ini... pentingkatannya memang ada dan kemudian menyebut penyakit jantung koroner atau penyakit cardiovascular ini sebagai suatu 'modern epidemic'. Tetapi 'authorities' ini seharusnya orang-orang atasan, yang saya tahu. (Some people believe that the increase of this disease really exists and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease modern epidemic. But, in my understanding, these "authorities" should be people of high-ranking position.)*

Responding to the seventh sentence, she read it silently, reread it aloud, paraphrased the sentence, inferred the gist, predicted one reason for the disease to be undetected, and reflected on her prior knowledge:

*"The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificate issued ..."*  
*Jumlah orang yang meninggal di California pada tahun 1942, yang disahabkan penyakit jantung ada ini. Melihat jumlah 18,591 ini selama tahun 1942, berarti penyakit itu memang mematikan. Mungkin orang kurang paham tentang penyakit itu sendiri, sehingga tahu kalau dirinya terkena jantung koroner ketika telah stadium akhir. Korena penyakit jantung ini memang buah duit banyak waktu mengetahui, orang baru tahu kalau ada yang sakit jantung setelah yang bersangkutan meninggal.*
The number of people dying of coronary heart disease in California in 1942 reached this number. Looking at the number, 18,391, in 1942, only for one year, we know that this is a fatal disease. Probably people did not know this disease itself well, so that they knew that they had coronary heart disease after reaching the final stages. As it needs a lot of money to find out whether one has been affected by this disease, people know that the patient got coronary heart disease after the patient had died.)

In response to the eighth sentence, Tin read it silently, reread it aloud, paraphrased it, identified a difficult phrase, inferred the gist, analysed the statistical data, interpreted the difficult phrase correctly, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, and inferred the time reference:

"Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths has risen to 102,478, more ..." En, dua puluh tahun kemudian catatan kematian dari penyakit jantung ini menjadi 102,478. Jadi 102, lebih dari lima ... lima kali, 'more than a five-fold increase?' Em, ini ... "five-fold increase" ini yang didek saya ketahui. Tapi peningkatan ini besar sekali, oh, dari 18 ribu menjadi 102 ribu. Oh ya, lima kali lipat peningkatannya selama twenty years. Berarti penyakit ini menakikan sekali. Twenty years ... berarti itu pada tahun 62. "Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths has risen to 102,478, more ..." Um, twenty years later the death record has risen to 102,478. So 102, more than five times, more than "a five-fold increase"? Um, it is this "five-fold increase" that I don't know. But this is a very large increase, oh, from 18,000 to 102,000, oh, yeah, a five-time increase for twenty years. It means that this disease is highly fatal. Twenty years ... it means in 1962.)

Moving to the next sentence, she read it silently, reread it aloud, paraphrased it, and inferred the gist of the sentence appropriately:

At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice due to ... Oh, di sinis disebutkan jumlah kematian yang disebabkan oleh penyakit jantung koroner jadi itu kok dua kali lipat lebih banyak daripada jumlah kematian yang disebabkan oleh kanker. Jadi bisa kita peroleh implikasi bahwa taynya jantung koroner lebih mengeras daripada kanker. Tapi kanker itu tetap merupakan penyakit yang juga mematikan. (Oh, it is mentioned here that the number of deaths due to coronary heart disease is more than twice the number of deaths due to cancer. So the implication is that coronary heart disease is more frightening than cancer. However, cancer remains a fatal disease.)

Arriving at the concluding sentence, she read it silently, identified a difficult phrase, reread the sentence while vocalising the difficult phrase, identified a problem of relating sentence constituents, reread aloud the whole sentence, inferred the gist, reflected on her comprehension strategies, and paraphrased the sentence:
Retellings

Tin's retelling of Text I was almost complete, covering the theme, the main idea, and 80% of the details. The only point she did not mention was that the changes Mann started were soon matched in other school districts around the country. She might have remembered the point, but as the think-aloud protocol shows, she was not sure about the meaning of the word “matched” so that the point was still obscure. However, Tin also provided an illustration in regard to the last sentence. She claimed that she was not surprised at the information contained in the last sentence. She already predicted that the result of any reform would not be completely satisfactory:

Pembaharuan tadi yang saya katahui hasilnya tidak dapat dilihat dengan langsung, begitu. Ya, saya sudah membayangkannya, memperkirakannya, yang namanya pembaharuan itu tidak dapat langsung dilihat hasilnya. Jadi ya, paling-paling sampai di situ yang bisa dhasilkan. (I knew that the outcome of could not been seen directly. Yeah, I already imagined, predicted, the outcome of the so-called reform could not be seen directly. So, yeah, that was the most that could be achieved.)
In regard to Text 2, Tin's retelling was incomplete, covering the theme, missing the main idea, and including 57% of the details. Despite the ample time given to reread the text, her misunderstanding of the first sentence ("Only few people know about the disease") was retained in the retelling. In contrast, she said aspects such as the population increases and accurate diagnosis caused the decrease (not the increase) in the death rate. In the retelling she used her belief, not the information given in the text. In the think-aloud session she appeared to be still controlled by the print, while in the retelling it seemed that the impression of the print, which had been heavily influenced by her belief, was dominant in her interpretation. She also claimed that she knew little about coronary heart disease. All she knew was that it was a fatal disease:

Yang saya tahu, penyakit koroner ini adalah penyakit "karta maut". Kalau sudah terkena penyakit ini, harapan untuk hidup sudah kecil. (All I know is that this coronary heart disease is a disease of "dead card". Once a person is attacked, there is little hope to survive.)

In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers

The discussion of test answers revealed that, at first, Tin associated the word "sentiment" (opinion) with the Indonesian non-cognate "sentimen" (ill feeling or disagreement). However, as the context did not provide a place for disagreement, she decided that "opinion" was closest in meaning to the word "sentiment":

"Sentiment" itu sepertinya kok saya rasa sesuatu yang negatif, sense-nya negatif, gliu. Kerika saya lihat negatif, itu berarti ada 'disagreement'. (It seems that "sentiment" has a negative connotation, a negative sense. As I consider it negative, there must be some "disagreement.")

Tin was one of the few informants who recognised the equal importance of cancer to that of coronary heart disease in the text. While most informants considered "heart disease" to be the theme, Tin considered "fatal diseases" to be the theme because the texts dealt with both diseases, coronary heart disease and cancer.

How Tin came to comprehend the meaning of "furring-up" in "furring-up of arteries", which was not mentioned in the think-aloud protocol, was revealed in the discussion section of the interview, as follows:
"Furring-up" itu, "furring-up" itu, kan ada kata "fur", ya, Pak? "Fur" itu kan "buhu", ya? Bula itu kan berarti ada sepih "serat", begitu. "Furring up of arteries" itu kok rasanya "buhu atau serat yang menump ang arteri." Itulah saya kira. ("Furring-up," "furring-up," there is the word "fur", isn't there, Sir? "Fur" is "hair", isn't it? Fur is like something with fibre. "Furring-up of arteries" seems like hair or fibre which blocks arteries. I think that's it.)

This was the best and clearest interpretation among those provided by the informants. The other informants merely stated that "furring-up of arteries" means "blocking of arteries".

**Observations**

From the observation notes a point worthy of reporting is that Tin pointed at the text when reading, mostly during her vocalisation and sub-vocalisation of the text and when she made a reference to the text during the discussion on the test answers. Pointing at the text and vocalisation or sub-vocalisation seemed to be intended to aid her to focus her attention on the text attended to.

**Reading texts in a reading test**

When asked about the strategies used, Tin claimed that in her last TOEFL test, for example, she read the questions first before reading the passage. The reason was that the time was limited. By reading the questions first, she had some idea of what the text was about and what to look for in the passage, so that she would be able to decide which parts she would read at a glance and which parts she would read seriously as the questions already provided a guide as to the answers she had to look for. When a comprehension problem was due to a difficult word, she would guess its meaning, but when the problem was beyond the word level so that guessing did not help, she would have to read and translate the text word by word. However, as the time was limited she usually relied on guessing based on context and the options provided following each test question.
Reading newspapers

Tin said that a newspaper article always came with a topic. Therefore, a first glance at the topic would tell her what the article would be about. As general information was what she was looking for, she would not bother about knowing every word in the sentences. She would keep on reading even if there were words she did not understand. She believed she would be able to comprehend the general information because she was usually aided by similar information she obtained from other mass media such as television, and so forth:


(Obviously, when I read a newspaper I just want general information. So I just keep on reading although I don’t know the vocabulary. Eventually, at least, I will be able to get the general message. From the title it is obvious that it is about forest fires. Incidentally there have been a lot of news broadcasts on this so that at least I already had some idea about this. If I have to read it again, what I will get is more complete information than what I have learned so far.)

Reading books

In reading books, Tin read little by little, but focused her attention on the text paragraph by paragraph. She would still read the text sentence by sentence, but she would not pay attention to every word in the sentence. As she would not receive help from other sources like in reading newspapers, she relied on the information in the text so that when difficult words hinder her comprehension, she had to look them up in the dictionary. To get the general idea of what the book was about, she usually discussed it with a friend before reading it herself. This might be due to her claim that she liked listening better than reading, for news as well as for other information. She said that for reading assignments she often listened to what others said about the text before reading it herself. The following are her comments in regard to her strategies in reading books:

(In reading a textbook, there is something I really have to know. Frankly speaking, the problem is that I get the information only from that book. As I really have to know its content, it forces me to use a dictionary as well. In regard to content, I usually ask a friend, first. After knowing its gist, I will locate the gist. My friend, who has better comprehension, reads a text in general, first. So when I read the book by myself I have had a general picture of what the book is about. In reading a chapter, I read it little by little, paragraph by paragraph, but I don't have to look at every word. Only when difficult words hinder comprehension, will I look them up in the dictionary.)
Appendix 5.15
Strategy Profile of Reader 15 (Sil)

Think-aloud protocol

It can be seen from Graph 5.4.15.1 that, starting with the first sentence of Text 1, Sil read the sentence silently, paraphrased the gist, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, reflected her strategy that in order to arrive at her inference she related the text to the current educational condition in Indonesia, expressed her empathy, and justified the text content:

"Em, yang ada di benak saya yaitu bahwa ... apa itu ... sistem pendidikan di Amerika itu belum begitu teratur. Jadi em, ... di sini ... apa itu ... ya pokoknya belum begitu bagus. Em, ... Ya, system yang heriaku di sana masih perlu perbaikan. Saya bisa menahani itu ... karena ... saya membandingkan di sini, di Indonesia, sekarang saya saya kira belum begitu bagus. Meskipun Amerika sekarang itu sudah maju, ya, tetapi ... kan ini di awal tahun 1900, ... the beginning of the nineteenth century.

(Or, what I have in mind is that, what's that, the American educational system was not well-organised yet. So, um, in short, it was not good yet. Yeah, the prevailing system still needed improvement. I can understand this, as I compare it with the present system in Indonesia, which is not yet good either. Although America is advanced now, this was in 1900, ... the beginning of the nineteenth century, wasn't it?)"

Moving to the second sentence, Sil read it silently, identified a problematic phrase, reread it silently, attempted to paraphrase the sentence chunk by chunk, related the chunks to build a logical relation, provided a rationale, completed the paraphrase, criticised the American public sentiment, and justified the reformer's steps to start the educational reform:

"Saya kesulitan, apa itu, "public sentiment." Di sini ... apa itu ... lebih banyak sekolah swasta, tapi mungkin bantuan terlalu mahal sehingga cuma untuk orang-orang kaya. Jadi untuk orang ... yang kelas ekonominya agak kurang beruntung, em, mungkin nggak bisa masuk ke situ. Ya, jadi, saya kira dapat dilubungkan dengan ... apa itu ... laborers. Mungkin mereka hanya bisa sekolah di public school yang cuma sedikit, karena mereka beranggapan bahwa kalau cuma mau bekerja ... bekerja sebogai ... apa itu ... buruh ... ya nggak usah berpendidikan yang tinggi. Tepi saya kira, em, agak aneh, ya, karena mereka kan biasanya punya institut pendidikan lebih banyak daripada kita. Jadi agak ... aneh kalau, em, mereka punya few public schools. Aneh ... karena orang Amerika itu mesti menu, em, ada skop yang lebih baik terhadap pendidikan ... meskipun itu di the beginning of the nineteenth century.

(I have difficulty with the phrase “public sentiment.” There were more private schools, but probably the fees was so high that they were only for the rich. So, the economically less fortunate people, um, probably could not go those schools. Yeah, so it can be related to, what’s that, labourers. Probably they could go only to public schools, which
were only very few, for they assumed that if they wanted to be labourers, they did not have to be highly educated. But I think it's, um rather strange, because they usually had more educational institutions than we do here. So, it's strange if they had only few public schools. It's strange because the American people should have had better attitudes towards education, although it was still in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In response to the third sentence, Sil read it silently, attempted to paraphrase the gist, monitored her comprehension, reread it silently, related it to the previous sentence, and perfected the paraphrase:

Topi itu termasuk... apa itu... malah alasan itulah yang untuk... perbaikan... sistem pendidikan. Em... jadi karena menganalisis keadaan itu, para... para... apa itu... educational reformers bekerja berdasarkan adanya anggapan seperti itu... yaitu bahwa pekerja itu... nggak usah sekolah tinggi-tinggi. Jadi anggapan ini yang menjadi dasar... apa itu... kerja reformers untuk memperbaiki sistem pendidikan di Amerika.

(But it was for this very reason that the improvement in the educational system was carried out. Um... so, analysing the conditions, the educational reformers worked based on the assumption that in order to be laborers, there was no need for high education. So it was this assumption that became the basis for the reformers' work to improve the educational system in America.)

Moving to the fourth sentence, Sil read it silently, related it to the information from the previous sentences, attempted a paraphrase, reflected on her personal judgment, related the figure in the text to that in the Indonesian community, confirmed the gist of her attempted paraphrase:

Jadi, em, apa itu... salah satu reformers tadi... em... karena anggapan di masyarakat itu, dia berpendapat, dia mengatakan bahwa... tidak benar... tidak ada alasan, em, untuk setiap orang untuk tidak mengenyam pendidikan, to be uneducated. Jadi Horace Mann itu melihat... apa itu... kondisi pendidikan di Amerika itu kurang bagus, moka dia memberikan pendapat. Ya, di sini, kalau ada yang tidak baik, tokoh reformasi kita pasti akan berkomentar.

(So, um, one of the reformers, um, due to that public sentiment, he thought, he said that it was wrong... there was no reason for everyone not to enjoy education, to be uneducated. Horace Mann saw that the educational condition in America was not so good that he put his opinion forward. Yeah, here (in Indonesia), if there is something wrong, our reformists would certainly make comments.)

In response to the fifth sentence, Sil read it silently, identified a difficult word (the word "superintendent"), reread the sentence, guessed the meaning of the word, provided a rationale for the proposed meaning, analysed the sentence and identified the sub-clause, identified problematic parts of the sub-clause, analysed the sub-clause
Moving to the sixth sentence, she read it silently, related it to the previous sentence, reread it aloud chunk by chunk and paraphrased it (confusing months with years), related it to the Indonesian context to provide an illustration, and reflected on her own experience:

Jadi ini berhubungan dengan “various changes” tadi. Jadi “changes” itu, di antaranya, em, memperpanjang, em, kalau di sini misalnya, wajib belajar dulu enam tahun sekaran, sembilan tahun. Kalau di sini dari lima tahun ke enam “tahun”. Dan ...


[So, this is related to the “various changes” mentioned earlier. So the changes were, among others, um, extending, here (in Indonesia), for example, the obligatory study from six to nine years, while in this text, from five to six “years”. And improve the quality of education by instituting teacher education. Here we have a program of the continuation of study for primary and secondary school teachers. And raising their salaries. Yeah, in our place, it is a demand due to their economic condition. But it’s problematic. If the salaries were raised, prices would go up. That could even worsen the teachers’ welfare. Still there are non-transparent deductions. I know this because my father and elder brother are teachers.]
Arriving at the concluding sentence, Sil read it silently, monitored her comprehension, reread it chunk by chunk while making a paraphrase, and provided illustrations which indicated her agreement with the author’s opinion:

Ya, meskipun ... apa itu ... Horace Mann itu telah ... me ... mengubah sistem pendidikannya, tapi perubahan-perubahan itu belum ... apa itu ... tidak langsung memberikan hasil. Ya ... ini wajar itu. "Not sudden improvement ..." karena yang dialah itu kan manusia, jadi sulit. Kalau barang ... itu ... di-anu ... diperbaiki bisa langsung jadi ... tapi ini kan 'human'. Kalau sudden improvement memang apa ... memang nggak mungkin. Ya, perlu ... perlu proses, karena yang dia perbaiki itu adalah masyarakat. Ya. (Yeah, although Horace Mann already changed the educational system, the changes did not bring about direct results. Yeah, it’s normal. “Not sudden improvement” because it was human beings that he was trying to change. So, it was difficult. Things can be repaired directly, but not human beings. Sudden improvement was indeed impossible. Yeah, a process was needed, because it was a society that he was trying to improve. Yeah.)

As Graph 5.4.15.2 indicates, starting with the first sentence of Text 2, Sil read it silently, attempted a paraphrase of the gist, identified a new word, related the word to her prior knowledge, predicted the text would be difficult, reflected on her knowledge about the topic, reflected on how she arrived at her inference, made an association with her prior knowledge, and made an inference:

Mungkin, ya, bacaan ini tentang masalah kesehatan yang berhubungan dengan apa itu, jantung, ya. Saya tadi agak kaget dengan 'coronary', tapi mungkin maksudnya, apa itu, jantung koroner. Ya, ini mungkin agak sulit karena, em, ini ilmu, apa itu, biologi, ya, jadi IPA. Penyakit jantung itu kan karena ... apa itu ... ruangan di sekitar jantung itu tertutup lemak. Itu ... saya dapaikan dalam Biologi. Kelebihan lemak itu ... tersimpannya di tiga tempat: di bawah kulit, di rongga perut dan di sekitar jantung. Orang-orang biasa kan nggak terlalu banyak makan yang berlemak itu ... mungkin lebih banyak sayur-sayuran. Tapi kalau yang kelas presiden dan orang-orang atas itu kan ... mungkin makanannya yang banyak lemak. Jadi kemungkinan apa itu ... terkena heart disease itu ... lebih besar.

[Probably, yeah, this text is about health issues related to heart, yeah. I was surprised at the word “coronary”, but probably it means “jantung koroner” (coronary heart). Yeah, this text may be rather difficult because, um, it is (related to) biology, yeah, so it is natural science. The coronary heart disease was caused by the blocking of space by the fat around the heart. I know this from my Biology class. The excess fat is stored in three places: underneath the skin, in the space around the stomach, and around the heart. The ordinary men do not consume much fatty food; probably they consume more vegetables. But presidents and high-class people consume more fat. Thus, they were more prone to coronary heart disease.)

Moving to the second sentence, she read it silently, made an association with her prior knowledge, reread the sentence, identified a discrepancy between the
information in the text and her prior knowledge, and correctly paraphrased the sentence:

_Ya, tapi di sini ternyata dinyatakan, ya apa, ya memang ada kemungkinan sampai ke ordinary man, tapi lebih sedikit. Em, tapi diperdrakan the illness itu tidak pandang bulu, ya, jadi tidak pandang status, ya. (Yeah, it is stated here that it may attack the ordinary men, but they are smaller in number. Um, but the illness is no respecter of persons, yeah, so it does not care about the person’s status.)_

In response to the third sentence, Sil read it silently, inferred the gist appropriately, reread the sentence silently, identified difficult words, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence while vocalising the words “primarily”, “advancing age” and “middle-age”, guessed the meaning of the words, attempted a paraphrase, and made a self-reflection:

_Yang ketiga itu menyangkut apa ... umur ... primarily ... advancing age, em ... middle-age ... ya, orang apa itu ... orang tua, apa ... orang middle age, dan juga apa itu ... mungkin remaja, itu yang mungkin. Ya, tapi saya nggak tahu persisnya itu “primarily”. (The third sentence concerns ages ... “primarily”, “advancing age” and “middle-age” ... yeah, the old, the middle age, and also probably the young, perhaps. Yeah, but I don’t know the exact meaning of “primarily”.)_

In reaction to the fourth sentence, she read and reread it silently, identified difficult words, vocalised the words, monitored her comprehension, identified the function of the words in the sentence, and attempted to paraphrase the gist of the sentence, made an association with prior knowledge, and finalised her inference:

_“Furring up”. Saya, _em_, nggak paham ini. Ini berhubungan dengan arteries, pembuluh darah. Apa yang terjadi dalam pembuluh darah saya nggak tahu, ya, tapi ini adalah apa, “basic cause,” yang menyebabkan apa itu ... _em_, penyakit jantung. Dan ini nggak cuma ... apa itu ... menyerang manusia, tapi juga other species in the animal kingdom. Mungkin, kalau di biologi itu kan makhluk hidup digolongkan menjadi species-species. Kita species yang lebih tinggi ya, karena kita manusia, tapi other species itu, apa itu, mungkin saja terkena heart disease. (“Furring-up.” I, um, don’t understand this. It has something to do with arteries. I don’t know what happens in the arteries, yeah, but it is the “basic cause” um, of the heart disease. And it attacks not only human beings but also other species in the animal kingdom. Perhaps, in biology, living beings are classified into species. We are the highest species, as we are human beings, but the heart disease may also attack other species.)_

Moving to the fifth sentence, Sil read it silently, reread it, identified difficulty due to the sentence construction, reread and analysed the sentence, made an inference,
monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, identified a reference for the word “it”, confirmed her understanding, and paraphrased the gist:

*Em, jadi meskipun, apa itu, penyakit ini sudah dikenal sejak dulu, biar sudah ada usaha-usaha untuk menanggulanginya, terbukti itu, ada nyi the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, tapi ternyata penyakit itu juga berkembang. Em,... saya agak sulit di sini, ... kan biasanya kalau ada ‘although’ itu ada sesuatu yang kontras. Saya tadi juga sulit menemukan, apa itu, kalimat induknya, “... has made it appear to be on the increase”. Saya bingung, ‘it’ itu me-refer ke apa, penyembuhannya, atau apa. Tapi ternyata ke, apa itu, ke penyakitnya. Jadi memang ada kontras - ada rapid advance in treatment, tapi ternyata penyakitnya juga berkembang.*

(Um, so, although the disease has been known since a long time ago, and although there have been efforts to fight against the disease, as indicated by the phrase “the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment,” the disease also proves to be developing. Um, ... I have a problem here. The word “although” usually indicates some contrast. I also had difficulty finding the main clause, “... has made it appear to be on the increase”. I was wondering whether the word “it” refers to “treatment” or something else. But it proves to refer to the disease. In fact, there is a contrast – there has been a rapid advance in treatment, but the disease proves to be developing.)

In response to the sixth sentence, she read and reread it silently, identified a difficult word, guessed its meaning (inappropriately), monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence, provided a paraphrase, made an association with prior knowledge, and made self-reflection:

*Em, “authority” itu mungkin pemerintah, ya. “Some authorities .....” Jadi, pemerintah beberapa negara itu ... mengakui bahwa ... apa itu ... memang penyakit ini ada dan memang berkembang .... dan menyebutnya ... apa itu ... jantung koroner, jantung koroner dan menjelaskan sebagai ... apa ... modern epidemic. Em, kalau saya pikir, penyakit yang berbahaya itu AIDS, gitu loh. Ini akibat pergaulan bebas dan lemah dalam agama. Ya.*

(Um, “authority” perhaps means government, yeah. “Some authorities.” So the governments of a few countries recognise that the disease exist and is developing, and they call the coronary heart disease “modern epidemic.” Um, I think the dangerous disease is AIDS. It is due to free communication and weak religious observance. Yeah.)

Moving to the seventh sentence, Sil read and re-read it silently, related it to the previous sentence, identified the relation, and vocalised a number of phrases while paraphrasing the gist of the sentence:

*Em, ... ya. Ya, jadi authorities mengakui adanya penyakit ini karena adanya laporan, apa itu, jumlah kematian orang karena penyakit jantung. Jadi ... kalimat ini melanjutkan ... “some authorities believe that this increase, em, is real.” Jadi alasannya itu karena ... the number of people dying, ada facts dalam laporan bahwa orang yang meninggal sekitarnya, sekitar.*
(Um, ... yeah. Yeah, so the authorities recognise the disease because there is a report on the number of deaths due to heart disease. So this sentence is the continuation of “Some authorities believe that this increase is real ....” So, the reason for believing is the number of people dying, facts in the report that such and such numbers of people died of this disease.)

In response to the eighth sentence, she read it silently, identified its relation to the previous sentence, read the ninth sentence silently, identified its relation to the eighth and the seventh sentences, and paraphrased the gist of the eighth and the ninth sentences:

Ya, jadi kalimat “Twenty years ....,” sama “At present ....,” itu menguatkan lagi alasan. Jadi beliieve-nya itu karena sudah ada laporan banyak kematian itu. Dua puluh tahun kemudian ... apa itu ... kematian orang itu lebih meningkat. Dan selanjutnya jumlahnya itu ternyata sudah apa ... berlipat, berlipat ganda, jadi dua kali lipat. Jadi dua kalimat ini masih melanjutkan, em, menguatkan alasan “belief”-nya authorities.

(Yeah, so, the sentences “Twenty years ....,” and “At present ....,” both confirmed the reason for the authorities’ belief. Their belief was due to the report on the large number of deaths. Twenty years later, the number of deaths increased. And, then, the number proved to double. So these two sentences still continued, um, confirmed the reason for the authorities’ belief.)

Arriving at the concluding sentence, Sil read and reread it silently, reported an ambiguity of the message, monitored her comprehension, reread the sentence aloud, attempted a paraphrase, reread the sentence chunk by chunk while giving its interpretation, identified a logical problem, provided an illustration, monitored her comprehension, reread (subvocalised) the sentence, and revised the paraphrase of the sentence partially incorrectly:

Ee ... apa ya. Agok kurang jelas ini. “However, generally it would seem probable that population increase ....”, Jadi ... mungkin meningkatnya jumlah kematian itu nggak cuma karena penyakit itu berkembang, tapi karena memang penduduknya bertambah. Tingkat harapan hidup? Apa hubungannya meningkatnya usia harapan hidup dengan ... berkembangnya angka kematian itu. Saya nggak ngeri, Ya, jadi ada empat penyebab di sini. Pertama, yaitu bertambahnya penduduk. Kalau ada orang 10 mungkin yang sakit satu, tapi kalau orangnya 1000 kan jadi 100. Terus yang nggak saya pahami itu usia harapan hidup. Apa hubungannya? Kamungkinan, ya, kalau umur 10 tahun mungkin belum terkena, tapi semakin tua mungkin akan terkena. Terus mungkin diagnostiknya ... terhadap penyakit ini belum tepat. Dan ... pendataan kematian orang itu mungkin belum begitu tepat. Jadi penyebabnya ada empat: karena tambahnya populasi, meningkatnya harapan hidup, dan belum tepatnya metode diagnosis, dan pendataan orang yang mati, death certification.

(Um ... what’s this? It’s rather ambiguous. “However, generally it would seem probable that population increase ....”. So the death rate increase is not due only to the development of the disease, but also because of the population increase. Life
expectancy? What is its relation to the death rate increase? I don't understand this. Yeah, there are four causes here. First, it's the population increase. If there are ten people, there will be only one person ill; but if there are 1000 people, there will be 100 ill. What I don't understand is the life expectancy. What is its relation? Perhaps, yeah, at the age of ten, one will not be affected by the disease, but as he/she grows older, he/she may be attacked by the disease. Then the diagnostic methods have not been accurate and neither has the death certification. So there are four reasons: population increase, improved life expectancy, and inaccurate diagnostic methods and death certification.)

Retellings

Sil's retelling of Text 1 was almost complete, covering the theme, the main idea, and 80% of the details. She summarised the gist of the early and later parts of the text before providing a detailed explanation and illustrations. She also related the text to her background knowledge and experience and reflected on her opinion beyond the information given in the text. Despite the opportunity offered to reread the text before retelling, she maintained her mistaken reading of "years" for "months" in the think-aloud session: "So the changes were, among others, um, extending ... the obligatory study from six to nine years". As a matter of fact, the text says "... from five to six months".

Her retelling of Text 2 covered the theme, the incomplete main idea, and 43% of the details. Like her retelling of Text 1, her retelling of Text 2 also retained her misunderstanding of the last sentence during the think-aloud session. Despite being given the opportunity to reread the text before retelling, her rereading did not seem to alter her faulty inference of the two causes of death rate increase. Instead of "more accurate diagnosis and death certification" she claimed "inaccurate diagnostic methods and death certification" to be two of the four causes of death rate increase.

In-depth interview: Discussion of test answers

Like most of the other informants, Sil recognised that the author's use of the quotation marks for the word "waste" was to indicate her disagreement that education was a waste of time. The interview revealed that Sil analysed the word
"reform" into its constituents "re-" (again) and "form" (shape). Thus "reform" means "reshape for the better" or "try to change things for the better."

Despite Sil's claim that Text 2 would be more difficult than Text 1, her knowledge of the topic obtained from her Biology class in high school helped her general comprehension of the text, particularly the early part of the text, which confirmed the importance of background knowledge in text comprehension. Similarly, her comprehension of the newspaper article "RI welcomes aid to combat fires" was also aided by her prior knowledge obtained from other mass media. However, she could answer correctly seven out of the eight questions related to Text 1, and only four out of the eight questions related to Text 2. It appeared that her general knowledge of the topic obtained from her high school was not directly related to the specific items included in the comprehension test.

Observations

The observation notes confirmed Sil's claim that in reading books she often marked or highlighted the text and made a summary of the content. The text she used for the think-aloud task was indeed full of underlines, arrow marks, circles, abbreviations of points she made, and numerals (in Text 2) to identify the four causes of the increase in the death rate from coronary heart disease.

Reading texts in a reading test

When asked about her strategies in reading texts in a reading test, Sil said that she read the text quickly (skimmed the text), read the questions and reread the text to find the answers to the questions. Whether or not she would read the text in detail depended on the time available and the level of difficulty of the questions. She sometimes found that she could answer the questions correctly although she could not comprehend the text thoroughly.
Reading newspapers

She mentioned that newspapers use vocabulary of every day language, but the message was often presented in an unusual sentence construction. For example, she often had to guess the meaning of a topic because it was not written in the form of a complete sentence. Fortunately, she could relate it to the information she obtained from other mass media so that it was not too difficult to obtain the gist of a newspaper article. For example, she comprehended the newspaper article about the forest fires in Indonesia well, because she had prior knowledge about the topic from Indonesian newspapers and television broadcasts. The gist was all she needed in reading a newspaper, and guessing meaning based on the context was a strategy she most often used.

Reading books

When asked about the strategies used in reading books recommended by the lecturers she claimed that she wrote notes or put marks on important points on the pages. She usually also made a summary after reading each section of a recommended book. When asked about the problems faced in reading books, she considered vocabulary to be the main source of her problems. To overcome the problems she usually guessed meaning based on context. Unlike reading texts in a reading test, she did not usually focus her attention on individual sentences, but on the discourse. Despite problems she faced in individual sentences, she kept on reading as long as she could obtain the gist of a paragraph or a section of the text. However, when guessing did not help, she would look up the words in the dictionary. Another problem she faced in some books, such as books on linguistics, usually concerned concepts. To overcome this problem she would read it over and over and attempt to infer the essence. To ensure her understanding she often discussed it with her classmates.
Appendix 5.16

Dynamics of strategy use of the fifteen readers in reading Texts 1 and 2 (expressed in codes)

Reader 1 (Dan)

Text 1
1 [skim-rd-monit-rerd-infer-assoc-par]
2 [rd-assoc-infer-reflec-eval]
3 [rd-inter-infer-eval]
4 [rd-rerd-infer-eval-assoc-reflec-eval-infer-eval]
5 [rd-inter-par-assoc-reflec]
6 [rd-infer-eval-assoc-reflec-assoc-reflec]
7 [rd-rerd-assoc-pred-par-illus-reflec-par]

Text 2
1 [rd-idkey-infer-assoc-eval-monit-rerd-correc-infer-eval]
2 [rd-assoc-par-rodal-eval-illus-par]
3 [rd-inter-par-illus-reflec]
4 [rd-refstra-reflec-par]
5 [rd-refstra-assoc-par]
6 [rd-monit-rerd-par-refstra-illus-par]
7 [rd-infer-par]
8 [rd-inter-scan-infer-par]
9 [rd-par-infer]
10 [rd-monit-rerd-par-idprobl-vocal-monit-vocal-reflect-monit-par]

Reader 2 (Min)

Text 1
1 [skim-rd-monit-rerd-par-infer]
2 [rd-subvoc-inter-rerd-par-monit-vocal-idkey-subvoc-par-illus-idkey-refstra]
3 [rd-rerd-vocal-infer-refer-idkey-monit-inter-illus-infer-monit-confirm]
4 [rd-idprob-restate-monit-reflec-monit-par-eval]
5 [rd-monit-rerd-vocal-inter-par-pred]
7 [rd-infer-monit-rerd-vocal-inter-monit-par]

Text 2:
1 [rd-assoc-infer-reflec]
2 [rd-assoc-eval-par]
3 [rd-par-monit-rerd-par]
4 [rd-idprob-rerd-panel-guess-monit-rerd-par-reflec-infer]
Reader 3 (Eki)

Text 1:
1 [rd-idprob-reflec-infer-par-infer]
2 [skim-inter-infer-par-idprob-par-rerd-infer-idprob-idkey-eval-infer]
3 [rd-inter-infer-rerd-inter-infer-refstra]
4 [rd-inter-infer-par-pred]
5 [scan-confirm-vocal-pred]
6 [skim-inter-confirm-restate-infer]
7 [rd-monit-idkey-intra-infer-assoc-infer-illus]

Text 2:
1 [rd-reflec-idprob-assoc-wanal-guess-infer]
2 [rd-idprob-monit-rerd-idkey-refstra-infer]
3 [rd-inter-reflec-infer-refer]
4 [rd-vocal-idprob-rerd-guess-infer-assoc-infer]
5 [subvoc-reflec-idkey-pred-infer-idkey-infer]
6 [rdal-rd-idkey-par-vocal-reflec-infer]
7 [rd-rerd-idkey-infer-vocal-refer]
8 [rd-monit-rerd-vocal-reflec-idprob-idkey-infer]
9 [rdal-infer-idprob-idkey-infer-assoc-illus-rerd-monit-infer]

Reader 4 (Yan)

Text 1
1 [rd-idprob-vocal-guess-monit-rerd-infer-refstra-pred]
2 [rd-confirm-par-infer]
3 [rd-idprob-inter-refstra-monit-infer]
4 [rd-infer-monit-rdal-conf]
5 [rd-inter-infer-par-refstra]
6 [rd-idprob-guess-par-monit-idprob-reflec]
7 [rd-par-eval-refstra-illus-pred]
Text 2
1 [skim-idkey-infer-assoc-infer-assoc-reflec]
2 [rd-assoc-disconf-vocal-infer-illus]
3 [rd-erd-assoc-corec-infer-reflec]
4 [rd-idprobl-vocal-guess-par-infer]
5 [rd-idprobl-reflec-refstra-rerd-monitor-rerd-vocal-intra-refstra-infer-erdprobl-refstra]
6 [rd-erd-inter-reflec-idprobl-assoc-infer-refstra]
7 [rd-confirm-inter-infer-refstra-confirm]
8 [rd-inter-infer-confirm]
9 [skim-par-infer-reflec-corec-sum]

Reader 5 (Lat)

Text 1
1 [rd-reflec-infer]
2 [rd-infer-eval-idkey-illus]
3 [rd-infer-illus-infer]
4 [rd-par-illus-assoc-par]
5 [rd-eval-assoc-illus-infer-assoc-reflec]
6 [rd-infer-assoc-illus]
7 [rd-infer-eval-illus]

Text 2
1 [rd-idkey-vocal-eval-reflec]
2 [rd-infer-par-infer-illus]
3 [rd-idkey-vocal-infer-inter-sum]
4 [rd-infer-reflec-inter-par]
5 [rd-par-infer-refer-assoc-illus]
6 [rd-idkey-par-assoc]
7 [rd-infer]
8 [rd-inter-infer]
9 [rd-infer-assoc-reflec]
10 [skim-infer-assoc-reflec]

Reader 6 (Gio)

Text 1
1 [rd-idprobl-vocal-rerd-guess-infer-assoc-reflec]
2 [Rd-idprobl-vocal-assoc-guess-par-assoc-idprobl-assoc-infer-monitor-refstra-reflec]
3 [rd-idprobl-guess-rdal-par-illus]
4 [rdal-eval-reflec-par-reflec]
5 [rdal-idprobl-monitor-par]
6 [rdal-vocal-infer-eval-illus-par-assoc-eval-infer]
Reader 7 (Tam)

Text 1:
1 [subvoc-sanal-infer-idprobl-guess-monit-reflec-infer]
2 [Rd-vocal-refstra-sanal-assoc-reflec-vocal-monit-infer-idprobl-monit-sum]
3 [rd-inter-monit-infer]
4 [rd-reflec-par-eval-pred-idprobl-reflec]
5 [rd-confirm-idprobl-inter-monit-par]
6 [rd-rerd-assoc-reflec-infer]
7 [rd-infer-assoc-reflec-monit-reflec-infer-refer-vocal-monit-guess-sum]

Text 2:
1 [rd-rerd-idprobl-vocal-monit-infer-reflec-assoc-infer-eval]
2 [rd-sanal-idprobl-vocal-monit WANal-assoc-rerd-par]
3 [rd-idprobl-rerd-vocal-par-illus-infer-refstra]
4 [skim-idprobl-rerd-assoc-guess-par-illus]
5 [rd-idprobl-rerd-sanal-illus-par]
6 [rd-reflec-monit-par]
7 [rd-inter-par]
8 [rd-idkey-vocal-panal-infer-panal-infer]
9 [rd-rerd-vocal-monit-par-infer]
10 [rd-idprobl-reflec-monit-guess-monit]-par-monit-infer-eval

Reader 8 (Lia)

Text 1
1 [Rd-monit-rerd-idkey-monit-rerd-infer-idkey-pred-monit-rerd-correct]
2 [Rd-confir-rdal-assoc-eval-assoc-monit-reflec].
3 [Rd-monit-rd-inter-infer-refstra-monit-infer]
4 [Rd-confir-par-reflec]
Text 2
1[rdd-idkey-infer-pred-idkey-pred-par]
2[rdd-rerd-idkey-vocal-rerd-intra-par]
3[rdd-idkey-rerd-vocal-infer-assoc-pred-refer-disconf]
4[rdd-idkey-rerd-monitor-rerd-sanal-rerd-wanal-assoc-infer-rerd-par]
5[rdd-par-subvocal-rerd-monitor-vocal-sanal-par-monitor-idprobl-rerd-infer-monitor-par]
6[rdd-rdal-inter-confin-par]
7[rdd-inter-infer-illus]
8[rdd-inter-infer]
9[rdd-infer-rdal-infer-monitor-rerd-reflec-rerd-sanal-infer]

Reader 9 (Fer)

Text 1
1[rdd-reflec-infer-pred-reflec]
2[rdd-monitor-refstra-rerd-reflec-idprob-sanal-idprob-assoc-rerd-conf-par-infer-monitor]
3[rdd-idkey-monitor-par-reflec]
4[rdd-conf-par-assoc-reflec-illus-reflec]
5[rdd-idprob-reflec-guess-monitor-par-pred-reflec]
6[rdd-rerd-par-infer-reflec]
7[rdd-inter-skim-inter-par]

Text 2
1[rdd-assoc-par-reflec]
2[rdd-idprob-vocal-monitor-rerd-idkey-infer]
3[rdd-rerd-sanal-idprob-rerd-idkey-infer-illus]
4[rdd-rerd-idprob-vocal-assoc-par-monitor-infer]
5[rdd-par-monitor-rerd-infer]
6[rdd-idprob-guess-par-illus-idprob-assoc-infer-idprob-rerd-guess-infer]
7[rdd-idkey-pred-par]
8[rdd-infer-refstra-idprob-monitor-infer-illus-reflec-monitor-rerd-conf]
9[rdd-reflec-par-vocal-sanal-conf]
10[rdd-reflec-rerd-idprob-monitor-eval-reflec]
Reader 10 (Eba)

Text 1
1 [rd-rerd-idkey-infer]
2 [rd-rerd-par-reflec-conf]
3 [rd-idprob-vocal-guess-par]
4 [rd-vocal-inter-infer-par-assoc-reflec]
5 [rd-idkey-assoc-rerd-vocal-inter-par-idprob-guess]
6 [rd-idprob-assoc-par-idprob-guess-sum-reflec]
7 [rd-rerd-par-eval]

Text 2
1 [rd-rdal-infer-pred-assoc-reflec]
2 [rd-rerd-vocal-rerd-par-assoc-illus]
3 [rd-rerd-par-monit-par]
4 [rd-rerd-idprob-vocal-assoc-illus-par]
5 [rd-reflec-sanal-monit-rerd-vocal-idprob-refstra-par-monit-par-infer]
6 [rd-rerd-vocal-guess-par-infer-eval-illus-reflec]
7 & 8 [rd-inter-vocal-reflec-sum]
9 [rd-rerd-monit-par-inter-conf]
10 [rd-subvoc-rerd-infer-par-sum]

Reader 11 (Yun)

Text 1
1 [rd-infer-idprob-infer]
2 [rd-infer-idprob-vocal-guess-par-idprob-infer-assoc-reflec]
3 [assoc-rd-infer-par]
4 [rd-idkey-infer-assoc-refstra]
5 [rd-idprob-vocal-infer-par]
6 [rd-idprob-vocal-assoc-guess-par-idkey-par-assoc-infer]
7 [rd-rerd-vocal-inter-monit-assoc-par-refstra]

Text 2
1 [rd-idkey-assoc-infer-pred]
2 [rd-rerd-idprob-idkey-intra-infer]
3 [rd-idprob-guess-par]
4 [rd-rerd-idkey-vocal-infer-refstra-assoc-infer]
5 [rd-idprob-rerd-sanal-assoc-pred-monit-rerd-inter-par]
6 [rd-inter-infer]
7 [rd-idkey-vocal-infer-reflec]
8 [rd-idprob-vocal-inter-panal-guess-par]
9 [rd-rerd-idkey-vocal-guess-rerd-par]
10 [rd-monit-rerd-idprob-inter-idprob-reflec-infer-refstra]
Reader 12 (Ací)

Text 1
1[rdal-subvoc-par-pred-assoc-reflec]
2[rdal-subvoc-reflec-rerd-vocal-subvoc-assoc-infer-eval]
3[rdal-idprob-inter-infer]
4[rdal-monit-rd-par-infer]
5[rdal-rd-idprob-guess-illus-par]
6[rdal-par-eval-assoc-reflec]
7[rdal-infer-eval-illus]

Text 2
1[rd-rdal-par]
2[subvoc-assoc-par-assoc-vocal-monit-eval]
3[rd-vocal-monit-par-infer-assoc-illus]
4[rdal-reflec-idprob-guess-illus-infer]
5[rd-rdal-infer-monit-reflec-monit-refstra]
6[rd-monit-rdal-inter-infer-rd-correc-infer-illus-rerd-par-idprob-guess-infer]
7[rd-idkey-vocal-infer]
8[rd-infer-inter-rdal-monit-rdal-idprob-guess-par-inter-illus]
9[rdal-infer-inter-illus-idprob-guess-confirm]
10[rdal-monit-infer-rerd-vocal-eval-par]

Reader 13 (Sur)

Text 1
1[rd-idprob-reflec-par-refstra-par]
2[rd-rerd-idprob-guess-monit-inter-assoc-infer]
3[rd-inter-assoc-par]
4[rd-par-monit-par-assoc-reflec-infer]
5[rd-idprob-guess-monit-rerd-confirm-infer]
6[skim-reflec-par-idprob-guess-inter-par-assoc-eval-illus]
7[rd-par-infer-par]

Text 2
1[skim-inter-infer-pred-idprob-vocal-infer-par]
2[rd-reflec-rdal-monit-idprob-vocal-guess-par-inter-par-reflec-assoc]
3[rd-rdal-guess-refstra-rerd-par-illus-par]
4[rdal-idprob-reflec-vocal-rerd-intra-infer-reflec-par-reflec]
5[Rd-rerd-monit-rdal-par-monit-idprob-guess-par-reflec-par-refstra]
6[rd-rdal-idprob-par-inter-par]
7[rd-inter-confirm-par]
8[rd-infer-inter-refstra-confirm]
9[rd-rdal-infer]
10[rd-rdal-par-idprob-infer-rerd-par]
Reader 14 (Tin)

Text 1
1 [rd-idprob-refstra-par-refstra]
2 [rd-par-idprob-guess-assoc-illus-infer]
3 [rd-inter-subvoc-par-assoc-eval-reflec]
4 [rd-reflec-par-eval-illus]
5 [rd-par-idprob-guess-par-rerd-idprob-vocal-guess-monit-refstra]
6 [rd-par-idprob-reflec-guess-assoc]
7 [rd-idprob-par-monit-rerd-par-illus-eval]

Text 2
1 [rd-assoc-par-illus-reflec]
2 [rd-idprob-reflec-rerd-vocal-par-vocal-refstra-infer]
3 [rd-idprob-vocal-intra-infer-rdal-par-rdal-intra-pred]
4 [rd-rerd-vocal-par-refstra-par-infer]
5 [rd-idprob-rerd-par-intra-rdal-infer-sanal-infer]
6 [rd-rerd-idprob-vocal-par-assoc-infer]
7 [rd-rdal-par-infer-pred-reflec]
8 [rd-rdal-par-idprob-infer-sanal-infer-monit-rerd-infer]
9 [rd-rdal-par-infer]
10 [rd-idprob-rerd-vocal-idprob-rdal-infer-refstra-par]

Reader 15 (S1l)

Text 1
1 [rd-par-monit-rerd-infer-assoc-reflec-eval]
2 [rd-idprob-rerd-par-intra-illus-par-reflec-eval]
3 [rd-par-monit-rerd-inter-par]
4 [rd-inter-par-assoc-reflec-par]
6 [rd-inter-rdal-par-assoc-illus-reflec]
7 [rd-monit-rerd-par-eval-illus]

Text 2
1 [rd-par-idprob-guess-assoc-pred-reflec-infer-refstra-assoc-infer]
2 [rd-assoc-rerd-eval-par]
3 [rd-infer-rerd-idprob-monit-rerd-vocal-guess-par-reflec]
4 [rd-rerd-idprob-vocal-monit-intra-par-assoc-infer]
5 [rd-rerd-idprob-rerd-sanal-infer-monit-rerd-intra-confirm-par]
6 [rd-rerd-idprob-guess-monit-rerd-par-assoc-reflec]
7 [rd-rerd-inter-infer-vocal-par]
8 & 9 [rd-inter-rd-inter-infer-par-infer]
10 [rd-rerd-eval-monit-rerd-par-rerd-par-idprob-illus-monit-rerd-correc-par]
Appendix 5.17

Scoring guide for text retelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed aspect</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>Text 2</td>
<td>Texts 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information beyond text</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.18
Correlations between MC test and Retelling scores

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance 00001</th>
<th>Variance 00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.476*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.19
Correlations between the percentages of the correct inferences and paraphrases made by the individual readers and their multiple-choice test scores

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's tau_b</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.524*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.524*</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.20

Correlations between the percentages of the correct inferences and paraphrases and the retelling scores

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.810**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.21

Correlations between the grade index average of Readings 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the multiple-choice test scores

**Nonparametric Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.746*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.22
Correlations between the grade index average of Readings 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the Retelling scores

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.947**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.23
Correlations between the grade index average of Readings 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the multiple-choice test and retelling scores

**Nonparametric Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau-b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.888**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).**
Appendix 5.24

Correlations between the TOEFL score (representing language competence) and MC test and Retelling scores

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall’s tau_b Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.478*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.25
Correlations between the retelling score and the time spent

**Nonparametric Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tau-b</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.483*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau-b</td>
<td>-0.483*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.26
Correlations between the number of strategies used and the retelling score

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.27

Correlations between the number of strategies used and the multiple-choice test score

Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's tau_b</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>VAR00001</th>
<th>VAR00002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.476*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.476*</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VAR00001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAR00002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix 5.28

Examples of marks and notes a number of readers made on the given texts

Texts for the actual think-aloud tasks

Text 1

(Quoted from *Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL* by Deborah Phillips, 1996, pp. 62-3)

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the American educational system was desperately in need of reform. • Private schools existed, but only for the very rich, and there were very few public schools because of the strong sentiment that children who would grow up to be laborers should not “waste” their time on education but should instead prepare themselves for their life’s work. • It was in the face of this public sentiment that educational reformers set about their task. • Horace Mann, probably the most famous of the reformers, felt that there was no excuse in a republic for any citizen to be uneducated. • As Superintendent of Education in the state of Massachusetts from 1837 to 1848, he initiated various changes, which were soon matched in other school districts around the country. • He extended the school year from five to six months and improved the quality of teachers by instituting teacher education and raising their salaries. • Although these changes did not bring about a sudden improvement in the educational system, they at least increased public awareness as to the need for a further strengthening of the system. •
Text 2

(Quoted from *The Penguin Practice Book for the TOEFL Test*
by Daniel De Souza, 1996, p. 26)

There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species of the animal kingdom. Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificates issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths had risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. However, generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.
Text 2

(Quoted from *The Penguin Practice Book for the TOEFL Test*
by Daniel De Souza, 1996, p. 26)

There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species of the animal kingdom. Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificates issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths had risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. However, generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.
There can be few people who have not heard of coronary heart disease. The illness is no respecter of persons and may strike presidents of super-powers or the ordinary man in the street. Primarily a disease of advancing age, it also frequently attacks the middle-aged and, in some cases the young. The "furring up" of arteries, which is the basic cause of coronary conditions, is also found in other species of the animal kingdom. Although coronary heart disease has occurred throughout the ages and was well known to doctors by the eighteenth century, the rapid advance in the diagnostic methods and improved treatment, together with the publicity given by the media, has made it appear to be on the increase. Some authorities believe that this increase is real and call coronary heart disease or cardiovascular disease a "modern epidemic". The number of people dying of this disease according to death certificates issued in California during 1942 was 18,591. Twenty years later the number of recorded deaths had risen to 102,478, more than a five-fold increase. At present the number of deaths annually from cardiovascular disease is more than twice those due to all forms of cancer. However, generally it would seem probable that population increases, improved life expectancy, and more accurate diagnosis and death certification are responsible for this rise in the cardiovascular disease death rate.
Appendix 5.29
Examples of notes the researcher made on the observation sheets

Observation sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>When/Related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td>// \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvocalisation</td>
<td>//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression/reread</td>
<td>\ / \ /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing at text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding head/nose, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing of relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frowning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking text sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Observation sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>When/Related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvocalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression/reread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing at text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding head/nose, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing of relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frowning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking text sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomena</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>When/Related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvocalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression/reread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing at text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding head/nose, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing of relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frowning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking text sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observation sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>When/Related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvocalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression/reread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing at text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding head/nose, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing of relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frowning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing relaxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking text sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional notes:
- TA: Entry-up
- Discussion: Test answer