VNU Journal of Science: Foreign Studies, Vol. 32, No. 4 (2016) 52-63

A Modified Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) - a Good Instrument to Assess Students' Reading Strategy Use

Nguyen Thi Bich Thuy*

College of Techniques, Economics and Trade, Phu Lam, Ha Dong, Hanoi, Vietnam

Received 25 August 2016
Revised 24 November 2016, Accepted 29 November 2016

Abstract: Reading comprehension is one of the most important factors in English language learning for all students because it provides the basis for a substantial amount of learning in education [1, 2]. Being aware of the importance of reading strategies and their impact on language learning researchers all over the world have taken a lot investigations into this field. This paper is an attempt to synthesize the most popular approaches to categorize reading strategies and proposes an effective instrument to assess students' reading strategy use.

Keywords: Reading strategies, reading strategy classification, reading comprehension, readers.

1. Introduction

Reading plays a crucial role in language learning. It is one of the most important language skills that students should be equipped with. It is through reading that students access a lot of information concerning the target language and culture. For either ESL or EFL learners (English as a second or foreign language), it is the important skill to master in order to ensure success in language learning [3]. After all, reading is the basis of instruction in all aspects of language learning [4].

Erler & Finkbeiner [5] have proposed a quite comprehensive definition of reading in which they state that reading comprehension has been conceived of as the result of complex interactions between text, setting, reader, reader's background, reading strategies, first and second language, and reader decision-making. Comprehension is enhanced when the reader actively uses his/her cognitive strategies such as comprehension strategies in the reading process. In order to read effectively, readers always try to draw selectively on a range of strategies, which are determined by readers' purpose, text type, and context [6].

2. Reading strategies and their classifications

Reading strategies indicate how readers conceive a task, what textual cues they attend to, how they make sense of what they read, and what they do when they do not understand [7]. Reading strategies refer to "the mental operations involved when readers purposefully approach a text and make sense of what they read" [8].

Koda [9: 205] characterizes reading strategies with three core elements: "deliberate, goal/problem-oriented, and reader-initiated/controlled". Sharing the similar view,

* Tel.: 84-989125552
Email: bichthuy.ctet@gmail.com

Afflerbach et al., [10: 11] indicate that reading skills are "automatic actions that result in decoding, comprehension and fluency" while reading strategies are "deliberate, goal-directed attempts to control and modify the reader's efforts to decode text, understand words, and construct meaning out of text".

Researchers in reading strategy studies have utilized different strategy types when categorizing reading strategies. Numerous classifications of reading strategies based on contrasting criteria have been proposed by different authors [7-14]. Each existing classification system in and on itself involves an implicit theory about the nature of reading strategies. However, how best use of the strategies presented by the authors can be made depends on types of readers and their reading purposes. Though using appropriate strategies for leaning a language helps learners think and process the target language in specific contexts [15-17]. In fact, how many strategies are available to learners to assist them in second/foreign learning and how these strategies should be classified are open to debate [18]. Consequently, it is very puzzling for teachers and researchers as to which classification system to follow when they conduct any research on reading strategy. In this part of the article a comparison of the most used reading strategy classifications by three authors namely O'Malley & Chamot [11], Oxford [12] and Mokhtari & Sheorey [14] will be presented.

2.1. Comparing the O'Malley & Chamot's (1990) System and the Oxford's (1990) System

O'Malley and Chamot's [11] reading strategy system, which derived from cognitive psychological theory of information processing [19], [20], distinguishes three broad types of reading strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective (or sometimes called socio-affective or social-affective). Oxford [12] classifies learning strategies into two major areas: direct and indirect strategies which are subdivided into a total six classes (memory, cognitive, and compensation under the direct class; metacognitive, affective, and social under the indirect class). However, in research practice, particularly in the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and Strategy Applications Listed According to Reading Skill, Oxford did not use the direct/ indirect dichotomy. In fact, she introduces fifty reading strategies divided into memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies.

There is a considerable degree of overlap exists between the two strategy systems, although there are also many differences. The table above indicates that O'Malley and Chamot's [11] metacognitive strategies generally match those of Oxford [12]. The general functions of this category are planning, organizing, and evaluating one's own reading process.

The number of metacognitive strategies introduced by O'Malley & Chamot [11] and Oxford [12] are nearly the same (seven compared with eight) and the two systems share six metacognitive strategies. According to Oxford [12] paying attention strategy involves two modes: directed attention and selective attention. However, these two strategies are separated in O'Malley & Chamot's [11] system. Besides that O'Malley & Chamot [11] add problem identification strategy and Oxford [12] adds four more (Overviewing and linking with already known material, identifying the purpose of a language task, setting goals and objectives, and seeking practice opportunities). It can also be said from this difference that setting goals and purpose of reading is considered important in Oxford's [12] system while O'Malley and Chamot [11] ignore this. In general metacognitive strategies are quite consistent in both classifications.

The cognitive strategies of O'Malley and Chamot [11] roughly correspond to a combination of Oxford's cognitive and memory strategies although the number of strategies of these two systems are quite different (eleven and twenty four, respectively). There are also

six cognitive strategies and eight memory strategies in Oxford's [12] classification. In addition, inferencing strategy of O'Malley and Chamot's [11] system is listed as a compensation strategy in Oxford's [12] (Using linguistic and other clues to guess- of guessing intelligently strategy set). The reason for this, according to Oxford [12] is that this strategy is essential to make up for inadequate knowledge while reading.

Table 1. Similar strategies of the Reading Strategy Systems by O'Malley & Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990)

O'Malley & Chamot (1990)	Oxford (1990)
METACOGNITVE STRATEGIES	
Planning (M)	Planning for a language task (M)
Directed attention (M)	Paying attention (M)
Selected attention (M)	
Self-evaluation (M)	Self- evaluating(M)
Self-monitoring (M)	Self- monitoring (M)
Self-management (M)	
COGNITIVE STRATEGIES	
Repeating (C)	Repeating (C)
Resourcing (C)	Using resources for receiving and sending messages (C)
Note taking (C)	Taking notes (C)
Summarization (C)	Summarizing(C)
Translation(C)	Translating (C)
Transfer (C)	Transferring (C)
Deduction/ Induction(C)	Reasoning deductively (C)
Grouping (C)	Grouping (ME)
Elaboration (C)	Associating/Elaborating (ME)
Inferencing(C)	Using linguistic clues (Com), Using other clues (Com)
SOCIO-AFFECTIVE STRATEGIES	
Cooperation (SA)	Cooperating with peers (S)
Questioning for clarification (SA)	Asking questions for clarification and verification (S)
Self-reinforcement (SA)	Making positive statements (A) Rewarding yourself (A)
Notes: C: Cognitive strategy; M: Metacognitive strategy; SA: Socio-affective strategy.	Notes: ME: Memory strategy; C: Cognitive strategy; Com: Compensation strategy; M: Metacognitive strategy; A: Affective strategy; S: Social strategy.

In Oxford's [12] taxonomy, memory strategies are separated from the cognitive category because she claims that memory strategies appear to have a very clear, specific function that distinguishes them from many cognitive strategies. Though memory strategies serve cognition, the actions included as memory strategies are particular mnemonic devices that aid learners in moving information to long-term memory for storage purposes and in retrieving it from long-term memory when needed for use. In addition, most of the memory devices do not tend to contribute to deep processing of language information, although cognitive strategies do contribute to deep processing [18].

Both systems mention strategies relating to affective and social interaction. Oxford [12:140-145] claims that affective strategies refer to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values and one of the most basic social interactions is asking questions, an action from which learners gain great benefit. Meanwhile,

social strategies are techniques involving cooperating with other learners. That's a reason Oxford [12] classified affective and social strategies as separate categories and listed six more affective and social strategies than O'Malley and Chamot [11] did. In contrast, affective strategies and social strategies are grouped together in O'Malley and Chamot's [11] system to form a category known as social-affective, socio-affective, or socio-affective strategies.

The reality of applications of O'Malley & Chamot's [11] and Oxford's [12] reading systems has proved that both of them have made an important contribution to and have advanced our understanding of how reading strategies can be systematically categorized.

In their research Hsiao and Oxford [18] suggested that "it may be preferable to subdivide O'Malley and Chamot's [11] cognitive strategies into memory, cognitive, and compensation dimensions than to consider cognitive strategies as a unitary dimension. This further differentiation may make the theory more consistent with students' actual use of strategies for L2 learning. They also added that O'Malley and Chamot's socio-affective strategies should be separated into affective and social dimensions. Hsiao and Oxford [18] also concluded that the six-factor model without the two higher-order strategy constructs is more consistent with learners' strategy use than other models. This supports the idea that Oxford's [12] classification is more comprehensive and detailed; it is more systematic in linking individual strategies, as well as strategy group; and it uses less technical terminology. Furthermore, this comprehensive classification system has provided the foundation for the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), which has been employed in numerous studies across the world to validate the effectiveness of reading strategies to reading comprehension. It is estimated that the SILL has been used in major studies on reading strategies around the world and involved thousands of language learners [21]. Moreover, SILL has been translated into more than twenty languages [17].

However, it appears that there could be other approaches that might help to advance theories of reading strategy classification and explain variability in learners' strategy use as well as or better than the six-factor strategy model.

2.2. Comparing the Systems by Oxford (1990) and Mokhtari & Sheorey (2002)

In 2002, Mokhtari and Sheorey introduced the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS), which is initially inspired by the review and use of another instrument Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) by Mokhtari and Reichard [22] as a measure of students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. The SORS is intended to measure the type and frequency of reading strategies that adolescent and adult ESL students perceive they use while reading academic materials in English.

As mentioned earlier Oxford [12] proposes fifty reading strategies categorized in six groups while there are only thirty strategies divided into three groups in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14] classification.

It can be seen from the table that twenty one strategies in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14] classification can be in line with twenty four strategies by Oxford [12]. The two systems share many strategies such as repeating, guessing, taking notes, using previous knowledge, translating, using clues, etc. though the strategies are categorized differently by the authors. Obviously, some strategies of each system are overlapped. For example, self-monitoring strategy in Oxford's [12] can be expressed by two strategies- checking understanding when coming across new information and checking to see if the guesses about the text are right or wrong in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14], because self-monitoring means notice and correct learners' errors in any of the language skills. For reading, this strategy can be applied when "readers scan or skim, make any

guesses about what will come next, and correct any of misinterpretations as they move ahead"[12]. Or adjusting reading speed according to what being read and deciding what to read closely and what to ignore when reading in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14] show the same activities as self-evaluating in Oxford's [12] since this strategy is defined "Learners might consider whether their speed or comprehension is acceptable at the reading time".

Three cognitive in Oxford's [12] namely analyzing contrastively, analyzing expressions, and recognizing and using formulas and patterns are clearly not different from one problem solving strategy in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14]- guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases when reading.

Moreover, according to Oxford [12:62], using key words strategy has two steps. First, readers identify a familiar word in one's own language or another language that sounds like the new word. Second, the readers generate a visual image of the new word and the familiar one. So, trying to picture or visualize information to remember what has been read strategy in Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14] might be considered the same as Using keywords strategy in Oxford's [12].

Table 2. Similar strategies of the Reading Strategy Systems by Oxford (1990) and Mokhtari & Sheorey (2002)

Oxford (1990)	Mokhtari & Sheorey (2002)
Paying attention (M)	Paying closer attention (P)
Repeating ©	Rereading (P)
Using resources for receiving and sending messages ©	Using reference materials (S)
Grouping (ME)	Finding relationships among ideas (S)
Taking notes ©	Taking notes (S)
Summarizing©	Summarizing (S)
Translating ©	Translating (S)
Cooperating with peers (S)	Discussing with others (S)
Discussing your feelings with someone else (A)	
Transferring ©	Thinking about what known (G)
Reasoning deductively ©	Guessing (G)
Asking questions for clarification and verification (S)	Asking oneself questions (S)
Using linguistic clues (Co)	Using context clues (G)
Using other clues (Co)	Using typographical aids (G)
Overviewing and linking with already known material (M)	Previewing the text (G)
Identifying the purpose of a language task (M)	Having a purpose in mind (G)
Setting goals and objectives (M)	
Getting the idea quickly (C)	Skimming the text (G)
Analyzing expressions (C)	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases (P)
Recognizing and using formulas and patterns (C)	
Analyzing contrastively (C	Critically analyzing and evaluating the information (G)
Highlighting (C)	Underlining or circling information (S)
Using imagery (ME)	Using tables, figures, and pictures in text (G)
Using keywords (ME)	Picturing or visualizing information (P)
Notes: ME: Memory strategy; C: Cognitive strategy; Com: Compensation strategy; M: Metacognitive strategy; A: Affective strategy; S: Social strategy.	Notes: G: Global strategy; P: Problem solving strategy; S: Support strategy.

Transferring and Overviewing and linking with already known material in Oxford's (1990) seem to be overlapped as Oxford [12:85] claims that "transferring means directly applying previous knowledge to facilitate new knowledge in the target language" while Overviewing and linking with already known material strategy involves previewing the basic principles and/or material for an upcoming language activity, and linking these with what the learners already know [12:152]. These two strategies by Oxford [12] show similar targets to Thinking about what known by Mokhtari & Sheorey [14].

It can be easily realized that the two authors show differences from the ways they categorize each strategy. Although Oxford's classification is more comprehensive and detailed, more systematic in linking individual strategies, as well as strategy group, and it uses less technical terminology [12:14] this system seems to be quite complicated with too many strategies (fifty strategies in six groups) which makes it difficult to decide which are the most important to readers' reading process. Furthermore, some strategies in this system may not be effective to readers during their reading process, such as Representing sounds in memory, Using physical response or sensation, Using mechanical techniques, Taking risks wisely, Listening to your body, etc., especially when readers are under time pressure while reading. In addition, there is a tendency to find overlapping strategies, which cannot be attributed to any particular theory of learning [23].

Meanwhile, Mokhtari & Sheorey's [14] classification with thirty strategies categorized in three groups show readers concrete strategies to apply depending on their evaluation on the text difficulty level. Accordingly, global strategies can be used by all readers for all types of reading articles. The more complicated the texts are, the more problem solving and support strategies will be recommended to be used. In fact, the classification by Mokhtari & Sheorey [14] is simply organized and the number of reading strategies are moderate for readers to measure themselves, as Mokhtari & Sheorey [14:2] mentioned: "SORS is presented as a simple and effective tool for enabling students to develop a better awareness of their reading strategies, for teachers assess such awareness, and for assisting students in becoming constructively responsive readers". In addition, many researchers have applied SORS in their studies to investigate readers' strategies used during their reading English academic materials as a foreign/ second language [24], [25]. This is a strong evidence to show the reliability and effectiveness of SORS by Mokhtari & Sheorey [14].

3. A modified SORS

3.1. A proposed modified SORS

SORS was based on the Metacognitve Awareness Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) originally developed by Mokhtari and Richard [14] and the authors removed two items (namely "summarizing information read" and "discussing what one reads with others"). Mokhtari and Sheorey's [14] explanation for this is that because the two items do not specifically constitute reading strategies as conceived in the current research literature review on metacognition and reading comprehension. However, these two strategies are considered necessary for readers, especially for people who read English for specific academic purposes. Furthermore, these two items also appear in Oxford's [12] strategy taxonomy, which has been also used by a lot of reading strategy researchers.

Based on the explanation above, an SORS with some modification by adding two more mentioned strategies might be recommended in reading strategy research. Thirty two statements grounded by thirty two strategies can be used as the main part of a questionnaire to investigate readers' strategy use. The strategies are divided into three categories proposed by Mokhtari and Richard [14]. They are described as followings:

1. Global reading strategies (13 items originally) refer to intentional, carefully planned techniques by which learners monitor or manage their reading. They can be thought of as generalized or global reading strategies aimed at setting the stage for the reading act (for instance, setting purpose for reading, previewing text content, predicting what the text is about, etc.).

2. Problem-solving strategies (8 items originally) are related to actions and procedures that the readers use while working directly with the text. These strategies are localized, focused problem-solving or repair strategies used when problems develop in understanding textual information (for example, checking one's understanding upon encountering conflicting information, re-reading for better understanding, etc.).

3. Support strategies (9 items originally) are a set of mechanisms intended to aid the reader in comprehending the text such as using a dictionary, taking notes, underling, or highlighting textual information. These strategies involve using the support mechanisms or tools aimed at sustaining responsiveness to reading (such as use of reference materials like dictionaries and other support systems) [15:4].

These three classes of strategies interact with and support each other when used in the process of constructing meaning from text. Below is a proposed modified SORS.

No.	Strategies
	Global strategies
1	G.1 I have a purpose in mind when I read.
2	G.2 I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.
3	G.3 I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.
4	G. 4. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.
5	G.5 I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.
6	G I.6 When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.
7	G.7 I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.
8	G.8 I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.
9	G.9 I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.
10	G.10 I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.
11	G.11 I check my understanding when I come across new information.
12	G.12 I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.
13	G.13 I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.
	Problem Solving strategies
14	P.1 I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading.
15	P.2 I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.
16	P.3 I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.
17	P.4 When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.
18	P.5 I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.
19	P.6 I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.
20	P.7 When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.
21	P.8 When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.

	Support Strategies
22	S.1 I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.
23	S.2 When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.
24	S.3 I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.
25	S.4 I use reference materials (e.g., dictionary) to help me understand what I read.
26	S.5 I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.
27	S.6 I go back and forth in the text to find relationship among ideas in it.
28	S.7 I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text
29	S.8 I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text
30	S.9 When reading, I translate from English into my native language
31	S.10 I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding
32	S.11 When reading, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue

3.2. A pilot study

To check the compatibility of the scale and the suitability of the strategies in the modified classification, a pilot study on the sample of 107 cases who were students from three universities in Hanoi, Vietnam, was conducted. Of the 107 students, 44 were male and 63 were female, majoring in accounting, administration and technology.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to check the reliability of the scale inside which indicates the degree of correlation among the variables in each strategy group. Scale gain credibility when Cronbach's alpha is more than 0.6 and a correlation between coefficient variables and total is more than 0.3. The correlation between coefficient variables and total presents the value of a variable correlated with the average score of the other variables in the same scale. The higher this coefficient is the higher the correlation between it and other variables in the group is. The variables correlated between variables and the total smaller than 0.3 are considered as spam and removed [26].

When testing the reliability of the scale, one bad variable was found out, named *I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose*. This variable had a correlation coefficient among other variables of less than 0.3 and when this variable was removed from the model the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient significantly increased (from 0,816 to 0,819). So this variable was removed to guarantee the reliability of the measuring scale.

Another bad variable was also found *I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read*, which had a correlation coefficient among other variables of less than 0.3 (=0,203). However, this strategy was useful for many students. In addition, with this variable the Cronbach's Alpha also reached the necessary reliability (=0.789), so this variable was remained. A survey of reading strategies with thirty one items categorized in three subscales was proposed.

3.3. Main study

To test the reality and the generalization of the proposed SORS, another study was conducted on 928 students from 6 universities in Hanoi (Hanoi University of Water Resources, Banking Academy, Trade Union University, Foreign Trade University, Hanoi Open University, and Vietnam Military Medical University). The students were diverse in terms of gender, major, time length and experiences in English learning including reading comprehension proficiency, etc. The participants aged from 20-22, majoring in Economics, Technology, Finance/Banking, Medicine, and Administrating are second or third year students. They have completed their

general English course and are going to finish their English for specific purposes programmes in their university curricula. After the data cleansing process the number of valid participants was 781. The participants were asked to fill in a questionnaire on English reading strategy use which consisted of two parts:

- Part One was designed to gather the information about individual characteristics of the participants. It required the subjects to supply their ethnographic data, such as gender, age, time of English study, major, their self-assessment on English and reading proficiency.

- Part Two included the proposed SORS mentioned above with thirty one statements appropriate to thirty different strategies categorized in three subscales applied in reading comprehension.

For each questionnaire statement, five alternative choices were provided. Participants were asked to select one from among the followings:

1 for Never or almost never true of me

2 for Usually not true of me

3 for Somewhat true of me

4 for Usually true of me

5 for Always or almost true of me

The higher the number that respondents indicate applied to them, the more frequent the use of the particular strategy was reflected.

After collecting the data, some tests were conducted to determine the validity and reliability of the SORS. Firstly, the assumption of normality of the data collected was examined with Skewness and Kurtosis. The results of the tests revealed that the data were approximately normally distributed, in terms of Skewness and Kurtosis, with z-value were in the span of -1.96 to 1.96. Furthermore, a Shapiro-Wilk's test with $p < 0.05$ [27] and a visual inspection of the histograms, normal Q-Q plots and box plots showed that the scores were also approximately normally distributed [28]. So, the assumption of normality for the data was tenable.

Secondly, the Cronbach's Alpha score was measured to examine the internal consistency of reliability for the modified SORS with the participants for this study. Cronbach's Alpha scores for the modified SORS for reading EGAP texts were 0.926 (Corrected Item-Total Correlation was 0.524) and for reading EGAP texts were 0.932 (Corrected Item-Total Correlation was 0.540), which proved that the modified SORS was highly reliable [26].

Thirdly, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was run to verify scale construction of the strategy classification. The results of KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated a good adequacy to use the data in a factor analysis (KMO = 0.940; Sig <0.05) [29]. It was a surprise that the result of rotated factor matrix showed that the thirty one strategies were categorized in five components, each of which consisted of strategies with significant correlation. Based on the meaning and correlation of strategies of each component, the researcher re-categorized the strategies into five subscales with titles and usage as follows:

No.	Subscale	Usage
1	Overviewing	Used at the first stage of the reading process when the readers plan to monitor or manage their reading.
2	Problem Solving	Used when the readers meet difficulties while working directly with the text
3	Supporting	Used when the readers need aids to understand the text. The aids may be from reference materials or the readers' own ways, or from other readers, for better comprehension.
4	Guessing	Used during reading process, when the readers want to guess the meaning of the text without any aids
5	Information Dealing	Used when the readers want to check their understanding of the read information

At this stage, a full modified SORS with thirty one items categorized in five subscales should be proposed as the followings:

No.	Strategies	1	2	3	4	5
OVERVIEWING STRATEGIES						
1	I have a purpose in mind when I read.					
2	I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.					
3	I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.					
4	I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.					
5	When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.					
6	I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.					
PROBLEM DEALING STRATEGIES						
7	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.					
8	I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.					
9	When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.					
10	I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.					
11	I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading.					
12	When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.					
13	When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.					
SUPPORTING STRATEGIES						
14	I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.					
15	I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it					
16	I use reference materials (e.g., dictionary) to help me understand what I read.					
17	When reading, I translate from English into my native language.					
18	I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.					
19	I go back and forth in the text to find relationship among ideas in it.					
20	I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text					
21	I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding					
GUESSING STRATEGIES						
22	I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.					
23	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.					
24	When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.					
25	I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.					
INFORMATION DEALING STRATEGIES						
26	I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.					
27	I check my understanding when I come across new information.					
28	I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text					
29	I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.					
30	I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.					
31	When reading, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue.					

The results of different necessary tests on the modified SORS have confirmed its reliability. The most significant thing of this modified SORS is that it covers all appropriate strategies proposed by previous authors and helps readers decide what strategies to use at each stage of the readers' reading process. In this way the strategies would be used appropriately which helps reading gain the most effectiveness. Any readers who want to assess their own use of reading strategies themselves, and any researchers who need to investigate students' strategy awareness can use this modified SORS with a Likert scale as proposed above.

4. Conclusion

The modified SORS has twofold usefulness. Firstly, it can help teachers get information to measure students' reading strategy use and to instruct them to comprehend a text in a strategic way. Data obtained from the SORS can be used as a means to monitor students to become effective responsive readers. Secondly, students can use the SORS as an instrument to increase their own awareness of reading strategies. They can evaluate themselves and adjust their way to read more effectively. Application of good strategies will help students become better readers which motivate them to read more and be more interested in language learning.

References

[1] Alvermann, D., & Earle, J. (2003). Comprehension instruction. In A. P. Sweet & C. Snow (Eds.).Rethinking reading comprehension (pp. 12-30). New York: Guilford Press.

[2] Martin-Chang, S.Y., & Gould, O.N. (2008). Revisiting print exposure: Exploring differential links to vocabulary, comprehension and reading rate. Journal of Research in Reading, 31, 273–284.

[3] Alderson, C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language. United States of America, New York. Longman Inc.

[4] Mikulecky, B. S. & Beatrie (1990). A Short Course in Teaching Reading Skills. Longman.

[5] Erler, L., & Finkbeiner, C. (2007). A review of reading strategies: Focus on the impact of first language. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), Language learner strategies. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[6] Wallace, C. (1992). Reading. Oxford University Press.

[7] Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. TESOL Quarterly, 20(3), 463-494.

[8] Brantmeier, C. (2002). Second language reading strategy research at the secondary and university levels: Variations, disparities, and generalizability. The Reading Matrix, 2(3), 1–13.

[9] Koda, K. (2005). Insights into Second Language Reading: A Cross-linguistic Approach.. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[10] Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P., & Paris, S. (2008). Skills and strategies: their differences, their relationships and why it matters. In: Mokhtari, K., Sheorey, R. (Eds.), Reading Strategies of First- and Second-language Learners: See How They Read. Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc., Norwood, MA.

[11] O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[12] Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies. What Every Teacher should know. Boston. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

[13] Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. Modern Language Journal, 75, 460-472.

[14] Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. Journal of Developmental Education, 25, 2-10.

[15] Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25, 112–130.

[16] Cohen, A. D. (2007). Coming to terms with language learner strategies: Surveying the experts. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice (pp. 29-46). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

[17] Oxford,R,.L. (2011). Teaching and researching language learning stratgies. Pearson.Harlow. UK.

[18] Hsiao, T.Y. & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A

confirmatory factor analysis. Modern Language Journal, 86, 368–383.

[19] Brown, A.L., & Palinscar, A.S., (1984). Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Fostering and Comprehension- Monitoring Activities. Cognition and Instruction. 1(2),117-175.

[20] Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. F., Wilkinson, I. A. G., & Scott, J. (1985). Becoming a Nation of Readers. Champaign, Ill.: National Academy of Education and Center for the Study of Reading.

[21] Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan, in R. Oxford (Ed.). Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, 75-88.

[22] Mokhtari, K. & C. Reichard (2002).“Assessing students’ metacognitive awareness of reading strategies”. Journal of Educational Psychology 94: 249-259.

[23] Nambiar, R. (2009). Learning strategy research- where are we now? The Reading Matrix, 9(2), 132-149.

[24] Alsheikh, N. (2011). Three Readers, Three Languages, Three Texts: The Strategic Reading of Multilingual and Multiliterate Readers. The Reading Matrix, 11(1), 34-53.

[25] Monos, K. (2005). A study of the English Reading Strategies of Hungarian University Students with Implications for Reading Instruction in an Academic Context. University of Debrecen, Hungary.

[26] Nunnally & Burnstein (1994). Pschy Chometric Theory. 3rd Edition. McGraw Hill.

[27] Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). Biometrika, 591-611.

[28] Cramer, D., & Howitt, D. L. (2004). The Sage dictionary of statistics: a practical resource for students in the social sciences. Sage.

[29] Hair &ctg (1998). Multivarate Data Analysis. Prentice- Hall International.

SORS - một công cụ hiệu quả để đánh giá việc sử dụng chiến lược đọc của sinh viên

Nguyễn Thị Bích Thủy

Trường Cao đẳng Kinh tế- Kỹ thuật Thương mại, Phú Lãm, Hà Đông, Hà Nội, Việt Nam

Tóm tắt: Đọc hiểu là một trong những yếu tố quan trọng nhất trong việc học tiếng Anh của sinh viên bởi vì nó là cơ sở cho việc học tập lâu dài trong quá trình đào tạo [1, 2]. Nhận thức được tầm quan trọng của các chiến lược đọc và tác động của chúng tới việc học tập ngôn ngữ, các nhà nghiên cứu trên thế giới đã thực hiện rất nhiều khảo sát về lĩnh vực này. Bài viết này nhằm tổng hợp các cách phân loại chiến lược đọc phổ biến nhất và đề xuất một công cụ hiệu quả để đánh giá việc sử dụng chiến lược đọc của sinh viên.

Từ khóa: Chiến lược đọc, phân loại chiến lược đọc, đọc hiểu, người đọc.