

ONLINE READING CULTURE AMONG INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS AT TERTIARY EDUCATION LEVEL

Kirana Safa Dewi¹, Sahiruddin²

¹ Universitas Brawijaya, email: kiranasaifa@student.ub.ac.id

² Universitas Brawijaya, email: shrdn@ub.ac.id

Info Artikel

Sejarah Artikel:
Diterima November 2020
Disetujui November 2020
Dipublikasikan Desember 2020

Abstrak

Selama pandemi COVID-19, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia telah menetapkan pembelajaran secara daring untuk diterapkan di semua jenjang pendidikan. Kondisi ini telah merubah budaya belajar (Kim, 2020) yang ada selama ini dari yang bersifat tatap muka di kelas secara tradisional menjadi kelas online virtual. Salah satu efek dari pembelajaran online adalah siswa atau mahasiswa diharuskan dan didorong untuk membaca materi secara daring sehingga hal ini mengarah pada budaya membaca online. Hal tersebut menyebabkan proses belajar mengajar berubah dengan cepat dari gaya membaca yang awalnya berbasis kertas menjadi daring, sehingga memotivasi penelitian ini untuk menyelidiki apa strategi para siswa saat membaca bacaan dari sumber daring saat kegiatan dalam kelas. Studi ini melibatkan pencarian strategi metakognitif menggunakan *Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS)* yang telah dimodifikasi oleh (Neil J. Anderson, 2003). Beberapa perbedaan potensial dari strategi membaca secara daring yang digunakan oleh kedua kelompok siswa yang memiliki perbedaan preferensi membaca juga ikut diteliti. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa mayoritas siswa menggunakan Strategi Pemecahan Masalah (*Problem Solving*). Implikasi pedagogis penelitian ini juga didiskusikan.

Kata Kunci: *Budaya Membaca Secara Daring; Strategi Membaca; Strategi Metakognitif; Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS)*

Abstract

During COVID-19 pandemic, online learning has been regulated to be applied in all education levels by the ministry of education and culture in Indonesia. This has brought about the changes in learning culture (Kim, 2020) from face-to-face or traditional classroom to online virtual classroom. One of the impacts of online learning is students are required and encouraged to read online materials as to set up new online reading culture. The swift of reading mode from paper-based to online-based in teaching and learning process has motivated this research as to investigate students' strategies in reading from online sources for class activities. This study involves finding out metacognitive strategies using the Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS) which already modified by Anderson (2003). Some potential differences of the online reading strategy used by both groups are also scrutinized. The result of the current study reveals that that majority of the students use Problem Solving Strategies. Pedagogical implications of the study are discussed.

Keywords: Online Reading Culture; Reading Strategies; Metacognitive Strategies; The Online Survey of Reading Strategy (OSORS)

INTRODUCTION

The alarming level of spread and severity of Covid-19 in Indonesia has brought some changes in many aspects, including education. The national policy of implementing full online learning has been chosen to be the best option for healthy purposes. During Covid-19 pandemic, online learning has been regulated to be applied in all education levels by the ministry of education and culture in Indonesia. This condition has brought some changes in learning culture (Kim, 2020), particularly in this context online reading culture. Online reading culture in this study is defined as a as academic values, roles, assumptions, attitudes, and patterns of behaviors common to the learners' culture, particularly in reading culture (Flowerdew & Miller, 1995). In this regard, one of the implications is that students are enforced to read online—whether it is a book, journal, presentation, and so forth—through the screen because reading is one of crucial thing to do in academic field. The swift of reading mode from paper-based to online-based in teaching and learning process has been of interest to examine in a way to what extent students apply method and strategies in reading through online sources. In this case, our students have been forced to build a similar learning culture with the students at the overseas universities. Thus, there has been a process of strengthening the management quality of learning in our higher education atmosphere (Kewuel, 2017).

Reading has been constructed as mental representation of the text or the message or meaning of the text achieved from an interaction between readers' knowledge and text features (Anderson, 2000). Many reading scholars propose that the interaction during reading comprehension can be top-down processing, bottom up processing or interactive (Grabe, 2009). Moreover, during reading process, reader may employ some strategies in dealing with text comprehension. The use of reading strategies in L2 context is common as to bridge the knowledge gap that L2 learners have, and due to the evidence that L2 reading instruction starts before the learner has built up an adequate knowledge of the language which is quite different from L1 context (Koda, 2005). Previous research demonstrated that one of reading strategies mainly used by EFL university students in Iran was support reading strategies (Hatami & Asl, 2017).

Understanding online reading strategies is essential for L2 students as it provides information and horizon how to cope with online reading. In terms of instruction, teachers' understanding of students' online reading strategies are also fundamental as it would inform them in deciding the best condition for enhancing reading development. Teaching students how to utilize the skills and strategies of online reading so that students know how to efficiently read the text online is part of the challenges the teachers meet nowadays. The role of computer and technology or internet has changed the way people read text, and that online reading functions as the source of input for many L2 readers across the world (Anderson,

2003). Coiro (2003) posits that electronic texts have their own impact for individual in their ability to comprehend online text.

Simply defined, according to Anderson (2003), strategies are the conscious actions (observable) that learners take to improve their language learning. Strategies are in nature involving a process of orchestrating more than one action to achieve certain L2 tasks, not one action or in isolation process. There are three types of strategies in reading, i.e. cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, and support strategies. The current study focuses on identifying the use of metacognitive reading strategies during online reading. The reason is because, in reading comprehension, the reader must possess the strategic awareness in order to be able to read properly. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) referred such awareness as metacognition. Furthermore, metacognitive reading strategies play more significant role because students have to connect their strategies in learning while being engaged during online task (Anderson, 2003).

This study involves finding out metacognitive strategies using the Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS) which have already been modified by Anderson (2003). Metacognitive reading strategies can be categorized into three groups: Global strategies, Problem-solving strategies, and Support strategies (Ravi Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). Those three strategies include the items of which differentiate the strategies used among the readers. Based on Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) survey of SORS, each category has different items in the survey; 18 items for GLOB subscale, 11 items of PROB subscale, and 9 items of SUP subscale. Hence, this study scrutinizes the different use in items between EFL students who prefer online reading and those who prefer paper-based reading.

During Covid-19 pandemic, all students are required to read the materials from online platform, whether or not they enjoy reading online. Therefore, understanding reading strategies are expected in helping to facilitate and enhance the comprehension of reading among students (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2008). Metacognitive strategies involve advanced planning and comprehension monitoring techniques (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001), which would be really helpful for students to comprehend the materials from online resources, especially during online class today.

There are several studies concerning metacognitive reading strategies used among students in tertiary level. For instance, Anderson (2003) explored the strategies of online reading among second language readers, as well as the distinctness of their online reading strategies usage between the readers of English as Second Language with English as Foreign Language. Researching a topic regarding the influence of technology towards L2 learners on their online reading strategies has never been identified before. Another study covering the reading strategies were a study conducted by Intan Sari (2016) examining the Indonesian EFL

pre-service teachers' nature of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies along with their performance in reading comprehension.

However, to the best of the researcher's understanding, a little is known about online reading strategies used by learners with different preferences, particularly for online and offline preferences. The idea of comparing the metacognitive reading strategies used between reading preferences among readers is of interest in this study. This research could be significant in contributing to metacognitive reading strategies research with a new focus in fulfilling the students' preferences of reading and would be helpful for the teachers or lecturers so that they could provide the best method to enhance the reading comprehension of their students.

This study attempts to answer these two questions: (1) What are the online reading strategies used by students of study program of English literature, Faculty of Cultural Studies in Brawijaya University?, and (2) Do the online reading strategies (items) from students who prefer online reading differ from those who prefer paper-based reading?

This study examines the online metacognitive reading strategies among university students and the effect of reading preferences on the strategies used. Some potential differences of the online reading strategy used by both groups are also scrutinized.

METHOD

Literature Review

Reading plays an essential role in students' life as it allows the access to knowledge and information about any phenomena happening across the globe, either in print format or digital online format. Reading is a complex cognitive process to build a mental representation of the text, and such meaning representation is a result of an interaction between reader and the text (Anderson, 2000). In this regard, reader is an active actor in retrieving the meaning through the text. Reading scholars proposed reading to be bottom up process where readers start looking at the message of the text from the smallest aspect in the text, such as vocabulary and grammar. Once the readers could understand the meaning of word and syntactic patterns, they can understand the meaning of sentence, paragraph, and the whole text (Grabe, 2009; Wallace, 2001). On the other perspective is top-down approach in looking at reading process where the readers use their background of knowledge to guess the content or meaning of the text (Goodman, 1967). Reading is regarded as a psycholinguistic guessing game. The reader can create the meaning based on his/her own previous knowledge, prior knowledge or schema. Albeit some differences in viewing reading, those two approaches acknowledge the role of reader in reading comprehension process. One of the interests in this study is how reader applies reading strategies in online platform.

Online Reading

As a student, especially a learner of English as Foreign Language (EFL) at tertiary education level, reading is fundamental for understanding the knowledge better as well as an opening to a new knowledge. Anderson (2003) states that the essential language skills which has been confirmed to lead to academic success is reading skills. In context of Indonesia, the readers' linguistic knowledge including vocabulary and grammar has been evident to play significant role in the L2 reading outcomes in online reading tests (Sahiruddin, 2018, 2019). With technology emerging swiftly these past years, many online resources are provided in terms of reading stuffs, whether it is an online journal, electronic book, blog, and so forth. Currently, with the existence of COVID-19 pandemic, students are encouraged to learn the material remotely from their own pace. The learning materials are in online form; thus the students need to read online. Therefore, metacognitive strategies were becoming crucial even more as the advent of technology, internet, digital tools, and technological gadgets made the literacies and learning form and nature changed (Öztürk, 2018).

Metacognitive Reading Strategies

O'Malley and Chamot (1990, p.1) define learning strategies as 'the special thoughts or behaviors that individual use to help them comprehend, learn or retain information'. This suggests that learning strategies are actively and purposively employed by the learners. In addition, the purpose of learning strategies is to 'help build learner's autonomy, which require learner to take conscious control of his or her own learning' (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002, p.369). When this general construct of language learning strategies applied to reading strategies, it can be simply that reading strategies are actions consciously performed for purpose of achieving a particular reading task which can be done in various ways within various contexts.

Classification of reading strategies is also a concern of scholars. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classify the types of strategies into cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, and social/affective strategies. This study focuses only on metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies are originally a category of language learning strategies, including cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, mnemonic or memory related strategies, compensatory strategies, affective strategies, social strategies, and self-motivating strategies. Metacognitive strategies are focused on learners' interaction with the text and include the strategies like monitoring and evaluating. In context of reading, monitoring and evaluation are referring mostly to reader's comprehension of the text.

The current study only focuses on the metacognitive strategies. Vandergrift (2002) asserts the importance of metacognitive strategies because those strategies oversee, regulate, or direct the language learning task, and involve thinking about the learning process (p. 559).

Previous Studies

Regarding reading strategies, there have been research conducted to explore this issue. For instance, Anderson (2003) attempts to explore L2 online reading strategies by EFL and ESL students using The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) adapted from Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001). Anderson (2003) also mentions that no research has observed the online reading strategies on L2 learners at that time. Thus, he conducted this study on online reading strategies between EFL and ESL learners, with a total of 247 participants consisting of 131 EFL learners and 116 ESL learners. He reveals 67% or 12 strategies mostly used are Problem Solving Strategies, and 58% or 12 strategies least used are Support Reading Strategies. His study also confirms that what makes online reading strategies statistically different between EFL learners and ESL learners are in Problem Solving Strategies.

Intan Sari (2016) examines the cognitive and metacognitive strategies among Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers along with their performance in reading comprehension. She delivered a reading comprehension test which was adopted from a standardized test of preparation module published by ETS (2009) and used a modified questionnaire developed by Phakiti (2003, 2006). Her participants consist of 132 out of 150 Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers whose age range from 18-20 years old. However, only 118 filled out the questionnaires completely. Her study then reveals that there were differences of reading strategies employed in English text comprehension among the Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers. Highly Successful Readers on her study were reported using cognitive reading strategies the most, while Moderately Successful Readers were using metacognitive strategies the most; Less Successful Readers were using both strategies the least.

Other studies concerning metacognitive reading strategies were conducted by Öztürk (2018) and Vaičiūnienė and Užpalienė (2013). Öztürk (2018) identifies the metacognitive online reading strategies among student teachers of English in his research. Participants in his study were 147 first year student teachers of English in Turkey, consisting of 93 females and 54 males. Öztürk (2018) employed the Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS) by Anderson (2003) to measure the metacognitive reading strategies among participants, revealing that problem-solving strategies were the most widely used strategies among the participants and support strategies as the least used strategies.

Meanwhile, Vaičiūnienė and Užpalienė (2013) conducted a research to elucidate the link between online reading strategies and metacognitive awareness by students in university level, and also to find out the strategies applied by them. They also used the OSORS by Anderson (2003) with a total of 89 full-time students for the participants who were having different experience in online reading. The result of their study reveals that problem-solving strategies were used the most, following with global strategies, and the least were support strategies.

Studies exploring metacognitive online reading strategies in EFL context are limited (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001) and a less is known in an Indonesian EFL setting. In this sense, this study is an attempt to replicate to some degree a study by Anderson (2003) to explore online reading strategies by EFL learners in an Indonesian context. This study also adapted the Online Survey of Reading Strategy (OSORS) which measure metacognitive reading strategies. After the covid-19 pandemic, Indonesian learners are required to study through online platform, requiring them to read online materials.

Research Method

This study is quantitative in nature since it involves survey and quantitative analysis (Creswell, 2014). There were sixty five ($n=65$) students voluntarily participated in this study. All participants were students of study program of English literature in one of the public universities in Indonesia. Seventy-one point two participants were females, while the rest 28.8% eight were males. Most of them were from class 2017.

This study employed the Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS) survey by Anderson (2003). It was adapted from Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) and already been used by many researchers to find out the metacognitive reading strategies employed by readers. The use of OSORS was relevant since it was related to the research questions regarding the metacognitive online reading strategies being examined.

In order to collect the data, the researcher put The OSORS through Google Form before distributing it to the participants. The survey itself contained 38 items underlying three categories, i.e. global reading strategies (18 items), problem solving strategies (11 items), and support strategies (9 items). The researcher added two more items after the participants answered the OSORS regarding their preferences in reading, whether it was reading online or paper-based. The additional items were designed to answer the second research question because it was related to the preferences of the students on their reading.

Data from Google form were then collected in the form of Excel file. Finally, data were analysed using SPSS 21 based on descriptive statistics (Mean & Standard variation) for answering research question 1 and inferential statistics involving one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for answering research question 2.

RESULT AND FINDINGS

Online Reading Strategies: Global, Problem-Solving and Support Strategies

The first question in this study scrutinized the online reading strategies applied by students of study program of English literature, Faculty of Cultural Studies at Universitas Brawijaya. This study revealed that the most frequently online reading strategies were problem solving strategies ($M=3.88$), followed by global reading strategies ($M=3.62$) and support

reading strategies ($M=3.49$). This demonstrated that students are using Problem Solving Strategies more frequently rather than the other two.

In more detail, below were the tables of the clustered items in OSORS which displayed the subscale of each category. The categories are consisting of Global Reading Strategies (GLOB Subscale), Problem Solving Strategies (PROB Subscale), and Support Reading Strategies (SUP Subscale).

Table 1. GLOB Subscale of Metacognitive Strategies Used among Participants (n=65).

GLOB Subscale	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I have a purpose in mind when I read online.	4.08	0.76
2. I participate in live chat with other learners of English.	3.05	0.96
3. I participate in live chat with native speakers of English.	2.78	1.08
5. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read online.	4.00	0.71
6. I take an overall view of the online text to see what it is about before reading it.	3.68	0.89
8. I think about whether the content of the online text fits my reading purpose.	3.89	0.89
10. I review the online text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.	3.43	1.07
14. When reading online, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	3.72	0.80
17. I read pages on the Internet for academic purposes.	3.68	0.87
18. I use tables, figures, and pictures in the online text to increase my understanding.	3.38	1.00
20. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading online.	3.85	0.87
23. I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.	3.57	1.17
24. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the online text.	3.38	1.00
26. I check my understanding when I come across new information.	3.98	0.72
27. I try to guess what the content of the on-line text is about when I read.	3.89	0.73
30. I check to see if my guesses about the online text are right or wrong.	3.58	0.97
32. I scan the online text to get a basic idea of whether it will serve my purposes before choosing to read it.	3.54	1.08
33. I read pages on the Internet for fun.	3.74	1.00
	3.62	

Table 2. PROB Subscale of Metacognitive Strategies Used among Participants.

PROB Subscale	Mean	Std. Deviation
9. I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading online.	4.11	0.81
11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	4.12	0.80
13. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading online.	4.00	0.79
16. When online text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.	4.20	0.85
19. I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading online.	3.49	0.89
22. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read online.	3.94	0.93
28. When online text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.	4.29	0.79
31. When I read online, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	3.83	0.88
34. I critically evaluate the online text before choosing to use information I read online.	3.43	0.85
35. I can distinguish between fact and opinion in online texts.	3.748	0.85
36. When reading online, I look for sites that cover both sides of an issue.	3.57	0.93
	3.88	

Table 3. SUP Subscale of Metacognitive Strategies Used among Participants.

SUP Subscale	Mean	Std. Deviation
4. I take notes while reading online to help me understand what I read.	3.40	1.16
7. When online text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.	3.31	1.37
12. I print out a hard copy of the online text then underline or circle information to help me remember it.	3.02	1.19
15. I use reference materials (e.g. an online dictionary) to help me understand what I read online.	4.18	0.95
21. I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read online.	3.49	1.12
25. I go back and forth in the online text to find relationships among ideas in it.	3.55	1.00
29. I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the online text.	3.46	0.97
37. When reading online, I translate from English into my native language.	3.17	1.14
38. When reading online, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue.	3.83	0.89
	3.49	

In addition, this study also examined the top 12 and bottom 12 strategies out of 38 items in the OSORS frequently used by Indonesian EFL learners. From the table provided below, this study found that in top 12, the most popular strategy to use among students was the Problem Solving Strategies (50%), followed by Global Reading Strategies (41,7%), and the least was Support Reading Strategies (8,3%). Meanwhile, on bottom 12 strategies, this study demonstrated that Support Reading Strategies dominated the use of strategies (41,7%).

Table 4. Top 12 and Bottom 12 Metacognitive Strategies Used among Participants.

TOP 12	BOTTOM 12
28. When online text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding. (Problem Solving)	3. I participate in live chat with native speakers of English. (Global)
16. When online text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading. (Problem Solving)	12. I print out a hard copy of the online text then underline or circle information to help me remember it. (Support)
15. I use reference materials (e.g. an online dictionary) to help me understand what I read online. (Support)	2. I participate in live chat with other learners of English. (Global)
11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration. (Problem Solving)	37. When reading online, I translate from English into my native language. (Support)
9. I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading online. (Problem Solving)	7. When online text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read. (Support)
1. I have a purpose in mind when I read online. (Global)	18. I use tables, figures, and pictures in the online text to increase my understanding. (Global)
13. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading online. (Problem Solving)	13. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading online. (Problem Solving)
20. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading online. (Global)	20. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading online. (Global)
5. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read online. (Global)	5. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read online. (Global)
4. I take notes while reading online to help me understand what I read. (Support)	4. I take notes while reading online to help me understand what I read. (Support)
26. I check my understanding when I come across new information. (Global)	26. I check my understanding when I come across new information. (Global)
10. I review the online text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization. (Global)	10. I review the online text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization. (Global)
22. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read online. (Problem Solving)	22. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read online. (Problem Solving)
34. I critically evaluate the online text before choosing to use information I read online. (Problem Solving)	34. I critically evaluate the online text before choosing to use information I read online. (Problem Solving)
8. I think about whether the content of the online text fits my reading purpose. (Global)	8. I think about whether the content of the online text fits my reading purpose. (Global)

27. I try to guess what the content of the on-line text is about when I read. (Global)

27. I try to guess what the content of the on-line text is about when I read. (Global)

From the result above, it can be concluded that the online reading strategies used by students in tertiary level of education was mostly problem solving strategies, with half of top 12 metacognitive strategies used among participants were dominated by them. On the contrary, most participants infrequently used Support Reading Strategies on their learning using online platform during reading activities. Thus, it can be inferred that the most popular strategy to use among participants in this research is the Problem-Solving Strategies.

Differences of Online Reading Strategies by Students' Preferences (Paper Vs. Online)

The second research question here focused on the differences of online reading strategies used among students whose reading preference is paper-based and those whose reading preference is through online platform. The additional items were added on the survey to find out the reading preferences of each student. This study showed that 38 (58.46%) students were more comfortable with reading on paper while the other 27 students (41.53%) preferred reading through online platform.

From the data result, both participants whose reading preference is paper-based as well as online platform, indicated that item 28 (when online text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding) was the most popular item for paper-based readers ($M=4.2105$) and online-based readers ($M=4.4074$)—which obviously an item from problem solving strategies. Meanwhile, paper-based readers in this study used item 3 (I participate in live chat with native speakers of English; global strategies) the least ($M=2.6579$), and online-based readers used item 12 (I print out a hard copy of the online text then underline or circle information to help me remember it; support strategies) the least ($M=2.5185$).

Looking at details to the online reading strategies for each item applied by two groups with different preferences, this study revealed that there were some significant differences from both groups on item 8 ($p=.049$), 12 ($p=.004$), and 22 ($p=.038$) with significant value $p<.05$. This demonstrated that these two groups have significant different value in applying strategies in their reading activities. In more detail, item 8 (I think about whether the content of the online text fits my reading purpose) indicates GLOB subscale, item 12 (I print out a hard copy of the online text then underline or circle information to help me remember it) indicates SUP subscale, while item 22 (I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read online) indicates PROB subscale. This illustrated that these two groups had different strategy implementation to some degree in the global reading strategies, problem solving strategies and support reading strategies.

DISCUSSION

The nature of interaction between reader and text in comprehending the text (Anderson, 2000) is evident in this study. The interaction is facilitated through the use of reading strategies, particularly metacognitive strategies in understanding the meaning or message of the text. Within online reading context by EFL Indonesian learners at tertiary level, this study reveals that that majority of the students use Problem Solving Strategies. Problem solving was observed to be more effective for L2 learners in facilitating the comprehension of the text. Problem solving itself is as part of monitoring and evaluation strategies employed by learners in handling the barrier in text comprehension (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). This study confirms prior study reported by Anderson (2003) and Öztürk (2018) about problem solving strategies to be the most frequently strategies employed by L2 learners either in ESL or EFL setting. In other words, both prior studies reveal that Problem Solving Strategies are mostly used by the participants, meanwhile the least used strategies are Support Reading Strategies.

Different from previous studies, the present study added an analysis of the differences students' preferences on reading—online vs. paper-based reading on the items among the online reading strategies used. Both groups used item 28 the most for their strategies in online reading. It could be inferred that both groups also used problem solving strategies the most rather than the other two strategies. However, the least strategy used by both groups were dissimilar, where paper-based readers least used strategy were item 3—global strategies—while online-based readers were item 12—support strategies.

Furthermore, from each item of the online reading strategies applied by two groups with different preferences in reading, it can be seen that there were some significant differences from both groups on item 8, 12, and 22 reflecting differences from various strategies. Hence, it can be inferred that both groups, apart from their different preferences in reading, they also apply different strategies in the global reading strategies, problem solving strategies and support reading strategies.

It is essential for L2 students to understand online reading strategies as it provides information and horizon how to cope with online reading, especially the metacognitive strategies ones. Moreover, metacognition will develop critical but healthy contemplation while coping with online reading.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study may contribute to the understanding of the reading strategies used by Indonesian EFL students at tertiary level. During Covid-19 pandemic, the classes are done remotely from home. Thus, analyzing the strategies of reading among students was very much interesting to do for research and implies the need for teachers to train students in

utilizing particularly problem-solving strategies in their online reading activities. The study reveals that that majority of the students use Problem Solving Strategies. In addition, this research added some items to increase the understanding of potential differences between students' preferences in reading with the online reading strategies. Evidently, there are significant differences for some items of strategies applied between both groups. Since the situation of the current study happened during pandemic, the researcher suggests the future study to compare the use of online reading strategy after the pandemic is over.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 460–472.
- Anderson, N. J. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Neil J. (2002). *The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. ERIC Digest, April 2002. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Anderson, Neil J. (2003). Scrolling, clicking, and reading English: Online reading strategies in a second/foreign language. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 1–33.
- Brun-mercer, N. (2014). Online Reading Strategies for the Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 2–11.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (1995). On the Notion of Culture in L2 Lectures. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 345–373. doi: 10.2307/3587628
- Geva, E., & Ramirez., G. (2015). *Focus on reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, K.S. (1967). Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*, 6(4), 126-135.
- Hatami, M., & Asl, H. D. (2017). The Reading Strategies Used by EFL Students: A Case of Iranian Advanced English Language Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(6), 1223–1232. doi: 10.17507/jltr.0806.26
- Hsiao, T.-Y., & Oxford, R. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: a confirmatory factor analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 368–382.
- Intan Sari, M. (2016). Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategy Use and Reading Comprehension Performance of Indonesian EFL Pre-service Teachers. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(2). doi: 10.18196/ftl.1213
- Kewuel, H. K. (2017). Analisis Antropologi Pendidikan tentang Penguatan Manajemen Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi dalam Tata Pendidikan Global. *Erudio: Journal of Educational Innovation*, 3(2), 55–66.
- Kim, D. (2020). Learning Language, Learning Culture: Teaching Language to the Whole

- Student. *ECNU Review of Education*, 3(3), 519–541. doi: 10.1177/2096531120936693
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into Second Language Reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2–10.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Öztürk, S. Y. (2018). Use of Metacognitive Online Reading Strategies by Student Teachers of English. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(3), 17–32. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1297197
- Sahiruddin. (2018). The role of lexical frequency in moderating the effect of grammar knowledge on L2 reading outcomes. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19 (2), 194-218.
- Sahiruddin (2019). Textual syntactic complexity and its role in second language reading outcomes in Indonesia. *JELLS (Journal of English Education and Linguistic Studies)*, 6 (2), 165-187.
- Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*, 29, 431–449. doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00039-2
- Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2008). Introduction. In: Mokhtari K, Sheorey R (Eds.). *Reading Strategies of First- and Second-Language Learners*. Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc, 1–10.
- Vaičiūnienė, V., & Užpalienė, D. (2013). Metacognitive Online Reading Strategies in Foreign Language Learning Context at University. *Social Technologies*, 3(2), 316–329. doi: 10.13165/st-13-3-2-06
- Vandergrift, L. (2002). It was nice to see that our predictions were right: Developing metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 555–575.
- Wallace, C. (2001). Reading. In: Carter, R., and Nunan, D. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.