

UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH READING STRATEGIES AND ENGAGEMENT AMONG THAI UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF MAHAMAKUT BUDDHIST UNIVERSITY, ROI-ET CAMPUS

Patlada Wongyotha¹, Napasap Lerdpreedakorn² and Worawoot Tutwisut³

¹ Doctor of Philosophy student in the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

Udon Thani Rajabhat University

^{2,3} Graduate School, Udon Thani Rajabhat University

E-mail: patladakk@gmail.com

Received: September 3, 2025

Revised: February 24, 2026

Accepted: May 11, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to 1) investigate the level of reading strategy use among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et Campus; 2) examine students' perception of reading engagement; and 3) explore the relationship between reading strategy use and students' perception of reading engagement. The participants consisted of 350 undergraduate students from seven majors on undergraduate level. Data were collected by using a questionnaire comprising 44 items, along with a semi-structured interview. The data were analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods, including Mean, Standard Deviation, percentage and correlation coefficient.

The results revealed that 1) the level of reading strategy use was moderate level; 2) the level of perception on reading engagement was moderate level, with “skipping difficult words” identified as the highest-scoring strategy; and 3) the relationship between the use of reading strategies and students’ perception of reading engagement was positive correlation. These findings underscored the importance of promoting intrinsic reading strategies and implementing targeted strategies to improve reading comprehension. Nevertheless, although the correlation was statistically significant, its practical significance appeared limited, indicating that other factors may have a greater influence on students’ English reading engagement.

Keywords

Reading Strategies, Reading Engagement, Reading Comprehension Ability

Significance of the Problem

Reading engagement and reading strategies have been gaining significance over the last several years to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) readers in order to be good readers with good comprehension (Karami & Mansoorabadi, 2008; Nakornsut, 2023). According to a good reader, is someone who possesses the skill to read written statements or texts effectively and properly (Floris & Divina, 2009).

Development in effective reading strategies is one of the most critical components of education, facilitating students to understand and carry out the process of reading. To clarify, several empirical investigations have examined how strategy instruction influences reading. Wright & Brown (2006) examined the impact of explicit strategy instruction on reading comprehension. What they discovered was that while the participants became more conscious of some strategies and their capacity for making metacognitive comment on what they were doing during reading, there were certain strategies that were harder to master. He (2008) explained how reading goals affect the utilization of strategy. What the study revealed was that the students with more goals performed better than students with the same degree of proficiency but with lower goals. In addition, Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016) determined the importance of applying reading strategies during reading since they allow students to build strong meaning and make sense of text. In short, reading strategies provide the readers with an explicit model for being more active and intentional participants in written text.

Meanwhile, reading engagement has also been one of the most essential dimensions for educators to develop EFL students' reading comprehension ability (Gunthrie & Klauda, 2016) also indicated that students who are more engaged are more inclined to be active in reading activities in order to achieve reading objectives. This is supported by Wang et al. (2022) who investigated reading engagement among undergraduate students and validated the relationship between engagement, academic performance, and reading strategy application. In addition to this, there are a few studies that have revealed the characteristics of poor reader. For example, Lau (2006) found that struggling readers do not tend to recognize main ideas, understand the overall structure of text, or make inferences to attain deep meaning. Guthrie & Klauda (2014) also found students to be more likely to be reading-engaged if they have reading objectives, value reading and have confidence in themselves. Since both reading strategy and reading engagement influence reading comprehension ability, the paper aims to explore the factors more thoroughly in order to promote the teaching of undergraduate English reading.

In additional context, in line with global academic standards, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) has been integrated into Thai university curricula to enhance international competitiveness. This strategic inclusion aims to elevate students' English proficiency to B1 and B2 levels, thereby facilitating academic and cultural exchanges and preparing graduates for global opportunities. However, achieving these proficiency levels at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et campus necessitates significant improvements in student motivation and attitudes, both of which are critical determinants of linguistic success (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Despite challenges such as limited resources, cultural-linguistic barriers, and variable learner motivation, the pursuit of CEFR standards remains imperative for broadening academic and professional prospects. By addressing these obstacles through targeted strategies and sustained investment in language education, Thai Buddhist universities can effectively equip students with the essential skills for global success (Chavangklang et al., 2024). To address these challenges and support the attainment of the aforementioned CEFR standards, it is essential to understand the specific linguistic processes and engagement patterns of learners. Consequently, this study aims to: 1) investigate the level of reading strategy use among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et Campus; 2) examine the level of students' perception of reading engagement; and 3) explore the relationship between the use of reading strategies and students' perception of reading engagement."

Overall, a study has also identified the characteristics of poor reader, for instance, students do not possess the ability to construct the main ideas and macrostructure of the texts (Lau, 2006). Moreover, Guthrie & Klauda (2014) affirmed that students are more engaged in reading when students possess reading goals, values and confidence in themselves. As reading comprehension skill is affected by reading engagement in accordance with reading strategies, a researcher therefore carried out a study in order to identify the instruction at the undergraduate level.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of the use of reading strategies among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus?
2. What is the level of students' perceptions of reading engagement among undergraduate
3. What is the relationship between the use of reading strategies and students' perceptions of reading engagement among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus?

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the level of the use of reading strategies among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus
2. To examine the level of students' perceptions of reading engagement among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus
3. To explore the relationship between the use of reading strategies and students' perceptions of reading engagement among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus

Research Methodology

This study uses a survey research design with quantitative and qualitative methods. The research was conducted with the entire population of 350 undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et campus.

Participants

The participants consisted of 350 students in bachelor degree from 7 majors (160 males and 190 females), aged 18-34 (Year 1 to 4), including the English Teaching program, Thai Teaching Program, Early Childhood Study Program, Elementary Education Program, General Political Science Program, Special Political Science Program, and Buddhist & Philosophy Program at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et Campus.

Research Instruments

1. Questionnaire: The 44-items questionnaire, originally prepared in Thai, was intended to comprehensively measure reading strategies use and perception on reading engagement in English reading. The reading strategies section, evaluated dimensions including summarizing, questioning, clarifying, practicing, dictionary, skipping, and guessing. The reading engagement section incorporated items adapted from Theoretical Perspectives on Motivation and Engagement from Gulthrie & Klauda (2014), and to measure four dimensions including intrinsic motivation, value, perceive competence, and devalue. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: part 1, collected demographic information; part 2, employed a 5-point Likert scale to measure students' reading strategies use and students' perception on reading engagement were collected by part 3. The development process involved an extensive review of relevant theories, item formulation, and validation by three subject matter experts, achieving an Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) threshold of 0.67. The questionnaire achieved a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.77 prior to full-scale administration. A pilot

test conducted with a demographically similar sample enabled refinements to enhance item obviousness and ensure internal consistency.

2. Semi-structured Interviews: Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with selected students to gain deeper insights into their reading strategies use and perception on reading engagement in English reading. The interview participants were selected using quota sampling, with 10 students per major for a total of 70 interviewees. Within each major, the sample was equally divided into five high-scoring and five low-scoring participants based on their questionnaire results. These interviews targeted students with both high and low scores in reading strategies use and perception on reading engagement in English reading and included 12 open-ended questions. The process of interview development included setting research objectives and question formulation, having them validated with experts to ascertain authenticity (IOC analysis), pilot testing with a similar sample, and final refinement based on expert advice.

Data analysis

Data analysis categorizes data into two types for analysis as follows:

1. Quantitative Data: Questionnaire responses on reading strategies use and perception of reading engagement levels were analyzed using descriptive statistics, focusing on frequency and percentage to describe data characteristics, and Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationship between reading strategies use and perception of reading engagement levels.

2. Qualitative Data: Semi-structured interviews were transcribed and analyzed using content analysis. Similar content was grouped, redundancies were removed, and data were organized to address the research questions, identifying key themes and patterns.

Research Results

The results are demonstrated into two sections: reading strategies use and perception of reading engagement.

1. Reading Strategies Use Level: The survey results on the reading strategies use of undergraduate students from Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et Campus were shown in the following table.

Table 1 Level of reading strategies use of undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et campus

Reading Strategies use	$\bar{x}$	SD	Results
1. summarizing	2.21	0.18	low
2. questioning	2.17	1.39	low
3. clarifying	2.05	0.15	low
4. predicting	2.28	1.38	low
5. using dictionary	3.66	0.05	moderate
6. skipping	4.20	1.04	high
7. guessing	2.23	0.16	low
Mean	2.68	.70	moderate

From Table 1, the following discussion can be made:

Summarizing: The mean score is 2.21 (SD = 0.18). This indicates students had summarizing strategy at low level. Interview finding here is that students are not capable of applying summarizing strategy through paraphrasing exercises and identifying main idea. *"I don't know why we have to summarize and perhaps that is the reason why I cannot do it appropriately"* (Student 1). *"If I understand all words' meaning, I can grape the main idea or summarize the text"* (Student 2)

Questioning: The mean score is 2.17 (SD = 1.39). The outcome confirms that the students need teacher's cue for building the questions. *"Most of the students don't prefer to go on with the reading exercise"* (Student 1). *"when I can do best in questioning in real time, then I have to go on further and further till the last stage... I would like to have a team for creating question in class"* (Student 2).

Clarifying: The finding that the lowest mean score is 2.05 (SD = 0.15). It indicates that students are not easy finding the meaning of the author. *"I struggle to describe the tough time I get from the writer because I don't know how and I struggle to translate"* (Student 1). *"I can't translate the word or phrase by my language but I can translate when I use dictionary"* (Student 2).

Predicting: The mean score is 2.28 (SD = 1.38). The outcome shows low predicting of strategy use level that students derive their reason to some extent to demonstrate processing depth. *"I think...normally, predicting should be fun and results in reading text successfully but studying in normal class without theurge to predict it with fun"* (Student 1). *"I do enjoy predicting when I am in a relaxed mood and do the reading activity without stress"* (Student 2).

Using dictionary: The mean score is 3.66 (SD = 0.05), suggesting that students are satisfied with dictionary and would utilize it. “...it is easy to use whenever I read lengthy passage” (Student 1). “I always use dictionary since I believe it can help me in collecting all the words meaning correctly, though, I need to spend more time” (Student 2).

Skipping: This is the highest mean score, 4.20 (SD = 1.04). This finding shows that students prefer employing the skipping strategy when they are reading if they are to comprehend reading text within short time. “...not once but I always employ skipping every time I’m reading difficult words, it is easier in comparison to attempting to read the words or sentence” (Student 1) “I’m able to make my time to complete the reading exercise when I skip difficult words, that’s okay” (Student 2).

Guessing: The mean score is 2.33 (SD = 0.16). This finding explains that students intend to estimate what, who, where, or when in the reading but cannot do so in the proper way when the teacher asks them in English. “...guessing is not difficult when I read because I’m able to guess, well it’s fun! I’m able to guess the sentence or word meaning” (Student 1) “...the problem of guessing while reading is that I’m unable to translate it in English at once” (Student 2).

2. Students’ perception of reading engagement

Perception on Reading Engagement Level: The survey results on the perception on reading engagement of undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Roi-Et campus.

Table 2 The levels of perception of reading engagement (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014)

Students’ perception of reading Engagement	$\bar{x}$	SD	Percentage	Results
1. Intrinsic motivation	2.80	0.98	25.43	Moderate
2. Value	2.77	1.42	25.16	Moderate
3. Perceive competence	2.84	1.27	25.56	Moderate
4. Devalue	2.60	0.41	23.42	Moderate
Average	2.76	1.02		Moderate

From Table 2, the following discussion can be made:

Intrinsic motivation: The mean score is 2.80 (SD = 0.98). This illustrates the students’ perception of intrinsic motivation and students’ responses to this clearly

indicate about the deep interest. The result from the interview shows that students are attracted by pictures.

"...I prefer watching the nice photos instead of spending too much time reading" (Student 1), *"I think... English text is interesting but nice pictures are more interesting because I can keep my concentration and know the text from predicting the pictures"* (Student 2)

Value: The mean score is 2.77 (SD = 1.42). This is in line with the students' understanding that reading is good for one's future. However, the students are not unanimous in the importance of reading which will be useful in their future. *"...reading is beneficial but I'm not studying English major thus I have not been focusing on reading yet"* (Student 1), *"I do not have a plan to improve my reading ability because I shall never have anything to do with English reading"* (Student 2).

Perceive competence: The mean score is 2.84 (SD = 1.27). This outcome indicates the belief in oneself to effectively carry out reading exercises. Students from the interview results indicate the use of dictionary as the most appropriate way of comprehending the material in reading.

"...I like to concentrate on what I read especially after receiving a task from teacher and my problem is difficult words, so I can solve that problem by either ask my sister or use the online dictionary" (Student 1), *"I always refer to dictionary while reading and translate every sentence in the text first because I am not proficient in English reading"* (Student 2).

Devalue: The mean score is 2.60 (SD = 0.41). It indicates that the students' belief that reading is not important or useful in achieving one's success or future. Also, according to the interview outcomes, the students declare that the poor attitudes towards the reading activity is vocabulary.

"...I'm bore when I have to join the reading class because I am poor in vocabulary and I will not pursue my English reading skill because I study Buddhist program" (Student 1), *"For me, I still have no intention to improve my reading skill because I think it is difficult and I need to learn harder for understanding in English reading"* (Student 2).

According to the findings, most students comprehend the application of reading strategies and the highest-scoring item is vocabulary. This shows that one's knowledge in vocabulary matters and plays strategies. Moreover, the students' perception on reading engagement are positive in the sense that most of the students viewed reading as a good activity but could not proceed further due to vocabulary issues.

Overall, vocabulary is important variable when reading strategy use is of concern, while reading engagement potentially can aid reading strategy use in order to promote further reading comprehension skill.

3. The relationship between strategies use and students' perception of reading engagement

The relationship between reading strategies and engagement is analyzed by using Pearson's correlation coefficient. The analysis reveals sturdy positive correlation ($r = 0.98$, $p < .001$). The overall correlation is strong and positive with a large effect size ($r^2 = 0.97$). This indicates that reading strategy use explains a substantial portion of the variance in students' engagement in reading.

Discussion

The discussion of the findings is divided into three aspects as following;

1. The level of reading strategies used among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus.

According to the findings, the level of reading strategies use gains the moderate level ($\bar{X} = 2.68$, $SD = 0.70$), it indicates that the students attained the moderate level of reading strategies used. According to the data obtained from the questionnaire, it clearly reveals that the students applied fewer reading strategies due to the issues of vocabulary. The most frequently used reading strategy is “skipping difficult words”, which indicates that students prefer to skip attempting to deal with difficult words rather than attempting to use context clues or other strategies to solve unfamiliar words. Apart from these figures, students gave an interesting perspective in the interviews on the strategies used which indicates the vocabulary was most difficult then skipping the words was used more than once when they read the reading texts. And some students revealed that “questioning” was strategy for difficulty but they were helped to create questions themselves. Similarly Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016) explain that reading strategies can help readers overcome challenges in understanding new words or complex sentence structures, which can eventually lead to a wider and better understanding of the content and the use of reading strategies is particularly required for English as a Foreign Language learners, who may face extra challenges in understanding and memorizing information due to their low level of proficiency in the language. Verify with Walczyk et al. (2007) demonstrates that if the readers determine a word they do not know or other misunderstanding contains a minor point, or that it takes too long for its solution, they might skip it.

2. The level of students' perception of reading engagement among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus.

The level of perception of reading engagement shows the moderate level ($\bar{x}$ = 2.76, SD = 1.02) with mean scores on the different aspects of engagement. This shows that the students lack the motivation, self-efficacy, and behavioral engagement needed to actively participate in English reading activities. Thus, the research concludes the interviews that are considered the "Qualitative Findings" and discloses in three themes; Theme 1: Strategy choice and application; vocabulary challenges (Muryani & Yunus, 2023), Theme 2: Emotional responses towards reading (Batini et al., 2021), and Theme 3: Engagement barriers; understanding challenges (Williams et al., 2023). Some interviewees state that they fear English reading materials and it seems that they require an active reading exercises to reduce the negative emotional. Regarding to "fear", this is the pressure to comprehend and analyze the text correctly and it could enhance these feelings of fearfulness (Le Doux & Pine, 2016). In addition, language learners may also feel intimidated by the grammatical structure, vocabulary and idiomatic expressions which those are able to create a feeling of being overwhelmed and discouraged (Bensoussan, 2012). On others hand, Huang (Huang, 2006) reports that the availability of teacher support, clear presentation of key points, and clear teaching of reading capability have been considered as significant variables in motivating students to engage in English reading exercises.

3. The relationship between reading strategies used and students' perception of reading engagement among undergraduate students at Mahamakut Buddhist university, Roi-Et campus

The analysis exposes strong positive correlation between reading strategies use and perception on reading engagement ($r = 0.98$, $p < .001$). There is a sturdy positive correlation between the two variables. This means that as students employ more reading strategies, their engagement with the text increases significantly. In this specific data, the correlation ($r = 0.98$) is exceptionally strong, suggesting they are nearly perfectly intertwined. Reading strategies—such as predicting, questioning, and summarizing—require students to be "active" rather than "passive". This active involvement is the core of cognitive engagement, where students exert mental effort to construct meaning from the text. In the meantime, using strategies acts as a "toolset" that helps students overcome difficulties in a text. When students know how to tackle a hard passage (e.g., by re-reading or visualizing), they feel more competent and confident. This boost in self-efficacy leads to higher affective engagement (enjoyment and interest). According to the educators clarify fascinatedly why do reading strategies

and reading engagement are closed. First, because engagement consists of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components (Pöysä et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, the important factors in student's reading ability are cultural background and motivation (Mahdikhani & Rezaei, 2015). Consequently, students use active engagement and reading strategies to enhance reading comprehend (Cantrell & Rintamaa, 2020).

Recommendations

The recommendations as following;

Recommendations for applying the results

1. University administrators should promote students' reading comprehension through reading strategies use and reading engagement in discussion are positively which showing the significant impact of their engagement. That can be promoted through online studies and social interaction reading in the class.

2. These results suggest that targeted interventions and encouragement may be necessary to strengthen the strategies use and students' engagement in English reading for students in programs where English is not the primary focus.

3. The study highlights the importance of considering the unique needs and academic courses of dissimilar student when designing and employing reading instruction.

4. The findings of this study provide a framework for developing English reading pedagogy at Buddhist universities in Thailand.

Recommendations for next research

The research results are pointed out the challenges in longitudinal studies, as making track strategy development over 4-year degree program, to measure the impact of strategy training in engagement levels across academic years.

References

- Batini, F., Luperini, V., Cej, E., Izzo, D. & Toti, G. (2021). The association between reading and emotional development: a systematic review. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*. 9(1), 12-48.
<https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v9i1.5053>
- Bensoussan, M. (2012). Alleviating test anxiety for students of advanced reading comprehension. *RELC Journal*. 43(2), 203-216.

- Cantrell, S. C. & Rintamaa, M. (2020). The nature of rural high school students' reading engagement. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*. 36(4), 297-319.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10573569.2019.1635543>
- Chavangklang, T., Chavangklang, P., Parnkul, K., Nupong, C. & Sathitdetkunchorn, P. (2024). Achieving B1-B2 CEFR levels: Challenges, opportunities, and practical guidelines for Thai university settings. *Jayaphruekpirom Journal*. 6(2), 17-34.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Floris, F. D. & Divina, M. (2009). A study on the reading skills of EFL university students. *TEFLIN*. 20(1), 37-47.
- Gilakjani, A. P. & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). How can students improve their reading comprehension skill. *Journal of Studies in Education*. 6(2), 1-12.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v6i2.9201>
- Guthrie, J. T. & Klauda, S. L. (2014). Effects of classroom practices on reading comprehension, engagement, and motivations for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 49(4), 387-416.
- Guthrie, J. T. & Klauda, S. L. (2016). Engagement and motivational processes in reading. In P. Afflerbach (Ed.), *Handbook of Individual Differences in Reading: Reader, Text, and Context* (pp. 41-53). Routledge.
- Harris, T. L. & Hodges, R. E. (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. International Reading Association.
- He, T. H. (2008). Reading for different goals: the interplay of EFL college students' multiple goals, reading strategy use and reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*. 31(2), 224-242.
- Huang, S. C. (2006). Reading English for academic purposes—What situational factors may motivate learners to read? *System*. 34(3), 371-383.
- Karami, E. & Mansoorabadi, A. (2008). Sustainable agricultural attitudes and behaviors: a gender analysis of Iranian farmers. *Environment Development and Sustainability*. 10(6), 883-898.
- Knight, S. (1994). Dictionary use while reading: The effects on comprehension and vocabulary acquisition for students of different verbal abilities. *The Modern Language Journal*. 78(3), 285-299.
- Lau, K. L. (2006). Reading strategy use between Chinese good and poor readers: A think-aloud study. *Journal of Research in Reading*. 29(4), 383-399.

- Le Doux, J. E. & Pine, D. S. (2016). Using neuroscience to help understand fear and anxiety: a two-system framework. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 173(11), 1083-1093.
<https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/abs/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16030353>
- Mahdikhani, Z. & Rezaei, A. (2015). An overview of language engagement: The importance of student engagement for second language acquisition. *Journal for The Study of English Linguistics*. 3(1), 108.
- Muryani, R. N. & Yunus, M. (2023). Students' digital vocabulary learning: experiences, barriers, and adaptive strategies exploration. *Journal of English Education*. 12(1), 31-42. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i1.9328>
- Nakornsut, T. (2023). Exploring Reading Engagement in English as an International Language (EIL) Materials. *English Language Teaching*. 16(1), 1-21.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n1p21>
- Pöysä, S., Poikkeus, A. M., Muotka, J., Vasalampi, K. & Lerkkanen, M. K. (2020). Adolescents' engagement profiles and their association with academic performance and situational engagement. *Learning and Individual Differences*. 82, 101922.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1041608020301023>
- Walczyk, J. J., Wei, M., Griffith-Ross, D. A., Goubert, S. E., Cooper, A. L. & Zha, P. (2007). Development of the interplay between automatic processes and cognitive resources in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 99(4), 867.
- Wang, X. W., Zhu, Y. J. & Zhang, Y. C. (2022). An empirical study of college students' reading engagement on academic achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 13, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1025754>
- Williams, K. J., Martinez, L. R., Fall, M. A., Miciak, J. & Vaughn, S. (2023). Student engagement among high school English learners with reading comprehension difficulties. *School Psychology Review*. 52(1), 38-56.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1868948>
- Wright, M. & Brown, P. (2006). Reading in a modern foreign language: exploring the potential benefits of reading strategy instruction. *Language Learning Journal*. 33(1), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730685200071>