



EFL READING IN INDONESIAN UNIVERSITIES: PERSPECTIVES AND CHALLENGES IN CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Harits Masduqi

The University of Sydney, Australia and State University of Malang, Indonesia

Reading is the main focus of tertiary English programs in Indonesia. Although there is a body of research into the development of English at tertiary level and evidence of low outcomes, there is little into the development of reading in English. This paper will discuss implementation of EFL reading program in Indonesian universities and offer recommendation for further research on reading instruction and cultural contexts. Since the role of culture has rarely been elaborated in EFL reading in Indonesia, the researcher will also highlight current theories of EFL reading in relation to cultural conditions affecting the teaching of reading in Indonesia. This will clarify not only the constraints which may hinder the reading instruction, but also uncover potential resources and perspectives on how effective reading program should be implemented in Indonesian universities.

Keywords: EFL reading, First language, Second language, Cultural contexts.

Introduction

Reading is a very important activity in which teachers and students have to deal with in daily academic life. The teacher often plays a significant role in mediating between the students as the readers, the reading text, and the text author (Wallace, 2003). In this way, the reading teacher is often a mediator of comprehension transferring meaning and moral lesson of a particular text to his or her students. At the same time, while attempting to comprehend the text, students engage with their attitudes, motivation, background knowledge, and even personal interests.

In contrast with speaking and writing, reading is conventionally categorized as a receptive skill which does not require learners to produce language expressions directly. In the process of learning a new language, learners begin with reading the new language items and absorb the knowledge in their mind. It might be for this reason that most first language reading research has been traditionally focussed on investigating cognitive processes inside the reader's mind (Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Stevenson, 2010). With the growing development of second language reading research, however, the emphasis has currently been extended to discuss the broader concept of *literacy* including its variety of aspects of oral, aural, and digital communication (Stevenson, 2010).

As a manifestation of reading research into reading instruction, Williams (1998) proposes two kinds of reading; initial reading and reading comprehension. Initial reading represents efforts done by readers who are in the beginning stage of learning to read. New readers are still learning how to read alphabets, letters, words, and phrases. In contrast, reading comprehension is usually an activity intended to understand a certain text, starting from literal meaning of sentences up to

interpretative meaning of the whole text. Furthermore, Grabe and Stoller (2011) point out that reading comprehension is a set of complex abilities which cover rapid, efficient, interactive, strategic, flexible, evaluating, purposeful, comprehending, learning, and linguistic processes. All of these abilities are interrelated to support readers to achieve the ultimate goal of reading, that is, a full understanding of a particular text. With regard to the instruction and research development, reading comprehension is believed to be a complex, debatable subject that invites researchers to eagerly challenge and propose new theoretical and practical perspective.

Theoretical Concepts from L1 and L2 Reading Research

Over recent decades the understanding of reading theories in a first language (L1) and second language (L2) has changed significantly. Beginning with traditional views which emphasised word-recognition of text and moving to cognitive views which promoted the function of schemata in comprehension, reading theories shifted to the metacognitive view which is dominant in L1 and L2 recent reading research.

In a traditional view, reading was a linear process by which readers decoded a text word by word, linking the words into phrases and then sentences. Influenced by behaviourism theory in the 1950's, reading in this view was seen as a word-recognition response to the stimuli of the printed words. Yet, there was no satisfactory explanation on what was happening in the recess of human's mind that allow readers to make sense of the printed words (Samuels & Kamil, 1988). These lower level skills are linked to a printed text as a visual stimulus and accordingly, reinforced readers to recognise and recall words in the quest of comprehending the text. Traditional reading theories have been criticised as mostly relying on the formal features of the language (e.g., words and structure) and were therefore considered insufficient to describe the complex nature of reading comprehension.

In the late 1960s and 1970s researchers focussed more on the reader's role and how fluent readers read, research which led to the emergence of cognitive theories of reading. In these approaches, reading is viewed as an activity mediating the reader and the text which involves an active cognitive process of activating background knowledge in the reader's mind. Readers extract meaning from a text by connecting information in the text with the readers' schemata or prior knowledge (Goodman, 1967). Reading is, therefore, not merely a mechanical action but purposeful and logical involving the reader's prior knowledge and expectations. These higher level skills are not only a matter of decoding print to sound, but also a matter of making sense of written language (Smith, 2004). In a nutshell, reading is a *psycholinguistic guessing game*, a cognitively active process in which readers sample the text, make propositions, and then confirm or reject the propositions (Goodman, 1967).

In recent years, Goodman and Smith's psycholinguistic reading theory has been expanded and L2 reading researchers started drawing L1 reading research. The central importance of readers' background knowledge on reading is now widely accepted among L1 and L2 researchers. Even, they have investigated further to describe the control performed by learners when making efforts to understand a reading text. The control naturally comes out from their previous L1 learning experiences, their on-going efforts in learning L2, and from their learning strategies that work in L2 contexts. This control is called meta-cognition which engages thinking about what one is strategically doing while reading (Block, 1992; Grabe & Stoller, 2011). This view signals the emergence of new reading theories under the rubric of metacognitive theory.

In the metacognitive theory of reading, strategic readers do not only sample the text, make hypotheses, confirm or reject them, and make new hypotheses while reading. The readers also

conduct many activities along the process of reading. The activities are usually in the form of three reading stages, i.e. before reading, while reading, and after reading. According to Klein, Peterson, and Simington (1991) and Snow (2002), in the before reading stage, learners usually identify the purpose of the reading and the type of the reading text. In the while reading stage, they think about and find out the general features of the text—such as finding out a topic sentence, scanning the text for supporting details, projecting the author’s purpose for writing the text, and making continuous predictions about what will happen next in the text. Lastly, in the after reading stage, readers commonly attempt to form a summary/conclusion or to make inferences of what has been read. Thus, it can be said that during each of these stages, learners’ reading ability develops and is improved through the application of previous knowledge, reading skills, and comprehension.

Language Issues in L2 research

It needs to be pointed out that the development of second language reading research has been mostly derived from theories and viewpoints in first language reading research. Most L2 researchers often follow and adapt reading theories and experts’ opinions in L1 reading research which is dominantly conducted in English language contexts. Nevertheless, there are unique features of L2 reading research that cannot be shared with L1 reading studies, including linguistic knowledge, processing abilities, individual differences, language environment, socio-cultural background, and institutional expectations (Bernhardt, 2003; Grabe, 2004; Koda, 2005). In fact, these differences encourage researchers and educators from both sides to conduct further research and give major contributions to the development of second language reading issues.

A key issue which has been a primary concern in second language reading is the concept of *language threshold*, also well-known as *Language Threshold Hypothesis*. It basically refers to the idea that there is a threshold level of knowledge that learners need to possess in their first language in order to be successful in their second language (Bernhardt & Kamil, 1995; Cummins, 2000). In the realm of second language reading, it is generally hypothesised that students who have difficulties in reading L1 texts will highly likely find L2 texts difficult to comprehend. Alderson (2000) concludes that although a language threshold is not absolute, it must be solved before students can transfer their first language reading ability to the second language reading context. A language learner is believed to pass the language threshold if he/she is able to comprehend texts in the second language without having serious grammar and vocabulary problems. Yet, this belief is still debatable due to a variety of reasons of a difficult text. A difficult text is not only a matter of its challenging linguistic features, but might also due to its unfamiliar topic or unusual text organisation. Stevenson (2010) also argues that there are also other factors influencing the transfer of L1 to L2 reading ability, such as the reader’s age, motivation, attitudes, proficiency level, language environment, and characteristics of first language. The issue of language threshold is even more debatable when dealing with language transfer from first language proficiency to second language reading.

Issues on Language Transfer

The concept of *transfer* is actually an extending issue of *Language Threshold Hypothesis*. Generally, transfer is knowledge and experiences which are used by first language learners to do particular tasks in second language. In the context of reading, transfer can be in the form of L1

linguistics knowledge, general prior knowledge, and reading strategies which assist L1 readers to carry out tasks in L2 reading texts (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). The degree of transfer from readers' L1 to their L2 is crucial in the completion of second language reading tasks. Sometimes transfer is useful for learners to carry out L2 reading tasks, but occasionally it also interferes or hinders the accomplishment of L2 reading tasks.

Due to the special characteristics of second language learners, several studies on language *transfer* and *language threshold* have been conducted with diverse findings. Some researchers argue that the degree of transfer and of language threshold is dependent on L2 linguistic knowledge of the learners (e.g., word recognition, syntactic parsing, vocabulary, grammar, and discourse). Learners whose L2 proficiency lower than the threshold will not be able to optimally transfer their L1 reading skills to L2 reading until they pass the threshold. Others researchers found that language threshold is not an absolute matter but vary by tasks given to students, claiming the more challenging the tasks are, the higher language threshold experienced by the students (Alderson, 2000; Bernhardt & Kamil, 1995; Carrell, 1991; Taillefer, 1996; Yamashita, 2002). Notwithstanding the disagreement of the results, most studies tend to come up with a conclusion that crossing language threshold is proven to be strongly related to effectiveness in second language reading comprehension (Eskey, 2005; Yamashita, 2002), signifying a sufficient degree of transfer of reading ability from the first language to second language reading (Van Gelderen, Schoonen, Stoel, de Glopper, & Hulstijn, 2007).

Another research issue worth discussing in L1 and L2 reading development is the different notion of *process* and *product* of reading. Alderson (2000) even suggests that any discussion on reading studies development should fundamentally cover the basic nature of reading itself, that is, the process of reading and the product of reading.

Research into the Process and Product of Reading

The reading process mainly refers to things happening when people are reading a text, such as decoding symbols or terms, negotiating meaning, thinking about the challenges or ease when reading, and eventually, deciding whether or not the text is worth-reading. On the contrary, the product of reading essentially deals with how readers come to understanding a text they are reading. It covers not only how people reach the fact of understanding, but also what kind of understanding ones reach after reading (Alderson, 2000).

It should be noted that early research into reading is focused more on product than on process. Researchers usually design tests of understanding of particular texts, administer the tests, and then inspect the relationship between the test results and variables being investigated. For example, experts on readability investigated linguistic features of particular texts in order to find out approximate level difficulty of the texts. Some practitioners interested in investigating students' reading ability designed a reading comprehension test containing a set of different questions to know the students' level of understanding toward the reading texts. Other researchers conducted research on eye movement of readers, a total number of vocabulary of L1 and L2 students in different level of education, effectiveness of whole-word approach compared to phonics method, and different reading abilities between male and female students (Alderson, 2000; Bernhardt, 2003; Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Yamashita, 2002).

As new directions of research have shifted on investigating the reading process experienced by readers and on supporting teachers to understand how their students approach a certain text, product oriented-research became old-fashioned (Alderson, 2000). A further reason of leaving the former research type is possibly due to the limitation of the measurement tests which do not

sufficiently describe the participants' reading ability, especially their process in comprehending the texts and coming up with particular answers. It is also possible that if learners are not comfortable with testing approaches, then their reading abilities cannot be measured accurately.

Different from product oriented-research, most studies on reading process are usually conducted in qualitative approach. The majority of researchers use reading strategies gathered from verbal protocols obtained by the think-aloud method (simultaneous verbalisation of mental activities) as representations of cognitive process done by readers during reading. Some of the researchers also calculate the data quantitatively after previously studying the participants' verbal protocols and classifying strategies in accordance with the qualitative differences in the verbal protocols (Stevenson, 2010; Yamashita, 2002).

Another important issue is the influence of first language characteristics to processing of words, sentences, and texts in second language. Learners who have an alphabetic first language such as Dutch and Indonesian tend to have better word recognition than those whose a non-alphabetic first language such as Arabic and Chinese (Muljani, Koda, & Moates, 1998; Wang & Koda, 2005). Furthermore, the degree of similarities of L1 and L2 in text structure properties potentially affects textual processing in second language reading in terms of processing main ideas and meaning associations (Koda, 2005). It can be said that if the first language of learners have similarities with the second language being learned, there should be positive transfer from L1 to L2 which influence the process and product of L2 reading (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

Having done studies on both reading process and product, researchers provide multiple insights in the investigation of reading issues as well as a verifiable understanding of how to support reading comprehension maximally. As an implication to reading instruction, by identifying the stages and reasons of a failed reading process, educators can apply better teaching techniques and design learning materials to prevent or solve the problems for a more optimal product of reading.

Moving from studies of different process and product of reading, by the end of twentieth century some linguists have come up with the idea of supporting students optimally to arrive at reading comprehension of a particular text. This issue becomes more crucial as language teaching experts give more concern on the teaching trend of EFL reading which aims at empowering students from different cultural backgrounds to have proper reading strategies to achieve reading comprehension on academic textbooks and similar materials in target language. As a result, the emphasis has currently been extended to discuss social, cultural, and multi-cultural issues in reading studies (Alptekin, 2006; Kamil, Mosenthal, Pearson, & Barr, 2000; Ketchum, 2006; Stevenson, 2010) and more importantly to discuss how a reading program should be implemented and evaluated in the context of ESL and EFL learners (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Slavin & Cheung, 2003).

Before further discussing the links between culture and EFL reading program in Indonesian universities, it is important to discuss general picture of English language teaching in the developing country. This is important since the success of English language teaching in Indonesia is influenced by many interrelated factors, such as language policy, curriculum development, local culture, and learners' socio-economic status.

English Language and Literacy Teaching in Indonesia

English has been formally taught at secondary schools in Indonesia since some years after the independence of the country. Although English has been prioritised as the 'first' foreign language, it has never been treated as an official second language, as in Singapore, Malaysia,

India, or other countries that have adopted English as a second language. A possible reason is that the effect of British colonialism in Indonesia was practically invisible and English did not serve any social function in the nation at that time (Dardjowidjojo, 1996; Jazadi, 2008; Mistar, 2005). This condition is almost similar to other Asian countries, such as Thailand, China, and Japan which also use English primarily as a foreign language (Baker, 2008; Hui, 1997; Mori, 2004).

Furthermore, efforts to propose English as a second language in Indonesia have been unsuccessful for at least two reasons. First, *Bahasa Indonesia* as the national language is actually the second language for Indonesian people. Most of them speak a local language before they learn Indonesian at schools. Second, from political perspective, many Indonesian leaders and ordinary people are reluctant to support English as an official language (Dardjowidjojo, 1996). It has ever been claimed that the use of English in some Indonesian institutions is seen as a betrayal of the national language (Hardjoprawiro, 1998). Nevertheless, the dominant role of English as a global language has caused Indonesian policy makers to give sufficient attention to the teaching of English in all education levels. As Nunan (2003) points out, the strong pressure of English as a global language has given a major influence on education policy, with English as a compulsory subject, in all Asia-Pacific countries.

The impact of English has varied according to the level of education and resources available. Even though English is compulsory from Year 3 to tertiary level, the time allocation for English is not sufficient to gain basic communicative competence. Many educators (e.g. Jazadi, 2008; Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Sukono, 2002) conclude that English is not prioritised and treated in the same way as other general subjects. At secondary schools, for instance, students only learn English for twice a week, 45 minutes each time. At universities, English in non-English departments is only taught once or twice a week, each meeting is 100 minutes during the first two semesters. In few universities, English is taught at the first semester only since it is not a part of the university core courses. This academic fact is disadvantageous for the students since a number of compulsory textbooks used are written in English.

In the most current development, however, some Indonesian universities have started giving more priority in English, such as supporting the establishment of English clubs and self-access centre and encouraging students to do academic presentations in English. Sukono (2002) found that such a constructive effort tends to be successful in well-established state and private universities where the enrolled students have had quite good language proficiency from their secondary schools and can afford better supporting ELT facilities. In this case, the success of English can be a factor of equality access between the haves and the have-nots (Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Lie, 2007; Nunan, 2003).

In the context of EFL reading instruction in Indonesian universities, Cahyono and Widiati (2006) found that the issue becomes more complicated since reading in tertiary level demands flexible and independent learning requiring students to read English texts from different sources independently and effectively. For Indonesian students who are generally influenced by their cultural background and lack motivation in reading English texts (Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Setiono, 2004), the demand of the EFL reading is not easy to accomplish. This issue is discussed further in the following section.

EFL Reading in Indonesian Universities: Facts and Cultural Contexts

Most Indonesian universities require their students to take English courses focussing on improving students' English competence to comprehend academic disciplinary texts. Non-

English department students usually take a subject called *English for Academic Purposes* (e.g., *English for Law*, *English for Economics*, and *English for Medicine*) once or twice a week for two semesters (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006). Classes typically involve text discussion with most focus on reading.

Reading courses are generally sequenced according to readability word level (5000, 6000, 7000 word level or more), type of reading (*Intensive Course*, *Interpretative and Affective Reading*, *Critical Reading*, and *Extensive Reading*) and text type (including descriptive, narrative, and argumentative) (Widayati & Anugerahwati, 2005; 2011). The main focus has been on intensive reading which is normally done in the classroom, using relatively short text accompanied by tasks (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006). Extensive reading, on the other hand, is usually given as the last reading course, aimed to provide the students with opportunities to improve their English vocabulary and gain better insight into English culture by developing their appreciation of English literary works. The reading activities can be inside and outside the class depending on the availability of self-access centre and library (Widayati & Anugerahwati, 2005).

Tertiary lecturers face problems similar to those in other contexts in Thailand, China, and Japan of economic, administrative, cultural, population and academic constraints (Baker, 2008; Hui, 1997; Mori, 2004). The main problem is minimal use of English in social interactions outside the classroom where students have quite limited contact with English communities (Baker, 2008; Hui, 1997; Mori, 2004). Lie (2007) argues that only students coming from middle and upper socio-economic backgrounds can afford private English courses or have sufficient opportunities to access Internet, Western culture-oriented programs in TV cables, foreign films, and expatriate networks.

The second issue is cultural. One of the main features in the research of successful EFL reading classes is learner centeredness, covering learning objectives, contents and progress, methods and techniques and evaluation which supports learners' autonomy, needs, and interests (Dardjowidjojo, 1997; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The notion of learner-centredness, however, does not generally align with learner expectations, previous experiences of education, and attitudes to learning.

Indonesian students, especially those from rural areas, may not be accustomed to the idea that learning activities are student centred. Two famous Javanese philosophies such as *manutlanpiturut* (to obey and to follow) and *ewuh-pakewuh* (feeling uncomfortable and uneasy) are reported as keys to understanding Indonesian people's way of thinking. The impact of these concepts could be linked to patterns of reading classes. Setiono (2004) argues that it is not easy to expect the students to openly challenge and criticise their teacher's opinions. They might feel uncomfortable to disagree with their teacher or feel uneasy to talk about controversial matters.

EFL Reading Research in Indonesia

The issue of cultural difference has motivated several studies into learners' psychological factors in relation to the culture and EFL reading comprehension. The majority of these studies are case studies of individual groups or strategies. Kweldju (1996) found that students are not willing to read their reading textbooks although they realised their usefulness. She argues that this lack of interest is due to the students' inadequate prior knowledge, inability to comprehend the reading texts, and complex structure of the textbooks. This study is confirmed by Rukmini (2004) and Firmanto (2005).

Rukmini (2004) found that new university students lack interest in reading classes since they are not familiar with explanation and discussion genres which are commonly used in reading

texts in tertiary level. (The genres in most secondary school textbooks are anecdote and descriptive texts). Reading classes were considered boring and stressful because of over long reading text/s, unfamiliar vocabulary, lack of pre-reading activities activating the students' background knowledge, and repetitive teaching (Firmanto, 2005).

Students' cultural background has also been found to influence individual differences in their reading behaviour and consequently, influence their reading performance (Imran, 2005). When sufficient opportunities are given to increase their motivation, confidence, knowledge of subject areas, and language skills, reading improvement occurs (Imran, 2005). In Imran's view, EFL learners should be assisted to increase their ability and willingness to learn in order to be more confident and independent readers. Kweldju (2000) proposed an alternative to motivate reluctant students to read in a literature course. In her study, the students were given a guideline based on cultural and gender elements which proved successful in changing attitude from reluctant to interested readers.

Recent studies have found that the interactive model of reading and classroom-based activities is the best option for effective reading courses at English department in Indonesian universities (Hadi, 2006; Hamra & Syatriana, 2010). Others argue that *extensive reading* should be more promoted and reading for pleasure needs to be given more priority, so that the students can pick up a great deal of new vocabulary and eventually develop their reading competence (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006; Renandya, 2007; Wahyudi, 2002).

Importance of New Research Based on Cultural Perspectives

There is now a body of research into the cultural, historical, social and linguistic contexts of reading (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000; Baynham, 1995; Gregory & Williams, 2000; Moore, 2011; Street, 1993; Wallace, 2003) to name but a few. This recent research questions many basic assumptions about reading. Reading and writing have different functions, status and draws on different skills across languages and cultures. The pathways to reading and the skills prized in learning to read vary much more across cultural groups (Aebersold & Field, 2007; Moore, 2011). There is evidence that fluent readers of Arabic, Chinese and other scripts read in a different way to fluent readers of English and that they develop different perceptual and cognitive skills (Cruickshank, 2006; Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven, 1998; Koda, 2005). Reading occurs in many ways in different languages and cultures. Sometimes group reading or reading aloud are the norm.

In an Indonesian context it is natural that tertiary students' approaches to reading in English would be affected by the role and functions of literacy in their home languages and also in some cases religious Qur'anic literacy (Gade, 2004; Street, 1993). The way Indonesian students read and write in English is influenced by their native language or dialect. In some Islamic communities, the influence can be from students' experiences with Qur'anic recitation. In this case, teachers often assist learners to read by using similar sounds in *bahasadaerah* (local language) that fit sounds in Arabic (Gade, 2004). The teaching of EFL reading at English departments in Islamic universities in Indonesia is often conducted in the same fashion since Muslim students coming from *pesantren* Islamic secondary schools are accustomed to that kind of Islamic teaching method. It is, therefore, common for English lecturers at Islamic tertiary institutions to use similar sounds and contexts in Arabic/Qur'anic recitation when teaching their students read and understand English texts.

The construct of culture that new research should draw upon is 'culture is a verb' (Street, 1993, p.25). In this view, as Street points out, culture is not referred to a passive object, but a

dynamic process of collective meaning-making. Culture is not a noun as previously seen in traditional views; it is a verb which influence people how to do something and interact with their surroundings. From this perspective ‘culture’ and ‘cultural approaches to reading’ in the Indonesian context are not a static set of beliefs or attitudes but a complex set of interrelated and changing behaviours. Students’ attitudes to and beliefs about reading in English could be informed by their previous educational experiences, their family background experiences, their religious teaching as much as by their peer group interactions and daily access to media, internet and global technology. These factors are constructed and played out in tertiary reading classroom contexts.

Street’s concept of “culture as a verb” (Street, 1993, p.25) is similar to Holliday’s idea of “small culture” (Holliday, 1999, p.237). The ideas of “small culture” culture essentially attempts to “...liberate “culture” from notions of ethnicity and nation and from the perceptual dangers they carry with them” (Holliday, 1999, p.237). The concept of small culture enables an analysis of the group which combines the richness, complexity and dynamism of the sociocultural dynamics of group interactions. This supports a focus on what a community of practice and the individuals within it does and is becoming; and on how it/ they are perceived and defined by the participants; rather than on fixed and reified notions of what they are such as Western, Asian etc (Holliday, 1999, 2009).

In the context of EFL reading in Indonesian universities, students’ cultural backgrounds and culture existing in their universities should be seen as an active component which potentially affects the ways stakeholders (e.g., students, lecturers, curriculum developers, policy makers, and community) view and frame the act of reading (teaching and learning) and the ways they make sense of text.

The problem with the existing EFL reading studies in Indonesia is their limited research base and focus on student psychological traits and on individual strategies. Therefore, they have limited validity and reliability of findings for reading programs. There has been no research that attempts to describe a larger depiction of EFL reading program in Indonesian universities – a study which takes into account different perspectives of stakeholders (e.g., lecturers and students) on what actually constitutes an EFL reading program and cultural factors which potentially contribute to or detract the development, implementation and outcomes of the reading program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This article has reviewed current cultural issues of EFL reading instruction in Indonesia in accordance with the current EFL reading theories and cultural contexts of English language teaching in Indonesia. For Indonesian students whose perceptions of reading are based on cultural values from their home languages, the demands of EFL reading in university level are not easy to realise. English teachers in Indonesia should be aware of these cultural problems and be encouraged to create supporting conditions for effective, learner-centred teaching in their reading classes.

There is a body of research into the development of English at tertiary level but little research into the development of reading in English, despite this being the primary focus of many tertiary programs in Indonesia. The few studies that have been done focus primarily on investigating the application of approaches or models of EFL reading and learner’s psychological traits such as attitude, interest, and motivation in reading.

Future researchers are recommended to conduct further studies investigating more effective ways of teaching EFL reading in Indonesia. The research topics might deal with factors supporting learning process of intensive and extensive reading, self-directed learning, and innovative ways of teaching reading skills.

New research on EFL reading in Indonesia should also address the 'bigger picture' of EFL reading in Indonesian universities by investigating how contextual factors, such as stakeholder expectations and goals, local resources and current research and curriculum impact on EFL reading program in Indonesian universities. This would clarify whether cultural influences existing in Indonesia support or hinder effective implementation of EFL reading program.

References

1. Aebersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (2007). *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Alptekin, C. (2006). Cultural familiarity in inferential and literal comprehension in L2 reading. *System*, 34(4), 494-508. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2006.05.003
4. Baker, W. (2008). A Critical examination of ELT in Thailand: The role of cultural awareness. *RELC Journal*, 39(1), 131-146. doi: 10.1177/0033688208091144
5. Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (2000). *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.
6. Baynham, M. (1995). *Literacy Practices: Investigating Literacy in Social Contexts*. London: Longman.
7. Bernhardt, E. B. (2003). Challenges to reading research from a multilingual world. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(1), 112-117.
8. Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (1995). Interpreting relationships between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 15-34. doi: 10.1093/applin/16.1.15
9. Block, E. L. (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2), 319-343. doi: 10.2307/3587008
10. Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2006). The teaching of EFL reading in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17(1), 23-46.
11. Carrell, P. L. (1991). Second language reading: Reading ability or language proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 159-179. doi: 10.1093/applin/12.2.159
12. Cruickshank, K. (2006). *Teenagers, Literacy and School: Researching in Multilingual Contexts*. New York: Routledge.
13. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
14. Dardjowidjojo, S. (1996). The socio-political aspects of English in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 3(1), 1-13.
15. Dardjowidjojo, S. (1997). *Cultural constraints in the teaching of English in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the The TEFLIN 45th National Conference, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung.
16. Durgunoğlu, A. Y., & Verhoeven, L. T. (1998). *Literacy Development in a Multilingual Context: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. New Jersey: Routledge.
17. Eskey, D. E. (2005). Reading in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 563-579). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Inc.
18. Firmanto, S. O. (2005). *Students behavior of reading comprehension: Expectations and follow up*. Paper presented at the LIA International conference, Jakarta.

19. Gade, A. M. (2004). *Perfection Makes Practice: Learning, Emotion, and the Recited Qur'ān in Indonesia*. USA: University of Hawai'i Press.
20. Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: Psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*, 6(1), 26-135.
21. Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 44-69. doi: 10.1017/S0267190504000030
22. Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching reading*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
24. Gregory, E., & Williams, A. (2000). *City Literacies: Learning to Read across Generations and Cultures*. London: Routledge.
25. Hadi, A. (2006). Reading based-classroom activities: An effort toward the integration of language skills in teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia 17 *TEFLIN Journal*, 17(1), 59-68.
26. Hamra, A., & Syatriana, E. (2010). Developing a model of teaching reading comprehension for EFL students. *TEFLIN Journal*, 21(1), 27-40.
27. Hardjoprawiro, K. (1998). Penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai pengantar, pengingkaran terhadap bahasa Indonesia [the use of English as a medium, a betrayal to Indonesian]
28. *Kompas*, p. 23 March.
29. Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 237-264. doi: 10.1093/applin/20.2.237
30. Holliday, A. (2009). The role of culture in English language education: key challenges. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 144-155. doi: 10.1080/14708470902748814
31. Hui, L. (1997). New bottles, old wine: Communicative language teaching in China. *Forum*, 35(4), 38-48.
32. Imran, N. (2005). *The interplay of culture, individual differences and adult EFL reading performance: From teacher-dependence to the development of autonomous readers*. Paper presented at the The 1st International Seminar on Literacy Education in Developing Countries, Semarang.
33. Jazadi, I. (2008). *The politics of curriculum*. Indonesia: Paracendekia NW Press.
34. Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson, P. D., & Barr, R. (2000). 'Preface'. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. ix-xiv). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
35. Ketchum, E. M. (2006). The Cultural baggage of second language reading: An approach to understanding the practices and perspectives of a non-native product. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(1), 22-42. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02247.x
36. Kiely, R., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program evaluation in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
37. Klein, M. L., Peterson, S., & Simington, L. (1991). *Teaching reading in the elementary grades*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
38. Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross linguistics approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Kweldju, S. (1996). English department students interest and strategies in reading their content area textbooks. *TEFLIN Journal*, 8(1), 104-117.
40. Kweldju, S. (2000). Assisting reluctant teacher's college students to autonomously appreciate a novel to read. *TEFLIN Journal*, 11(1), 22-34.
41. Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 189-205. doi: 10.2167/beb493.0
42. Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and efl curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 1-14.

43. Mistar, J. (2005). Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Indonesia. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum, and practice* (pp. 71-80). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
44. Moore, L. C. (2011). Moving across languages, literacies, and schooling traditions. *Language Arts*, 88(4), 288-297.
45. Mori, S. (2004). Significant motivational predictors of the amount of reading by EFL learners in Japan. *RELC Journal*, 35(1), 63-81. doi: 10.1177/003368820403500106
46. Muljani, D., Koda, K., & Moates, D. R. (1998). The development of word recognition in a second language. [10.1017/S0142716400010602]. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 19(01), 99-113.
47. Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613. doi: 10.2307/3588214
48. Renandya, W. A. (2007). The power of extensive reading. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 133-149. doi: 10.1177/0033688207079578
49. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Communicative language teaching Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
50. Rukmini, D. (2004). *Genre analysis of the reading texts in the English text book for high school students published by Balai Pustaka*. Paper presented at the The 52nd TEFLIN International Conference, Palembang.
51. Samuels, S. J., & Kamil, M. L. (1988). Models of the reading process. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 22-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
52. Setiono, S. (2004, October 17, 2012). Competency-based learning: The dreams and realities, *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2004/06/19/competencybased-learning-dreams-and-realities.html>
53. Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2003). *Effective reading program for English language learners: U.S. Department of Education*.
54. Smith, F. (2004). *Understanding Reading* (6th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
55. Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education.
56. Stevenson, M. (2010). Researching reading. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 174-190). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
57. Street, B. V. (1993). *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
58. Sukono. (2002). *Is CLT a thing of the past?* . Unpublished Paper. Monash University. Melbourne.
59. Taillefer, G. F. (1996). L2 reading ability: Further insight into the short-circuit hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(4), 461-477. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb05466.x
60. Van Gelderen, A., Schoonen, R., Stoel, R. D., de Glopper, K., & Hulstijn, J. (2007). Development of adolescent reading comprehension in language 1 and language 2: A longitudinal analysis of constituent components. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 99(3), 477-491.
61. Wahyudi, A. (2002). Come to an enjoyable class: EFL extensive reading. *TEFLIN Journal*, 13(2), 1-11.
62. Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical reading in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
63. Wang, M., & Koda, K. (2005). Commonalities and differences in word identification skills among learners of English as a second language. *Language Learning*, 55(1), 71-98. doi: 10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00290.x
64. Widayati, S., & Anugerahwati, M. (2005). Katalog jurusan sastra Inggris (The catalogue of English literature study program). In S. U. o. M. Faculty of Letters (Ed.). Malang: Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang.
65. Widayati, S., & Anugerahwati, M. (2011). Katalog jurusan sastra Inggris (The catalogue of English literature study program). In S. U. o. M. Faculty of Letters (Ed.). Malang: Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang.

66. Williams, E. (1998). Teaching reading. In K. Johnson & H. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedic dictionary of applied linguistics* (pp. 330-335). Oxford: Blackwell.
67. Yamashita, J. (2002). Mutual compensation between L1 reading ability and L2 language proficiency in L2 reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 25(1), 81-95. doi: 10.1111/1467-9817.00160.