Exploring English Reading Strategies Employed by Teachers at Secondary School Level

Maria Bibi[1], Dr. Kifayat Khan[2] & Iqra Ayub[3]

[1] MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Haripur Email: mariakhaan34@gmail.com
[2] Assistant Professor (Corresponding Author), Department of Education, The University of Haripur
   Email: kifayatkhan@uoh.edu.pk
[3] PhD Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Haripur Email: iqraayub1996@gmail.com

Abstract

Importance of English is inevitable not only in Pakistan but all over the world. English language has gained a significant place in various fields of life demanding modern people to have sufficient command of language skills to progress in academic and professional domains. Similarly, the students are also required to be adept in language skills to meet the needs of the modern era. In this context, the research was carried out to explore the English reading strategies adopted by teachers at the SSC level in district Haripur and also to find difference of male and female, urban and rural teachers' reading strategies in term of basic components of reading; phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. A survey research design was used. Four hundred (400) secondary school teachers teaching English to grade-10 was selected through stratified random sampling technique as sample. A self-constructed questionnaire for teachers was used as research tool. The findings revealed that a very least number of teachers had shown interest in basic teaching skill while more of the focus was on syllabus completion and exam-preparation. The study provided an insight about the current situation of language teaching in terms of their focus on basic language skills particularly reading. It is hoped that the government of KP and education department would take necessary measures to improve language teaching by implementing required changes in the policies, conducting training workshops and seminars to sensitize and familiarize the teachers with modern trends of language teachings and revising curriculum with the focus on to polish the basic skills of students at large.

Keywords   Reading Strategy, Reading Comprehension Skills, Urban/Rural and Male/Female Teachers

Introduction

The importance of English is great not only in Pakistan but all over the world. English language has gained a significant place in various fields of life. It is considered as lingua franca. Due to this, the scope and need for English language have increased to a great extent. Therefore, it demands the citizens of modern societies to be proficient enough to be successful in their academic and professional careers to live a prosperous and successful life. So, on this basis, the students are required to be good enough to understand and use the English language confidently to meet the needs of the modern era by being adept in language skills.

Block and Israel (2005) stated that for academic learning and success reading competence is considered as the most crucial skill in school. A study conducted in the United States, links the personal and professional achievement in life with reading proficiency. Second language reading is considered as a link that is responsible for improving other language skills such as speaking, writing, and vocabulary acquisition (Albiladi, 2019). In Pakistani context, English has gained the status of official language and is considered a token of highness and superiority. Officially English language

International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)....................................Vol. 3, Issue III, 2024

Exploring English Reading Strategies Employed by Teachers------------------Bibi, Khan & Ayub

has got the unique position in getting high-ranking civil service jobs and having proficiency has led to various opportunities. At the same time, it is revealed through research studies that even the secondary students have major areas of difficulty in reading, speaking and writing English and are found poor readers and receive lower grades in English language (Teevno & Raisani, 2017).

Keeping in view the crucial importance of basic skills, the research was designed to study English reading strategies adopted by secondary school teachers to teach the text to the students. In the field of language teaching, reading is considered more crucial among the four basic skills and is widely emphasized by experts. So, the researcher took on the journey to investigate different English reading strategies used by English teachers at secondary level.

Statement of the Problem
The nucleus of English language teaching is to teach the mastery of skills and when students are learning a language from nursery to college, they have to be able to use language effectively. But, it is a common observation that despite studying English for over 14 years, most of the students lack the required command of English language skills to pursue their educational and professional goals. In this context, the researcher was motivated to explore English reading strategies adopted by secondary school teachers in district Haripur to teach basic skills of language, particularly reading comprehension skills.

Objectives of the Study
The following were the objectives of the study:
1. To explore English reading strategies of secondary school teachers
2. To compare English reading strategies of male and female teachers at secondary level
3. To find the difference of English reading strategies between urban and rural secondary teachers

Hypotheses of the Study
The following were the hypotheses of the study.

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between male and female teachers English reading strategies at secondary school level.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers English reading strategies at secondary school level.

Significance of the Study
The researcher tried to find out the most prevalent English reading strategies to provide an insight to English language teachers, policymakers, and curriculum developers to understand the current condition of language teaching in the rural as well as the urban sector in terms of their focus on basic skill development in students like reading, writing speaking, and listening.

Delimitation of the Study
The study was delimited to district Haripur. Furthermore, it was delimited secondary schools' English teachers of Haripur. The strata of teachers selected further delimit to male/female, and urban/rural teachers.

Literature Review
Literature review focuses on differences in the use of reading strategies of male and female and urban and rural secondary school teachers as well as students and problem and issues encountered by them. Numerous researchers shed light on importance, nature and types of reading strategies and comprehension process. Anderson et al (1988) defined reading as fundamental skill of life. It is fundament of a child's success in academic and practical life. Lack of reading ability can take away job opportunities and results in personal dissatisfaction. Trends in language teaching have shifted from focusing on teaching language components; grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation to the concentration on the communicative proficiency and the integration of basic skills: reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Crystal, 2003).

Teaching of these communication skills has become an integral part of language teaching inside and outside the classrooms. It is called as token of academic and professional success to be competent in these skills. Among all these four fundamental skills reading is most influential. All the other skills are directly or indirectly related to proficiency in reading skill.

Reading and Reading Process
Reading can be defined an active process in which readers deduce the meaning from a text by making use of useful strategies. To comprehend the text, readers require reading strategies/plans. For

developing students' reading comprehension reading strategies are the basic element (Goodman, 1996). Reading is a highly strategic process during which readers construct meaning through the constant use of several strategies. There is a strong relationship between learners' reading strategies and their ability to comprehend (Banditvilai, 2020).

Reading Strategies

Reading strategies are conscious plans and procedures that proficient readers apply to understand the text (Maine, 2013). Effective reading strategies play a vital role in aiding students to plan and oversee their reading comprehension. Language learners utilize reading strategies to enhance their reading comprehension skills with more adaptability and strategy (Scheid, 1993).

The most frequently used strategies are following.

a. *Previewing text:* Teachers teach students to simply preview the reading material to grasp the information just by looking at the title or contents.

b. *Guessing meaning:* This reading strategy involves the teaching of guessing the meaning by looking at the title/topic.

c. *Using prior knowledge:* This strategy is employed when students relate their previous knowledge with the text and share ideas of their existing knowledge to make connection with what they are going to read.

d. *Skimming:* To quickly locate particular information within a text, a reader may employ the technique of skimming, which involves rapidly scanning the material.

e. *Scanning:* Scanning is reading strategy to get a quick overview of key facts of the text.

f. *Making predictions:* Students are taught to make predictions about the content of reading material using this strategy. They make assumptions and predictions about what they will learn based on the topic or title of the reading content.

g. *Cognitive reading strategy:* It is a king of conscious process in which reader analyze highlight, take notes, identify main ideas, and draw inferences.

h. *Meta-cognitive reading strategy:* In meta-cognitive reading strategies the pupils evaluate their own reading process by controlling, checking, and comprehending the text.

i. *Paraphrasing:* This is the strategy where students are taught to re-write the gathered information in their own words for their understanding.

j. *Criticizing the text:* In this strategy students are taught to give comments and share their opinions about the reading material.

k. *Summarizing:* In this strategy students are taught to summarize the key information in their own words.

Significance of Teaching Reading Strategies

Reading strategies are essential for both teachers and students, especially in an EFL classroom. Using reading comprehension strategies efficiently and putting them into practice has been proven to be difficult and challenging for teachers and students alike within the classroom setting. Learners' reading comprehension competency can be improved through the application of different reading strategies. Learners having learnt reading strategies use them to recognize the main point of a given text, to clarify difficult words, phrases, or sentences, and to summarize their reading. While reading the text these strategies help readers in problem solving, assessing, and planning its results. Reading skills of both proficient and less proficient readers may be improved using these strategies. Readers who have acquired diverse reading strategies are aware of what, when, how, and why to apply them in their reading comprehension processes.

Su (2006) investigated the impact of reading strategies on the learners' reading competence. The findings revealed that reading strategies are among the most crucial factors to improve reading comprehension skills and they have a great effect on the students' reading comprehension performance. Through using these strategies learners turn to be passive receivers of information as well as active makers of meaning. Skillful readers try to make use of various skills to catch meaning from the texts. Readers should be involved in the reading process by using different strategies to monitor their meaning.

Theoretical Framework

The research is designed to study English reading strategies adopted by secondary school teachers to teach the text to the students. In the field of language teaching, reading is considered more crucial among the four basic skills and is widely emphasized by experts. So, the research endeavored to

International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)....................................Vol. 3, Issue III, 2024

Exploring English Reading Strategies Employed by Teachers-------------------Bibi, Khan & Ayub

investigate different English reading strategies used by English teachers. Much research had been carried out on the nature of reading that how people learn to read. It had resulted in many contrasting theories about what works best in the teaching of reading. This study adopted *Schema theory*, which explains how learners use prior knowledge to understand and learn from text. Initially, the term 'schema' was coined by Barlett in psychology as 'an active organization of past reactions or experiences. Later, Rumelhalt (1977) used this term in reading and presented the interactional model based on amore extended theory that could explain the process of reading comprehension and can also be applied in teaching of reading comprehension. This model explains that any act of reading comprehension is the combined result of the *top-down model* and the *bottom-up model*. Reading psychologists are of the view that the interaction between top-down and bottom-up reading strategies result in effective reading. So, through the implication of the model, it will be investigated that what reading strategies are used by English teachers to facilitate the students to build their own reading knowledge framework from all aspects.

Review of Related Studies

Shakoor et al. (2019) conducted an experimental study to investigate the impacts of teaching reading strategies on reading comprehension of students in the subject of English at the higher secondary school level. 60 higher secondary school students at a private girl's college in Mansehra were the respondents of the study. Experimental pretest-posttest equivalent research design was chosen for data collection. The findings revealed the positive effect of teaching reading strategies on the reading comprehension of students at higher secondary level.

Al-Ghazo (2015) carried out a study to explore the reading comprehension strategies of Jordanian school instructors to evaluate their pupils' reading comprehension. Twenty female teachers of English made up the study's sample. Data were analyzed using qualitative analysis after a survey card was designed. The study's findings showed that language teachers used a variety of reading strategies and reading assessment techniques because they believed that reading assessments were an essential part of teaching reading effectively. Oral reading, text comprehension tests, sentence completion quizzes, word identification lists, and reading self-assessment are some of these strategies.

Teevno et al. (2020) conducted a study to explore the strategies adopted by teachers for teaching reading of English at higher secondary level grade XII and their impact on the performance of the students in reading comprehension in English in Pakistan. The participants of this study were 52 English teachers (male/female) teaching to grade XII was the sample of the study. Data was collected through questionnaire and interview. The findings of the study were that teaching strategies of the teachers and performance of the students in reading comprehension was strongly correlated. Students' reading aloud, text translation, questioning, teaching grammatical patterns and vocabulary, making summaries, skimming, and scanning and column matching were the common strategies applied by the teachers.

Navarrete (2019) aimed to carry a study on theories and process of reading comprehension. The study focused on investigating teaching strategies for both single and multiple texts. The review emphasized the importance of reading teachers having practical knowledge about these strategies and how to implement them effectively to enhance students' reading abilities.

Kanmaz (2022) highlighted the crucial role of teachers' competencies in promoting students' reading comprehension skills. In this regard, he carried a study using descriptive screening model, one of the quantitative research methods to explore teachers' levels of reading comprehension and use of reading strategies. Teachers at secondary schools in Denizli province was the population of the study. Total of 418 teachers were the participants of the study selected through probability sampling technique. The research results were that the teachers' reading comprehension and use of reading strategies levels differ by the branch variable and Turkish teachers were better reading comprehension as compared to teachers. In addition to that, it was suggested that an effective instruction of reading strategies enhances teachers of other branches to perform better.

Farid et al. (2020) investigated the reading strategies and their theoretical perspectives in reading comprehension in the classroom. Basic differentiated strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and socio-affective strategies were the four main categories of strategies that the study focused on. They were also noted for their educational value. The study also opens a new area of research into how these techniques are viewed as significant, which one's teachers and students avoid, and how pedagogical instructions and assessment affect these strategies. In order to integrate

new knowledge with the existing for potential conceptual change, it was advised that all of these techniques should be given equal weight. This is because they collectively work through cognitive patterns that link memory and retention.

Teevno and Raisani (2017) carried a study on students' strategies used for reading English and tried to find the impact of these strategies on students' reading comprehension performance at secondary school level. A design of the research was survey research. Through stratified sampling technique 359 students from Higher Secondary Schools and intermediate colleges were selected as respondents. Reading comprehension tests, interviews, and questionnaires were used to gather the data. The results showed that students employ a range of reading learning techniques, such as reading aloud, silent reading, summarizing the texts they are reading, outlining the grammatical structures and patterns they contain, responding to simple questions, looking up the definitions of new words, and translating English texts into their native tongues. The pupils do not, however, employ these techniques on a regular, systematic, and need-based basis. Additionally, a comparison of the students' reading performance by gender revealed no appreciable differences; nonetheless, pupils performed better when compared to their peers who lived in rural areas.

Rehman et al. (2020) conducted a study with the purpose of investigating reading strategies of English teachers being taught to elementary pupils. To carry out the study quantitative research design was used sample of the study was 100 teachers from 50 public schools selected through random sampling technique. The instrument was a questionnaire. The results revealed showed the problems faced by teachers in teaching of teaching English reading strategies to elementary students. The study also suggested implementation of necessary measures to enhance students understanding and development of reading comprehension strategies.

Solak and Altay (2014) conducted study at a state-run University, English Language Teaching Department in Turkey. 130 aspiring English teachers who were majoring in English Language Teaching and attending the lecture on teaching language skills made up the sample. Data on the application of reading strategies when reading academic or school-related texts was gathered using the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI). The results showed that participants successfully applied each tactic. The most notable method used by subjects to aid with memory was underlining or circling pertinent information in the text. Although both sexes tended to utilize comparable strategies, they favored problem solving techniques over other types of techniques the most.

Methodology

The plan for linking conceptual research issues to relevant and practicable empirical research is known as the research design. It is an inquiry that offers precise guidance for research operations. To identify English reading strategies of the teachers a descriptive survey method was used, and approach was quantitative. This research design was used because of its suitability to collect data from a large sample size in a natural setting.

Population and Sample of the Study

All secondary school teachers teaching English in the district of Haripur was the population of this study. There were total 1800 English teachers (EMIS, 2022). Four hundred (400) secondary school teachers teaching English to grade-10 was the sample of the study. The teachers were selected through stratified random sampling techniques such that the number of teachers in each stratum remained the same. The sample was further divided into two strata i.e., male and female (200) and urban and rural (200) respectively.

Research Instrument

A self-administered questionnaire for teachers comprised of a set of closed-ended items/questions was used as tool of data collection. It was consisted of five points Likert scales i.e., always, often, sometimes, rarely and never and contained 45 statements. The tool was made valid through judgmental validation. The tool was pilot tested on 50 teachers other than the sample. The reliability of the instrument was calculated as 0.799 respectively.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher used the questionnaire to collect data from secondary school teachers to find what sort of English reading strategies are used by the teachers for teaching English as a compulsory subject. The researcher personally visited each school to collect data from the respondents/participants. The data were collected from 400 secondary school teachers of district Haripur and were analyzed through

SPSS and interpreted in the form of tables in the light of the research questions of the study. Below tables showed the perceptions of teachers about reading strategies (Phonemic/phonic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) correspondingly.

Table 1:

Perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for Phonemic/Phonic Awareness

S. N	Statement of Question	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1.	I make students clear in identifying relationships between different speech sounds (phonemes).	3 (0.8%)	40 (10%)	97 (24.2%)	155 (38.8%)	105 (26.2%)
2	I make students clear in identifying relationships between different letters (grapheme).	7 (1.8%)	51 (12.8%)	116 (29.0%)	145 (36.2%)	81 (20.2%)
3.	I guide students to segment individual sounds in a word.	15 (3.8%)	35 (8.8%)	103 (25.8%)	141 (35.2%)	106 (26.5%)
4.	I ask students to find rhymes and produce rhyming words later.	25 (6.2%)	41 (10.2%)	109 (27.2%)	138 (34.5%)	87 (21.8%)
5.	I ask students to recognize alliteration in words and later produce words that begin with the same sound.	14 (3.5%)	40 (10.0%)	124 (31.0%)	106 (26.5%)	116 (29.0%)
6.	I guide students to blend different sounds to make new combinations of words.	62 (15.5%)	132 (33.0%)	97 (24.2%)	71 (17.8%)	38 (9.5%)
7.	I make students to differentiate between vowel and consonant sounds.	9 (2.2%)	20 (5.0%)	85 (21.5%)	116 (29.0%)	170 (42.5%)
8.	I teach them to substitute initial sounds (phonemes) to make new words.	58 (14.5%)	128 (32.0%)	114 (28.5%)	59 (14.8%)	41 (10.2%)
9.	I encourage students to break words into syllables by clapping or tapping.	26 (6.5%)	57 (14.2%)	97 (24.2%)	111 (27.8%)	109 (27.2%)
10.	I suggest students to isolate initial sounds (onset) and last sounds (rime) in words.	61 (15.2%)	128 (32.0%)	114 (28.5%)	58 (14.5%)	39 (9.8%)
	Mean	**7.00%**	**16.80%**	**26.41%**	**27.48%**	**22.29%**

Table 1 represents the perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for Phonemic/Phonic Awareness. In response to statement No.1 "I make students clear in identifying relationships between different speech sounds (phonemes)". 0.8% responded to always, 20 % responded to often, 24.2 % to sometimes, 38.8 % to rarely, and 26.2 % to never. For statement No.2 "I make students clear in identifying relationships between different letters (grapheme)." about 1.8 % of the teachers were in favor of always, 12.8% were with often, 29% dealt with sometimes, 36.22% with rarely, and about 20.2 % dealt with never. Likewise, for statement No.3 "I guide students to segment individual sounds in a word". 3.8% marked always, 8.8 % marked often, 25.8 % marked sometimes, 35.2% marked rarely and 26.5% marked never. Similarly, for statement No.4 "I ask students to find rhymes and produce rhyming words later". 6.2% responded to always, 10.2% responded to often, 27.2% to sometimes, 34.5% to rarely, and 21.8 % to never. Further, in response to statement No.5 "I ask students to recognize alliteration in words and later produce words that begin with the same sound."3.5 % marked always, 10% marked often, 31 % marked sometimes, 26.5 % marked rarely and 29% marked never.

In the same way for statement No.6 "I guide students to blend different sounds to make new combinations of words". 15.5% agreed with always, 33% to often, 24.2% to sometimes, 17.8% responded to rarely while 9.5% marked never. Likewise, for statement No.7 "I make students to differentiate between vowel and consonant sounds". 2.2 % were in favor of always, 5% with often, 21.5% agreed with sometimes, 29 % with rarely and 42.5 % choose never. In addition, for statement No.8 "I teach them to substitute initial sounds (phonemes) to make new words". 14.5% chose always, 32% marked often, 28.5 % marked sometimes, 14.8 % marked rarely and 10.2% marked never. Statement No.9 "I encourage students to break words into syllables by clapping or tapping". 6.5% dealt with always, 14.2% with often, 24.2% with sometimes, 27.8% with rarely and 27.2% dealt with

never. Statement No.10 "I suggest students to isolate initial sounds (onset) and last sounds (rime) in words". 15.5%responded to always, 32% responded to often, 28.5% to sometimes, 14.5 % to rarely and 9.8% to never

On the whole, the mean percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding phonemic awareness is that total 7.0% agreed with always, 16.80% were in favor of often, about 26.41 % marked sometimes, 27.48% showed agreement with rarely while 22.29% responded to never.

Table 2:

Perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for Vocabulary

S. N	Statement of Question	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
11.	I direct the students to look for new words in the text.	13 (3.2%)	12 (3.0%)	54 (13.5%)	109 (27.2%)	212 (53.0%)
12.	I also provide a word bank to the students according to the topic.	12 (3.0%)	20 (5.0%)	93 (23.2%)	150 (37.5%)	125 (31.2%)
13.	I suggest students find synonyms and antonyms of unfamiliar words.	6 (1.5%)	20 ((5.0%)	96 (24.0%)	145 (36.2%)	133 (33.2%)
14.	I ask students to write definitions of new words in their own words.	14 (3.5%)	67 (16.8%)	129 (32.2%)	122 (30.5%)	68 (17.0%)
15.	I ask students to reflect and practice new words.	6 (1.5%)	26 (6.5%)	113 (28.2%)	142 (35.5%)	113 (28.2%)
16.	I guide them to use contextual clues to grasp meaning of new words.	3 (0.8%)	32 (8.0%)	120 (30.0%)	152 (38.0%)	93 (23.2%)
17.	I guide them about the meaning of root words and affixes.	10 (2.5%)	84 (21.0%)	153 (38.2%)	100 (25.0%)	53 (13.2%)
18.	I also make them find figurative meanings (similes, metaphors, and idioms).	6 (1.5%)	37 (9.2%)	112 (28.0%)	104 (26.0%)	141 (35.2%)
19.	I teach students dictionary skills and recommend additional reading materials.	10 (2.5%)	50 (12.5%)	85 (21.2%)	122 (30.5%)	133 (33.2%)
20.	I ask students to find word cognates (the same words from different languages).	77 (19.2%)	134 (33.2%)	105 (26.2%)	49 (12.2%)	35 (8.8%)
	Mean	**3.9%**	**12%**	**26.67%**	**29.86%**	**27.62%**

Table 2 illustrates the perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for vocabulary. For statement No.11 "I direct the students to look for new words in the text", about 3.2% responded to always, 3% were in favor of often, 13.5% responded to sometimes, 27.2% to rarely and 53% marked never. Moreover, in response to statement No.12 "I also provide a word bank to the students according to the topic", 3% agreed with always, 5% responded to often, 23.2% responded to sometimes, 37.5% to rarely while 31.2% responded to never. Further, for statement No.13 "I suggest students find synonyms and antonyms of unfamiliar words", 1.5% dealt with always, 5% with often, 24% with sometimes, 36.2% with rarely and in the same way 33.2% dealt with never. Statement No.14 "I ask students to write definitions of new words in their own words", shows 3.5% responses to always, 16.8% to often, 32.2% to sometimes, furthermore, 30.5% marked rarely and 17% marked never. Next to statement No.15 "I ask students to reflect and practice new words", only 1.5% dealt with always, 6.5% with often but majority that is about 28.2% agreed with sometimes, 35.5% with rarely and 28.2% dealt with never. In the same way, for statement No.16 "I guide them to use contextual clues to grasp meaning of new words", just 0.8% marked always, 8% chose often, while 30% marked sometimes, 38% marked rarely and 23.2% marked never. Likewise, for statement No.17 "I guide them about the meaning of root words and affixes", 2.5 % responded to always, 21% responded to often, 38.2% responded to sometimes, 25% to rarely and 13.2% responded to never. Further to statement No.18 "I also make them find figurative meanings (similes, metaphors, and idioms)", just 1.5% dealt with always, 9.2% with often and 28% with sometimes, 26% with rarely and 35.2% dealt with never. Statement No.19 "I teach students dictionary skills and recommend additional reading materials", got responses like 2.5% marked always, 12.5% marked often, 21.2 % sometimes, 30.5 % marked rarely and 33.2% marked never. For the last item of vocabulary that is statement No.20 "I ask students to find word cognates (the same words from different languages)". 19.2%

responded to always, 33.2% responded to often, 26.2% responded to sometimes, 12.2% to rarely and 8.8% responded to never.

The overall percentage illustrates that only 3.9% chose option always, 12% marked often, while 26.67% dealt with sometimes, 29.86% responded to rarely and similarly 27.62% went for never.

Table 3:

Perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for Fluency

S. N	Statement of Question	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
21.	I prefer to read aloud first with correct pronunciation and intonation.	12 (3.0%)	14 (3.5%)	19 (4.8%)	82 (20.8%)	273 (68.2%)
22.	I ask the students to read aloud with guidance and feedback.	8 (2.0%)	17 (4.2%)	43 (10.8%)	127 (31.8%)	205 (51.2%)
23.	I direct the students to read as a class or group ensuring everyone practices smoothly with expressions.	0 (0%)	28 (7.0%)	103 (25.8%)	130 (32.5%)	139 (34.8%)
24.	I monitor all students throughout the reading activity to read with the correct pace and expression.	3 (0.8%)	44 (11.0%)	104 (26.0%)	152 (38.0%)	97 (24.2%)
25.	I also assign tasks of silent reading in intervals.	24 (6.0%)	71 (17.8%)	157 (39.2%)	91 (22.8%)	57 (14.2%)
26.	I conduct reader theatres so the students can perform roles as readers.	80 (20.0%)	115 (28.8%)	102 (25.5%)	70 (17.5%)	33 (8.2%)
27.	I guide students to read the same text several times to increase their reading pace.	20 (5.0%)	40 (10.0%)	92 (23.0%)	112 (28.0%)	136 (34.0%)
28.	I make students drill sight words (common words) to have a good command of vocabulary.	13 (3.2%)	27 (6.8%)	78 (19.5%)	162 (40.5%)	120 (30.0%)
29.	I sometimes provide students with additional reading materials besides textbooks in class.	28 (7.0%)	107 (26.8%)	135 (33.8%)	73 (18.2%)	57 (14.2%)
30.	I sometimes carry out Audio-recording reading listening practice to give them confidence.	144 (35.2%)	123 (30.8%)	71 (17.8%)	38 (9.5%)	27 (6.8%)
	Mean	**8.22%**	**14.0%**	**22.6%**	**25.9%**	**28.5%**

Table 3 demonstrates the perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for fluency. For statement No.21 "I prefer to read aloud first with correct pronunciation and intonation", about 3% responded to always, 3.5% responded to often, 4.8% responded to sometime while 20.8% agreed with rarely and 68.2%responded to never. To continue for statement No.22 "I ask the students to read aloud with guidance and feedback", just 2% responded to always and 4.2% responded to often while 10.8% responded to sometimes, 31.8% to rarely and 51.2% responded to never. For statement No.23 "I direct the students to read as a class or group ensuring everyone practices smoothly with expressions" 0% dealt with always, 28% with often, 25.8% with sometimes, 32.5% with rarely and 34.8% dealt with never. Next for statement No.24 "I monitor all students throughout the reading activity to read with the correct pace and expression", only 0.8% marked always, 11% marked often while 26% marked sometimes, 38% agreed with rarely and 42.2% responded to never. Similarly, in response to statement No.25 "I also assign tasks of silent reading in intervals".6% dealt with always, 17.8% with often, 39.2% with sometimes, 22.8% with rarely and 14.2% dealt with never.

In the same way statement No.26 "I conduct reader theatres so the students can perform roles as readers", shows 20% responses for always, 28.8% for often, 25.5% for sometimes, 17.5% for rarely and 8.2% for never. in addition to this statement No.27 "I guide students to read the same text several times to increase their reading pace", only 5% responded to always, 10% responded to often, while 23% chose sometimes, 28% rarely and 34% responded to never. Further for statement No.28 "I make students drill sight words (common words) to have a good command of vocabulary", only 3.2% dealt with always, 6.8% with often, while 19.5% with sometimes, 40.5% with rarely and 30% dealt with never. Statement No.29 "I sometimes provide students with additional reading materials besides textbooks in class", got responses like 2.5% marked always, 12.5% marked often, and 21.2 % marked

sometimes, 30.5% marked rarely and 33.2% marked never. And for statement No.30 "I sometimes carry out Audio-recording reading listening practice to give them confidence", big number that is 35.2% responded to always, 30.8% responded to often, 17.8% responded to sometimes, while only 9.5% to rarely and 6.8% chose never.

To conclude the mean percentages about fluency are about 8.22% responded to always, 14% chose often, 22.6 % were in favor of sometimes while 25.9% responded to rarely and 28.5% chose never.

Table 4:

Perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for comprehension

S. N	Statement of Question	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
31.	I make students translate text in their mother tongue.	60 (15.0%)	36 (9.0%)	69 (17.2%)	101 (25.2%)	134 (33.5%)
32.	I instruct the students to scan (find relevant information).	5 (1.2%)	56 (14.0%)	103 (25.8%)	162 (40.5%)	74 (18.5%)
33.	I instruct the students to skim (to gain a quick impression).	5 (1.2%)	47 (11.8%)	149 (37.2%)	126 (31.5%)	73 (18.2%)
34.	I motivate students to do the intensive reading (a thorough read-through of the text).	3 (0.8%)	20 (5.0%)	91 (22.8%)	129 (32.2%)	157 (39.2%)
35.	I ask students to break text into little chunks and integrate the information.	2 (0.5%)	44 (11.0%)	137 (34.2%)	129 (32.2%)	88 (22.0%)
36.	I ask students to find the main idea and sub-ideas of the paragraphs.	6 (1.5%)	30 (7.5%)	62 (15.5%)	139 (34.8%)	163 (40.8%)
37.	I guide students to highlight particular words, phrases, and information.	9 (2.2%)	26 (6.5%)	82 (20.5%)	126 (31.5%)	157 (39.2%)
38.	I teach students to break sentences into segments for grammatical structure understanding.	10 (2.5%)	51 (12.8%)	102 (25.5%)	146 (36.5%)	91 (22.8%)
39.	I teach to make students clearly paraphrase the text.	14 (3.5%)	28 (7.0%)	74 (18.5%)	124 (31.0%)	160 (40.0%)
40.	I teach students to summarize information in their own words.	5 (1.2%)	32 (8.0%)	79 (19.8%)	116 (29.0%)	168 (42.0%)
41.	I offer students additional reading tasks (newspapers, grammar books, etc.)	8 (2.0%)	76 (19.0%)	151 (37.8%)	109 (27.2%)	56 (14.0%)
42.	I teach students to compare and contrast the given information.	16 (4.0%)	101 (25.2%)	139 (34.8%)	86 (21.5%)	58 (14.5%)
43.	I ask them to provide answers to the given questions.	4 (1.0%)	38 (9.5%)	71 (17.8%)	136 (34.0%)	151 (37.8%)
44.	I instruct students to generate their own questions about the text.	29 (7.2%)	81 (20.2%)	152 38.0%)	86 (21.5%)	52 (13.0%)
45.	I make students mark different parts of speech.	6 (1.5%)	83 (20.8%)	118 (29.5%)	108 (27.0%)	118 (21.2%)
	Mean	**3.02%**	**12.4%**	**26.33%**	**30.37%**	**27.78%**

Table 4 presents perceptions of teachers about English reading strategies for comprehension. For statement No.31 "I make students translate text in their mother tongue", about 15% responded to always, 9% responded to often, 17.2% responded to sometimes, 25.2% to rarely while 33.5% agreed to never. Similarly, for statement No.32 "I instruct the students to scan (find relevant information)", only 1.2% responded to always, 14% responded to often, while 25.8% responded to sometimes, 40.5% to rarely and 18.5% marked never. Further for statement No.33 "I instruct the students to skim (to gain a quick impression)", just 1.2% dealt with always, 11.8% with often, 37.2% with sometimes while 31.5% agreed with rarely and 18.2% marked never. Likewise, in response to statement No.34 "I motivate students to do the intensive reading (a thorough read-through of the text)", only 0.8% marked always, 5% marked often, on the other hand 22.8% marked sometimes, 32.2% marked rarely and 39.2% chose never. In addition to, for statement No.35 "I ask students to break text into little chunks and integrate the information", only 0.5% dealt with always, 11% with often, while 34.2% greed with sometimes, 32.2% with rarely and 22% dealt with never.

In the same way, for statement No.36 "I ask students to find the main idea and sub-ideas of the paragraphs", about 1.5% marked always, 7.5% responded to often, 15.5% marked sometimes, 34.8% marked rarely and 40.8% chose never. Similarly, for statement No.37 "I guide students to highlight particular words, phrases, and information", just 2.2% responded to always, 6.5% responded to often, while 20.5% agreed to sometimes, 31.5% to rarely and 39.2% marked never. Likewise, statement No.38 "I teach students to break sentences into segments for grammatical structure understanding", got responses like 2.5% dealt with always, 12.8% with often, 25.5% with sometimes, 36.5% with rarely and 22.8% dealt with never. Statement No.39 "I teach to make students clearly paraphrase the text". 3.5% marked always, 7% marked often, 18.5 % marked sometimes, 31% marked rarely and 40% responded to never. For statement No.40 "I teach students to summarize information in their own words", only 1.2% responded to always, 8% responded to often while 19.8% agreed to sometimes, 29% to rarely and 42% responded to never. Furthermore, for statement No.41 "I offer students additional reading tasks (newspapers, grammar books, etc.".) just 2% marked always, 19% marked often on the other hand 37.8% marked sometimes, 27.2% marked rarely and 14% chose never. For statement No.42 "I teach students to compare and contrast the given information", about 4% responded to always, 25.2% dealt with often, 34.8% responded to sometimes, 21.5% to rarely and 14.5% were in favor of never. Similarly, for statement No.43 "I ask them to provide answers to the given questions", only 1% were in favor of always, 9.5% dealt with often, 17.8% with sometimes while 34% agreed with rarely and 37.8% chose never. Further for statement No.44 "I instruct students to generate their own questions about the text", about 7.2% marked always, 20.2% marked often, 38% chose sometimes, 21.5% agreed with rarely whereas 13% marked never. For the Statement No.45 "I make students mark different parts of speech", just 1.5% responded to always while 20.8% responded to often, 29.5% dealt with sometimes, 27% to rarely and 21.2% responded to never.

The overall percentage for comprehension demonstrates that only 3.02% chose option always, 12.4% marked often, while 26.33% agreed with sometimes, 30.37% responded to rarely whereas 27.78% went for never. Likewise, Table 5 and 6 showed the gender-wise and location-wise comparison of teachers' reading strategies about phonemic/phonic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Table 5:

Gender-wise comparison of English reading strategies (N=200)

Factors	Gender	Mean	SD	SEM	t	p
Phonemic/phonic Awareness	Male	34.47	6.271	0.44349	1.107	0.269
	Female	33.78	6.192	0.43790		
Vocabulary	Male	36.730	5.629	0.398	0.759	0.448
	Female	36.325	5.023	0.355		
Fluency	Male	35.850	5.415	0.382	2.275	0.023
	Female	34.555	5.957	0.421		
Comprehension	Male	56.045	7.686	0.543	2.373	0.018
	Female	54.175	8.070	0.570		
Total	Male	163.10	20.334	1.437	2.027	0.043
	Female	158.84	1.682	1.533		

Table 5, shows comparison of male and female English teachers using reading strategies for phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. For phonemic awareness the p=0.269>0.05 level of significance. So, there is no significant difference. Therefore, male, and female teaching of reading strategies for phonemic awareness is almost same. For vocabulary, the p=0.448>0.05 level of significance. Hence, it delineates there is no statistically significant difference of male teachers and female teachers reading strategies of vocabulary. For fluency, the p=0.023<0.05 level of significance. Hence, the difference between male and female use of reading strategies for fluency is significant. The male teachers are better in use of these strategies than female teachers. In the same way, for the reading strategies of comprehension, the p=0.018<0.05 level of significance. The difference is significant. So, it is found that male teachers are better than female teachers in using comprehension strategies.

In overall comparison of English reading strategies of male and female secondary school teachers. The value of p=0.04<0.05 level of significance. The difference is significant. Furthermore,

the mean values for male and female teachers are 163.10 and 158.84 respectively. Therefore, male secondary school English teachers are better in using reading strategies as compared to female teachers.

Table 6:
Location-wise comparisons of English teachers reading strategies (N=200)

Factors	Location	Mean	SD	SEM	t	p
Phonemic/phonic Awareness	Urban	34.670	5.924	0.418	1.737	0.083
	Rural	33.590	6.499	0.459		
Vocabulary	Urban	36.135	5.164	0.365	-1.474	0.141
	Rural	36.920	5.480	0.387		
Fluency	Urban	34.685	5.886	0.416	-1.814	0.070
	Rural	35.720	5.520	0.390		
Comprehension	Urban	56.060	7.416	0.524	2.412	0.016
	Rural	54.160	8.315	0.588		
Total	Urban	163.3	19.557	1.382	2.287	0.023
	Rural	158.5	22.330	1.579		

Table 6, represents the comparison of urban and rural teachers' reading strategies for phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. For the reading strategies of phonemic awareness, the p=0.083>0.05 level of significance. So, the difference between rural and urban teachers for use of strategies is not significant. It further demonstrates that there is no significance difference for vocabulary too as p=0.141>0.05 level of significance. The comparison of reading strategies for fluency the p=0.070>0.05 level of significance. Hence, the difference between urban and rural teachers' use of reading strategies for fluency is not significant. In the same way, for comprehension the p=0.016<0.05 level of significance. So, the difference between urban and rural teachers for use of comprehension strategies is significant. It shows that urban teachers are better than rural teachers in use of comprehension strategies. the overall comparison of English reading strategies of urban and rural secondary school teacher the value of p=0.023<0.05 level of significance. Therefore, difference is significant. Furthermore, the mean value for urban and rural teachers is 163.3 and 158.5 respectively. Therefore, urban English teachers are better in using reading strategies as compared to rural teachers.

Discussion

The analysis of teachers' perceptions about English reading strategies regarding phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension revealed a very small percentage of teachers applying all these reading strategies. It showed that that most of English teachers in district Haripur taught these reading strategies according to their need and choice where major focus was to go with the pace of course completion. The study also stays indifferent to Rehman et al. (2020). The study was carried out with the purpose of investigating reading strategies of English teachers taught to elementary pupils and findings revealed that teachers taught all the reading strategies such as analyzing, highlighting, taking notes, generating questions, identifying main ideas, and drawing inference. It also contradicts the findings of Solak and Altay (2014) where the major findings of the research study showed that the teachers were using each strategy effectively and both the genders preferred same strategies showing no difference of gender. While comparing the English reading strategies of male and female secondary school teachers, it rejects and the first hypothesis that there is no significance difference between male and female teachers in using reading strategies and thus male teachers were found better in using these reading strategies showing a significant difference as compared to female teachers. Similarly, it can be summarized from the overall comparison of English reading strategies of urban and rural secondary school teachers, that the difference was statistically significant. It also disapproved the second hypothesis of difference between urban and rural teachers. The urban English teachers were better in using reading strategies as compared to rural teachers. So, their lack of interest applying these strategies and differences in use of strategies in term of gender and location were evident from the data analysis. In addition to this, there were some of the strategies that were most adopted by teachers. These simple strategies were summarizing a text, loud reading by teacher and silent reading by students, translating texts in their mother languages, reading for specific information, answering comprehension question, underling, and column matching, and finding meaning of new

vocabulary. The current research is in line with Gulzar and Qadir (2010) in term of most frequently used reading strategies of teachers as summarizing the text, reading for information, answering comprehension questions, reading aloud, filling gaps, underling, column matching, translating text, finding meaning of new unfamiliar words.

Furthermore, the current study stays in line with the findings of (Qanwal & Karim, 2014) in term of teachers' perceptions and interest about using reading strategies. The study discovered that students are not equipped with the necessary reading strategies to become self-reliant learners, and the reading strategies employed by teachers are not tailored to students' needs and interests.

Conclusion

By exploring teachers' perceptions about English reading strategies, it was concluded that a very least number of teachers were using these English reading strategies. It was evident that most of English teachers in district Haripur taught these reading strategies according to their need and choice where major focus was to go with the pace of course completion and to prepare the students for exams. In overall comparison of English reading strategies of male and female secondary school teachers, the difference was significant whereas the male English teachers were better in using reading strategies as compared to female teachers. Similarly, it was concluded from the overall comparison of English reading strategies of urban and rural secondary school teachers, that the difference was statistically significant and the urban English teachers were better in using reading strategies as compared to rural teachers.

Recommendations

On the base of the conclusions, it is recommended that more studies might be conducted on English reading strategies of the teachers as well as the students at secondary school level (SSC), higher secondary school level (HSSC) and university level. Teachers might devote more time on teaching basic skills especially reading comprehension skills and switch on from more traditional methods of teaching to interactive classrooms and integrate new concepts with learnt ones for more fruitful and long-term results. Higher education authorities might conduct training workshops and launch seminars to familiarize the teachers with modern trends of language teachings and methodologies. The government of KP, the policymakers, and curriculum developers may take necessary measures to improve the current situation of language teaching by implementing necessary strategies and bringing required changes in the policies, including such activities in the textbook that will offer more practice of reading comprehension to polish the basic skills of students. It is concluded that syllabus of English is overburdened. Very a smaller number of teachers pays attention to basic skill teaching and more on syllabus completion. Hence, it is recommended that curriculum should be revised after fixed time according to existing needs. Rural teachers can be provided with basic facilities and opportunities and the education department may conduct different trainings with the help of training institutions (PITE and RITE) to train teachers at their convenience.

References

Albiladi, W. S. (2019). Effective English reading strategies: English language learners' perceptions.

Al-Ghazo, A. (2015). The assessment of reading comprehension strategies: practices of Jordanian public teachers at secondary level. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, *3*(5), 721-742.

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., Wilkinson, I. A., Becker, W., & Becker, W. C. (1988). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 389-396.

Banditvilai, C. (2020). The effectiveness of reading strategies on reading comprehension. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *10*(2), 46-50.

Block, C. C., & Israel, S. E. (2005). *Reading first and beyond: The complete guide for teachers and literacy coaches*. Corwin Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press.

Education Management Information System. (2022). *Annual statistics report of Government schools.* Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan: Elementary & Secondary Education Department.

Farid, A., Ishtiaq, M., & Hussain, M. S. (2020). A review of effective reading strategies to teach text comprehension to adult English language learners. *Global Language Review*, *4*(3), 77-88. https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2020(V-III).09

Goodman, K. (1996). *On reading: A common-sense look at the nature of language and the science of reading*. Heinemann, 361 Hanover St., Portsmouth, NH 03801-3912.

Gulzar, M. A., & Qadir, S. A. (2010). Issues of language (s) choice and use: a Pakistani perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, *30*(2).

Kanmaz, A. (2022). Teachers' reading comprehension and use of reading strategies levels: a study on the secondary school teachers. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, *5*(1), 1-14.

Maine, F. (2013). How children talk together to make meaning from texts: A dialogic perspective on reading comprehension strategies. *Literacy*, *47*(3), 150-156.

Navarrete, J. C. (2019). Reading comprehension: theories and strategies toward an effective reading instruction. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *10* (13), 108-114.

Qanwal, S., & Karim, S. (2014). Identifying correlation between reading strategies instruction and L2 text comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(5), 1019.

Rehman, A. U., Khan, K., Almas, A., Mohamad, M., & Ismail, N. H. (2020). Teachers' teaching reading strategies at public elementary schools in Haripur district. *Creative Education*, *11*(4), 468-478.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). Toward an interactive model of reading. In *Attention and performance 6*(pp. 573-603). Routledge.

Scheid, K. (1993). *Helping Students Become Strategic Learners. Guidelines for Teaching. Cognitive Strategy Training Series*. Brookline Books, PO Box 1047, Cambridge, MA 02238-1047.

Shakoor, M. A., Khan, M. I., & Majoka, M. I. (2019). Effect of teaching reading strategies on the students' reading comprehension. *Global Social Sciences Review, 4*(4), 157-164. doi:10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-IV).20.

Solak, E., & Altay, F. (2014). The reading strategies used by prospective English teachers in Turkish ELT context. *Online Submission*, *1*(3), 78-89.

Su, C. (2006). Evaluation of reading skills applied in the first-year college English reading course. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on English Teaching* Taipei, Crane, (pp. 579-587).

Teevno, R. A., & Raisani, R. B. (2017). English reading strategies and their impact on students' performance in reading comprehension. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, *5*(2), 152-166.

Teevno, R. A., Bhatti, M. T., & Devi, S. (2020). Reaching strategies in reading of English and their impact on performance of the students in reading comprehension at higher secondary level in Pakistan. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, *17*(16), 109-121.