

## **Perceptions of Extensive Reading Practitioners in Four Asian Countries**

Rob Waring  
Extensive Reading Foundation

Mintra Puripunyanich  
Chulalongkorn University  
Thailand

### **Abstract**

This study reports the perceptions and understanding of extensive reading (ER) of 259 ER practitioners in Japan, Thailand, Mongolia, and Vietnam. The majority of participants understood the core principles of ER, namely (a) the fluent reading of (b) a lot of (c) easy texts. However, about 25% of the participants in Thailand, Mongolia, and Vietnam did not understand that the texts need to be easy and read fluently. Despite all the participants being self-declared ER practitioners, a large number of participants in Mongolia, Thailand and Vietnam often reported the desire for intensive reading practices in their ER classes. This suggests more training on ER is necessary. Participants highly rated all questions regarding the need for more ER training, showing that even the more experienced ER practitioners still need assistance.

**Keywords:** extensive reading, defining extensive reading, extensive reading practices, areas of training, Asia

The positive impacts and benefits of extensive reading (ER) on the learning of a foreign language are well-known and well-documented (for example, Nation & Waring, 2020; Robb, 2022; Robb & Ewert, 2024). If teachers and students want to take advantage of the benefits of ER, it is crucial that the correct conditions for students to read extensively are implemented. This means ER practitioners not only need to understand what ER is, the linguistic conditions needed for it to take place, and how it should fit the curriculum, but also know which materials to use, and what activities can extend the reading. While, in reality, the actual implementation of an ER program may be hampered by curricular, logistical, financial and time constraints among many others, ER teachers should have a solid understanding of the main principles of ER if they wish to use the term ‘extensive reading’ to refer to their class. It is especially important that we share a common base of understanding what ER is, and is not, when we report data from studies so as to avoid misunderstandings (Waring & McLean, 2015).

### **Defining Extensive Reading**

The first step when investigating the perceptions of ER is to be clear about what ER is, and what it is not. Day and Bamford (1998) point out “it is hard to reduce [ER] to a dictionary-type

definition” (p. 7), but this should not prevent us from attempting to do so. It is common for scholars to state that intensive reading (IR) happens when the teacher highlights specific linguistic features and content within the text, introducing and reinforcing selected reading strategies through whole-class instruction activities (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2018; von Frauke, 2024). In contrast, when learners are reading extensively, they should be reading “a lot of easy material” (Bamford & Day, 2004, p. 84), “large quantities of material that are within their linguistic competence” (Grabe & Stoller, 2011, p. 286), “very easy, enjoyable books to build their reading speed and reading fluency” (Extensive Reading Foundation, 2011, p. 1) and “lots of easy, enjoyable reading” (Macalister, 2015, p. 122). Yamashita (2015) summarizes her review of ER definitions by saying “from these definitions, four common features to characterize ER emerge: a large amount of reading, easy materials, faster reading rate, and pleasure” (p. 169).

From the above, we propose that there are three ‘core principles of reading extensively’, namely the students should a) *read a lot of*; b) *easy materials which they can*; c) *read comfortably and fluently* so they can read with high levels of comprehension. The volume of text read is not a condition for reading extensively, but it is axiomatic that reading more is better and it is thus included in our three core principles. Nation and Wang (1999) suggest a minimum of one graded reader a week at the learner’s level is an acceptable level for ER. However, we decline to include Macalister’s (2015) and Yamashita’s (2015) suggestions that the reading be enjoyable, or pleasurable in our core principles even if it is preferred and desirable. The reason is that it is possible to read in a fast fluent manner without it being pleasurable and is therefore not a condition of the *way text is processed* when reading extensively (see also Grabe & Yamashita, 2022). In contrast, if learners are reading slowly and intentionally and are focused on learning the vocabulary or grammar, they are not considered to be reading extensively even if the reading is pleasurable.

We can categorize the practice of ER into two dimensions. The first refers to *how* a student reads. Reading a lot of easy material fluently, we feel, is a necessary condition for an ER program to be called ‘extensive’. A typical ER class would thus involve the students self-selecting text they enjoy reading silently and comfortably to build fluency and confidence to practice the skill of reading itself. The choices in the second dimension are options of the way ER is implemented, for example, deciding how much reading will be done, whether the reading will be assessed or followed-up in some way, done digitally or with paper materials, done individually or as a class, among numerous other options (Waring & McLean, 2015). We do not consider these to be part of a definition of what it means to read extensively but rather options of how to implement it. Following the above, we would not expect students of lower abilities in an ‘extensive reading’ class to choose something difficult such as non-graded materials or unsimplified texts as the difficult language would prevent fluent reading whereas higher ability students might be able to cope. Typically, students would also not be doing activities in an ‘ER class’ that are more closely aligned with IR. Examples include reading aloud or reading to others, using a dictionary to learn new words or grammar from short dense texts, or read them for a detailed understanding, and doing language-based follow-up activities (Day & Bamford, 1998; Nation & Waring, 2020; Waring & McLean, 2015).

### **Teachers’ Perceptions of Extensive Reading**

Several factors contribute to shaping teachers’ attitudes towards ER. Among these, the teachers’ previous experiences both as learners and educators significantly impact their attitudes (for example, Horst, 2013; Tabata-Sandom & Ikeda, 2024). As an example of negative perceptions, if

a teacher strongly believes in a more structured, grammar-focused approach, they may view ER skeptically. However, even if teachers have a positive perspective, they may feel inhibited by logistical challenges such as class size and time constraints to successfully incorporate ER into their teaching practice and consider ER as ‘too hard’ (Macalister, 2010). In addition, they may not have been trained to learn what ER is and thus either do not understand it, or mistake it for something else. Nakanishi (2015) documented some negative attitudes towards ER, often arising from a perception of ER as a non-essential or leisure activity rather than a crucial aspect of foreign language learning.

Extensive reading as a pedagogical activity seems to be well-understood in some countries, and less well in others. Several studies conducted predominantly in Southeast Asia (for example, Chang & Renandya, 2017; Puripunyanich, 2022; Puripunyanich & Waring, 2024; Thongsan & Waring, 2024; Waring & Chu, 2017; Waring & Husna, 2019; Waring & Vu, 2020; Wulyani et al., 2022) have collected data on teacher knowledge and perceptions of ER and how it is implemented. In general, many of these studies show that ER is often poorly understood with teachers commonly mistaking ER for IR, or using materials at an inappropriately difficult level. Most of these studies are local and are thus limited in scale, but it is likely that the misconceptions and attitudes to ER found in these studies are not isolated cases and may be a more pervasive phenomenon.

A teacher’s understanding of ER can also be revealed in the quality of the ER training they have received, and thus their implementation and their desire for more training. Numerous studies, with local scope have noted misperceptions of ER (for example, Al Seyabi & Al Rashidi, 2016; Renandya & Jacobs, 2002; Sun, 2020). Al Seyabi and Al Rashidi (2016), for example, suggested that the Omani teachers involved in their research, attend orientation sessions on ER, and supervisors should clarify their practices and bridge the gap between Ministry of Education instructions and their current practices. Sun (2020) pointed out that there is still a lack of appropriate ER training in secondary schools in China. This finding is mirrored by a survey of 34 teachers in Indonesia by Firda et al. (2018) and a follow-up study by Wulyani et al. (2022). Sun’s (2020) study highlighted the need for a clear definition of ER based on updated theories and pedagogy, guidance on selecting materials, student motivation, supervision and evaluation of the ER program.

The above studies highlight inadequacies in the understanding of ER in some countries, but this does not mean that misunderstandings are common everywhere. ER has been common practice in some countries such as Japan for decades, but is far less well-known in other countries. Understanding this ‘state of ER’ is a motivator for the study reported here. At present, very little between-country data that systematically report how ER practitioners conceive ER are available. A detailed examination into the practitioners’ understanding of the core principles of ER is needed to help us pinpoint what further training might, or might not, be needed to ensure appropriate understanding and practice of ER. To do this, we must not only ask ER practitioners their perceptions of ER and how we should conduct ER programs, but also ask about the training they need.

## **Research Questions**

This research investigates the following research questions:

1. How well do extensive reading practitioners in Japan, Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam understand extensive reading?

2. What aspects of extensive reading do the practitioners in the four Asian countries want to learn more about?

## Method

### *Research Design*

This study utilized a descriptive survey approach to explore the characteristics of a specific population and evaluate the occurrences of various opinions (Gray, 2014).

### *Context and Aims*

This study researches the perceptions of ER in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts where English is not the primary spoken language. It excludes first language literacy due to significant differences in the pedagogical environments and motivations. We focused on ER within formal education systems (both public and private), deliberately overlooking the informal systems such as language schools, and home schools due to their varied teaching situations and the potential interference on education due to their financial imperative. The study also concentrates solely on ER in the learning of English, discounting other languages due to linguistic differences between languages requiring different approaches to developing a student's reading ability and the limited prevalence of ER programs in languages other than English.

In this study, ER is defined as reading *a lot of easy text fluently and quickly* while focusing on general comprehension. An ER program is defined as any class activity that encourages students to read extensively which can vary from a teacher bringing a few books for voluntary reading to a mandatory course with extensive libraries (either physical or digital) that spans a school or district. The program may include any reading materials that facilitate reading extensively and may or may not include direct assessments or follow-up activities.

### *Participants*

The study collected data from self-declared ER practitioners and excluded those who had not engaged in ER. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and without compensation. A total of 383 teachers from 30 countries completed the main questionnaire. Here, we decline to report the data for countries which did not constitute a reliable sample size suitable for comparison. Thus, we report only on a subset of data from 259 teachers in four Asian countries: Japan ( $n = 107$ ), Mongolia ( $n = 74$ ), Thailand ( $n = 49$ ), and Vietnam ( $n = 29$ ). The participants comprised 53.28% university teachers ( $n = 138$ ), 30.89% secondary school teachers ( $n = 80$ ), and 15.83% primary school teachers ( $n = 41$ ). 97% of the participants said their students were intermediate level or lower.

### *Research Instrument*

The full online questionnaire consisted of 95 items in eight sections which included the respondent's profile confirmation, background, understanding of ER, implementation of ER, reading materials, issues faced by ER practitioners, topics for future ER training, and the questionnaire conclusion. This paper only reports the data on (a) how ER practitioners perceive and understand ER (Part 3 of the questionnaire), and (b) the aspects of ER that the practitioners want to learn more about (Part 7). The questions relevant to this study are in Appendix A. Other

data from this questionnaire pertaining to the actual implementation of ER by the practitioners are reported in Puripunyanich and Waring (2024).

The questionnaire was validated by three experts in ER and reading research using Item Objective Congruence (IOC). The questionnaire was in English to ensure consistency across diverse respondents. The questionnaire demonstrated reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.906.

### *Sampling Methods, Data Collection, and Analysis*

Convenience and snowball sampling methods were employed to recruit participants. Snowball sampling allowed the researchers to identify initial participants who then referred other EFL teachers to join the study (Gray, 2014). Data were collected using a Google Forms questionnaire which was distributed online via email and postings on Facebook, websites, and LINE groups between July and October 2023.

## **Results**

This section has three parts: (a) the participants' understanding of the core principles of ER, (b) perceptions of the practice of ER, and (c) aspects of ER that practitioners want to learn more about. The results in parts 1 and 2 answer RQ1 and those in part 3 answer RQ2.

### ***Part 1: The Participants' Understanding of the Core Principles of ER***

Tables 1–3 reveal the ER practitioners' understanding that ER involves reading *a lot of easy material fluently and comfortably* that reflect how students should be reading when doing ER. The overall data in Table 1 show 86.48% of the practitioners understood that there should be *a lot* of reading, but there were notable differences between the countries. 100% of the participants in Japan believed that students should *read a lot*, while this belief was shared by only 74.32% of those in Mongolia, 75.51% of those in Thailand, and 86.21% of those in Vietnam.

Table 1. *The Amount that Students Should Read When Doing ER*

When doing ER, students should read..	Japan <i>n</i> = 107	Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74	Thailand <i>n</i> = 49	Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29	Mean <i>n</i> =259
1. a lot	100.00%	74.32%	75.51%	86.21%	86.48%
2. a little	0.00%	25.68%	24.49%	13.79%	13.52%

Table 2 also shows substantial differences between Japan and the other countries. 96.26% of the participants in Japan said ER involves students reading *something easy*, following standard ER practice. Conversely, in Mongolia, only 55.41% said ER involves reading easy texts, while 44.59% felt more challenging texts were appropriate. Thailand and Vietnam favored easier texts (75.51% and 58.62%, respectively), but with a notable number of participants suggesting more difficult materials were a feature of an ER program.

Table 2. *The Difficulty Level of the Text that Students Should Read When Doing ER*

When doing ER, students should read..	Japan <i>n</i> = 107	Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74	Thailand <i>n</i> = 49	Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29	Mean <i>n</i> =259
1. something easy	96.26%	55.41%	75.51%	58.62%	76.44%

2. something a bit difficult	3.74%	44.59%	24.49%	41.38%	24.56%
------------------------------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Table 3 shows 97.20% of the participants in Japan understood that ER involves *reading fluently and quickly*, compared to only 41.89% in Mongolia, 51.02% in Thailand, and 68.97% in Vietnam.

Table 3. *How Students Should Read When Doing ER*

When doing ER, students should read...	Japan <i>n</i> = 107	Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74	Thailand <i>n</i> = 49	Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29	Mean <i>n</i> = 259
1. fluently and quickly	97.20%	41.89%	51.02%	68.97%	64.50%
2. slowly and carefully	2.80%	58.11%	48.98%	31.03%	35.50%

In summary, these three questions seem to show that the participants in Japan, and the majority of participants in the other countries, understood the standard ER practice that ER should be fast, fluent, easy and done in considerable volume. However, the data from Thailand, Vietnam, and Mongolia show that some participants probably did not understand the core elements of ER even though they were self-declared ER practitioners. A closer examination of the individual data, however, shows that none of the participants said ER involved all three components of reading difficult texts slowly in limited volume. This shows that there is at least some understanding of ER by all participants.

## **Part 2: Perceptions of the Practice of ER**

The second set of data in Tables 4 to 6 reveal how the ER practitioners perceive an ER class *should* be conducted, not necessarily how it is *actually* conducted. The first set of data highlights perceptions of how the students should be reading, following Day and Bamford (1998) and Waring and McLean (2015). The second set assesses perceptions of how the ER class should be implemented. The third set are features we would not expect participants to employ in an ER class. Some of these items such as *read a lot*, repeat those in Tables 1–3 to confirm their responses. Participants were asked to respond to these questions using the rubric *Very important*, *important*, and *not so important* with a score of 3 showing high importance.

### *Features Often Considered to be Standard ER Practice*

Overall, as we might expect, the data show a high understanding of these standard ER practices with all responses above the means of 2.30. One surprise exception was the responses to *read silently* with all countries only rating it a *little important* on average with Japan being the lowest ( $M = 1.21$ ) and Mongolia ( $M = 2.28$ ) highest. Data from all the countries show high importance for *building reading confidence*. *Building reading speed and fluency* was valued more in Japan ( $M = 2.83$ ) and Vietnam ( $M = 2.76$ ) when compared to Mongolia ( $M = 2.31$ ) and Thailand ( $M = 2.41$ ). Allowing students to *choose what they want to read* was highly valued across all four countries, with Thailand showing the highest mean ( $M = 2.86$ ) and Japan ( $M = 2.81$ ) next. Encouraging students to *read a lot* was emphasized more in Japan ( $M = 2.95$ ) than in other countries, particularly Mongolia, which shows a relatively lower mean ( $M = 2.50$ ), supporting the data in Table 1. *Reading something they can enjoy* was universally important, with Japan ( $M = 2.96$ ) and Thailand ( $M = 2.92$ ) showing the highest means and Japan, highlighting consensus. *Practicing the skill of reading* was highly valued in all countries with Mongolia ( $M = 2.72$ ) and Thailand ( $M = 2.63$ ) the highest. *Selecting materials at a comfortable reading level* was

consistently important across all countries, with little variation in responses. There was also a consistent emphasis on encouraging students to *read without a dictionary* across all countries.

Table 4. *Features Often Considered to be Standard ER Practice*

When I do ER, I want my student to	Japan <i>n</i> = 107		Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74		Thailand <i>n</i> = 49		Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29		Average <i>n</i> = 259	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
* 1. build their reading confidence	2.93	0.25	2.81	0.39	2.90	0.37	2.76	0.51	2.87	0.36
2. build reading speed and fluency	2.83	0.40	2.31	0.70	2.41	0.70	2.76	0.51	2.59	0.62
3. choose what they want to read	2.81	0.44	2.72	0.45	2.86	0.35	2.83	0.38	2.80	0.42
7. read a lot	2.95	0.25	2.50	0.58	2.67	0.55	2.76	0.51	2.75	0.49
8. read something they can enjoy	2.96	0.19	2.78	0.48	2.92	0.28	2.90	0.31	2.90	0.33
13. read silently	1.21	0.47	2.28	0.69	1.94	0.83	1.51	0.69	1.69	0.79
19. practice the skill of reading	2.22	0.77	2.72	0.54	2.63	0.64	2.31	0.81	2.45	0.72
21. select something at their own comfortable reading level	2.94	0.23	2.76	0.49	2.92	0.28	2.93	0.26	2.88	0.34
23. try to read without a dictionary	2.72	0.55	2.72	0.48	2.65	0.52	2.62	0.52	2.70	0.52

Note. \* Numbers refer to the item number in the questionnaire.

#### *Features that Are Often Part of a Typical ER Program*

The overall responses are on average lower than those in Table 4, showing a more diverse range of implementation strategies for these features of ER. Regarding the feature of *having students' comprehension checked after reading*, Japan-based practitioners showed the least preference to include it in an ER class with a mean of 1.74. In contrast, those in Mongolia placed the highest importance with a mean of 2.74, indicating a stronger consensus. The practitioners in Thailand and Vietnam also valued comprehension checks with means of 2.43 and 1.97, respectively.

When it comes to suggesting students in an ER class should *read something a little difficult*, the practitioners in Japan again showed the lowest preference with a mean of 1.31, mirroring the results in Table 2. The practitioners from Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam, however, suggest ER involves the use of more challenging texts, with means of 2.16, 2.12, and 2.28, respectively, also mirroring those in Table 2. The preference for *reading authentic or unsimplified texts* follows a similar pattern. Japan-based practitioners had the lowest mean of 1.31 whereas the practitioners in Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam, on the other hand, emphasized this more strongly, with means of 2.19, 2.18, and 2.38, respectively.

The notion that ER involves students *reading materials chosen by the teacher* was least favored by Japan-based practitioners, with a mean of 1.23. Mongolia-based practitioners, with a mean of 2.12, showed a higher preference, indicating that in Mongolia, teachers should play a more central role in selecting ER materials. Practitioners in Thailand and Vietnam had mixed

preferences, with means of 1.86 and 1.62, respectively. Practitioners in Japan rated *reading the same book together in class* as not being important in an ER class ( $M = 1.30$ ). In contrast, practitioners in Mongolia had the highest mean of 2.26, indicating a strong recommendation for group reading activities when doing ER. Those in Thailand and Vietnam showed moderate interest, with means of 1.90 and 1.69, respectively.

Lastly, in terms of *helping manage the library*, Japan-based practitioners showed the least preference for this to be included in an ER class with a mean of 1.33. Those in Mongolia showed the highest preference ( $M = 2.38$ ), followed by those in Thailand ( $M = 2.00$ ) and Vietnam ( $M = 1.62$ ).

Table 5. *Features that Are Often Part of a Typical ER Program*

When I do ER, I want my student to	Japan <i>n</i> = 107		Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74		Thailand <i>n</i> = 49		Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29		Overall	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
4. have their comprehension checked after reading	1.74	0.70	2.74	0.53	2.43	0.71	1.97	0.73	2.18	0.79
9. read something a little difficult	1.31	0.56	2.16	0.62	2.12	0.73	2.28	0.59	1.81	0.74
10. read authentic or unsimplified texts	1.31	0.56	2.19	0.66	2.18	0.75	2.38	0.78	1.85	0.79
14. read something I chose for them	1.23	0.49	2.12	0.78	1.86	0.84	1.62	0.62	1.65	0.77
15. read the same book together in class	1.30	0.52	2.26	0.68	1.90	0.77	1.69	0.71	1.73	0.76
20. help manage the library	1.33	0.58	2.38	0.68	2.00	0.76	1.62	0.78	1.79	0.80

#### *Non-Typical Features of an ER Program*

The data in Table 6 highlight features that were generally considered non-typical or less desirable for inclusion in an ER program as defined above, as they are more typical of intensive reading programs. These include activities such as *listening to the teacher read, repeating after the teacher, reading a lot of short passages followed by activities, reading for detailed understanding, and focusing on new grammar and vocabulary*.

*Listening to the teacher read to students* was least favored by Japan-based and Vietnam-based practitioners, with a mean of 1.31. In contrast, Mongolia-based practitioners showed a higher preference for this activity with a mean of 2.15, suggesting it would be a more accepted practice in Mongolia. Practitioners in Thailand had moderate preferences, with means of 1.65. These results indicate some variability in how this practice was viewed across these countries.

The activity of *listening to [the teacher] read and then repeating* as part of an ER program was also least favored by Japan-based practitioners, with a mean of 1.11, indicating strong consensus against this practice. Practitioners in Mongolia showed the highest preference for its inclusion in an ER class with a mean of 2.03. Those in Thailand and Vietnam had mixed views, with means of 1.71 and 1.28, respectively. Similar results were found for stating that an ER class should



involve students *reading their stories to others* with 1.36 for Japan, but over 2.0 for the other countries. The high values for students *practicing reading aloud to the class* with all countries displaying a mean over 2.26 seem to show the teachers feel the need to have extensive whole-class listening or reading-while listening in an ER class.

*Reading a lot of short passages followed by activities* was another non-typical ER feature least recommended by Japan-based practitioners ( $M = 1.27$ ). Practitioners in Mongolia, with a mean of 2.43, showed a strong preference for this practice, indicating that an ER class involves intensive reading practices. Practitioners in Thailand and Vietnam also showed similar sentiments with means of 2.27 and 1.69.

Having ER students *read a text for the detailed understanding of the content* in an ER class was again least favored by practitioners in Japan ( $M = 1.22$ ), while those in Mongolia showed the highest preference ( $M = 2.53$ ). This indicates a large difference in approach, with Mongolian practitioners believing that ER involves elements of an IR approach. Practitioners in Thailand and Vietnam showed means of 2.14 and 2.03, respectively, showing moderate acceptance of this view of ER.

Finally, the feature of *intentionally looking for and learning a lot of new grammar and vocabulary* was not considered part of ER by practitioners in Japan ( $M = 1.24$ ). However, practitioners in Mongolia again showed the highest desire to include it ( $M = 2.41$ ), followed by those in Thailand ( $M = 2.29$ ) and Vietnam ( $M = 2.10$ ). The data for reading to *practice reading strategies* also suggest a different aim for the reading in Japan ( $M = 1.62$ ) compared to a more intensive focused ER class in Mongolia ( $M = 2.61$ ), Thailand ( $M = 2.53$ ) and Vietnam ( $M = 2.31$ ).

Table 6. *Non-Typical Features of an ER Program*

When I do ER, I want my student to	Japan <i>n</i> = 107		Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74		Thailand <i>n</i> = 49		Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29		Overall	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
5. listen to me reading to them	1.31	0.56	2.15	0.82	1.65	0.69	1.31	0.60	1.61	0.76
6. listen to me read and then they repeat	1.11	0.37	2.03	0.84	1.71	0.79	1.28	0.59	1.51	0.75
7. read a lot of short passages followed by activities	1.27	0.49	2.43	0.55	2.27	0.84	1.69	0.66	1.84	0.80
12. read a text for the detailed understanding of the content	1.22	0.50	2.53	0.55	2.14	0.79	2.03	0.68	1.86	0.82
13. read their stories to others	1.36	0.56	2.30	.68	2.22	0.79	2.03	0.68	1.85	0.78
17. practice reading aloud to the class	2.38	0.76	2.26	0.66	2.33	0.72	2.45	0.74	2.34	0.72
18. practice reading strategies	1.62	0.72	2.61	0.52	2.53	0.64	2.31	0.81	2.45	0.72

---

22. intentionally look for and learn a lot of new grammar and vocabulary	1.24	0.49	2.41	0.66	2.29	0.79	2.10	0.77	1.87	0.83
--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

---

### ***Part 3: Aspects of ER that Practitioners Want to Learn More About***

The data in Table 7 reveal a nuanced understanding of the need for training for ER programs. As we saw above, not all of the practitioners understand the ‘core principles’ and as such, this may have biased these data. Nevertheless, ER teachers are likely to want to learn new teaching tips and activities, learn new ways to motivate students, learn about new research and so on that could improve their classes (for example, Al Seyabi, & Al Rashidi, 2016; Sun, 2020). The data corroborates this view because practitioners across all four countries sought more training in nearly every aspect of their ER programs with very high values for most items.

The highest overall mean scores were observed for *How to motivate students to read* ( $M = 2.75$ ) and *How to design post-reading activities that could motivate students* ( $M = 2.52$ ), suggesting that motivation-related aspects were the top priorities for practitioners. Categories related to *How to assess students' reading* ( $M = 2.39$ ) and *How to gather data on the effectiveness of my ER program* ( $M = 2.45$ ) indicate a great interest in assessment and program evaluation, reflecting a need for more robust methods to measure the impact of ER programs and ensure their effectiveness. Conversely, *How to run and manage an ER library* ( $M = 2.14$ ) has the lowest overall mean, suggesting that this topic might be least needed, probably because the participants are already running an ER program. Other training topics suggest a moderate to high need for training and include *How to get funding for the materials or training etc.* ( $M = 2.22$ ), *How to keep records of what students have read* ( $M = 2.35$ ), *How to share my experiences with other ER practitioners* ( $M = 2.37$ ), *How to coordinate with other ER teachers and the administration* ( $M = 2.38$ ), *How to choose ER materials* ( $M = 2.39$ ), *How to convince others that ER is important* ( $M = 2.41$ ), *How to educate other teachers/administrators about ER* ( $M = 2.43$ ), *How to search for and understand the up-to-date research on ER* ( $M = 2.47$ ), and *How to integrate the ER into our curriculum* ( $M = 2.49$ ).

Country-specific needs vary greatly. In Japan, the lower mean scores for most question items suggest that they had already had more access to ER training and were thus less in need of more than in the other countries. This was particularly found in areas such as *How to get funding for the materials or training etc.* ( $M = 1.74$ ) and *How to run and manage an ER library* ( $M = 1.75$ ).

Mongolia, on the other hand, showed consistently higher mean scores such as *How to motivate students to read* ( $M = 2.72$ ), *How to assess students' reading* ( $M = 2.70$ ), *How to design post-reading activities that could motivate students* ( $M = 2.66$ ), and *How to get funding for the materials or training etc.* ( $M = 2.65$ ).

Of all four countries, Thailand showed the highest need for training on several topics such as *How to motivate students to read* ( $M = 2.88$ ), *How to design post-reading activities that could motivate students* ( $M = 2.76$ ), *How to choose materials for ER programs* ( $M = 2.73$ ), *How to assess students' reading* ( $M = 2.73$ ), *How to integrate the ER into curriculum* ( $M = 2.73$ ), *How to search for and understand the up-to-date research on ER* ( $M = 2.67$ ), *How to get funding for the materials or training etc.* ( $M = 2.63$ ), and *How to convince others that ER is important* ( $M = 2.63$ ).

Vietnam showed high mean scores in two topics, including *How to motivate students to read* ( $M = 2.83$ ) and *How to integrate the ER into our curriculum* ( $M = 2.62$ ). This shows a balanced need for both motivational strategies and curriculum integration.

There is a higher perceived need to learn *How to keep records of what the students read* in Mongolia ( $M = 2.53$ ), Thailand ( $M = 2.59$ ), and Vietnam ( $M = 2.48$ ) than in Japan ( $M = 2.08$ ). Similar difference in the need to learn *How to share my experiences with other ER practitioners* was apparent between Mongolia ( $M = 2.53$ ), Thailand ( $M = 2.57$ ), Vietnam ( $M = 2.41$ ) and a lower need in Japan ( $M = 2.15$ ). This might be a reflection that the understanding of ER is higher in Japan, showing less of a need to share information or findings with others.

Table 7. *Aspects of ER that Practitioners Want to Learn More About*

Topic	Japan <i>n</i> = 107		Mongolia <i>n</i> = 74		Thailand <i>n</i> = 49		Vietnam <i>n</i> = 29		Overall	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. How to get funding for the materials or training etc.	1.74	0.80	2.65	0.51	2.63	0.64	2.24	0.74	2.22	0.81
2. How to search for and understand the up-to-date research on ER	2.29	0.73	2.55	0.50	2.67	0.55	2.55	0.63	2.47	0.64
3. How to choose materials for ER programs	2.09	0.75	2.53	0.53	2.73	0.49	2.52	0.51	2.39	0.67
4. How to motivate students to read	2.70	0.54	2.72	0.45	2.88	0.33	2.83	0.38	2.75	0.47
5. How to assess students' reading	2.03	0.72	2.70	0.46	2.73	0.49	2.38	0.68	2.39	0.69
6. How to convince others that ER is important	2.16	0.78	2.59	0.52	2.63	0.57	2.45	0.63	2.41	0.69
7. How to run and manage an ER library	1.75	0.73	2.49	0.58	2.37	0.70	2.31	0.85	2.14	0.77
8. How to integrate the ER into our curriculum	2.26	0.72	2.59	0.49	2.73	0.49	2.62	0.49	2.49	0.62
9. How to educate other teachers/administrators about ER	2.31	0.73	2.57	0.55	2.51	0.65	2.38	0.62	2.43	0.66
10. How to gather data on the effectiveness of my ER program	2.36	0.70	2.50	0.58	2.59	0.57	2.41	0.63	2.45	0.64
11. How to coordinate with other ER teachers and the administration	2.13	0.66	2.59	0.57	2.57	0.61	2.45	0.63	2.38	0.66
12. How to design post-reading activities that could motivate students	2.29	0.75	2.66	0.50	2.76	0.43	2.59	0.63	2.52	0.65

13. How to keep records of what students have read	2.08	0.74	2.53	0.55	2.59	0.64	2.48	0.57	2.35	0.69
14. How to share my experiences with other ER practitioners	2.15	0.67	2.53	0.55	2.57	0.58	2.41	0.57	2.37	0.64

## Discussion

This questionnaire seeks to understand and describe the ‘state of ER’ in these countries but does not seek to explain the results found. Rather, we wish to identify differences in approaches to, and understanding of, ER and highlight what ER training is needed. We feel it would be imprudent to speculate too deeply on the findings without in-depth structured interviews with the practitioners themselves. Some of this in-depth research on ER programs in Thailand has already been conducted (Puripunyanich, under review).

### *The Core Principles*

The data reveal differences in the understanding of the core principles of ER in the four Asian countries. Overall, of the three core principles, only reading *a lot* was understood by the vast majority of the participants despite them currently conducting an ER class. The principles of reading *something easy* and reading *something fluently and quickly* were well-understood by the Japanese participants, but much lower figures were supplied for Thailand, Mongolia and Vietnam. This might not be surprising because the concept of ER is relatively new in these countries. In Japan, by contrast, ER is often embedded in school curriculums as well as in pre-service training programs leading to a good chance the teachers would understand the core principles of ER.

Despite these results, perceptions of the principles of ER seem to be improving. Encouragingly, the understanding of ER by the Thailand-based participants seems much higher than that of the teacher participants in Thongsan and Waring (2024). Their study reveals that 48% of 200 teachers thought ER involved reading a lot. 34% reported their students should be reading and able to understand 98% of the text, and 19% thought students should be reading quickly and fluently. In contrast, 75.51% of the participants in this study thought their students should read a lot and easy texts, and 51.02% reported that their students should read fluently and quickly.

The Vietnam-based participants also seem to show a higher understanding of ER principles than those in previous studies such as Waring and Chu (2017) and Waring and Vu (2020). The current data show that 86.21% of the Vietnam-based teachers said they should be *reading a lot*, 58.62% reported their ER students should be reading *something easy*, and 68.97% said they should be reading *fluently and quickly*. In contrast, the data in Waring and Vu (2020) showed only 41% of the 107 participants thought students should be *reading fluently*, 38% said they should be reading *a lot* (86.21% in this study) and only 18% said the students should be *reading quickly*. The data in Waring and Chu (2017) are almost identical with 44% saying students should be *reading fluently*, 39% saying they should *read a lot*, and 17% saying they should be reading as fast as possible.

### *Perceptions of ER Practice*

The second set of data explored how practitioners in Japan, Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam believed an ER class should be conducted. The data in Table 4 show a high overall understanding of common ER practices such as *reading something students can enjoy*, *selecting something at their own comfortable reading level*, *building reading confidence*, *choosing what they want to read*, *reading a lot*, and *trying to read without a dictionary*. Notably, practitioners in Japan, Thailand, and Vietnam rated these features slightly higher than those in Mongolia. Overall, the data suggest practitioners believe these features should be part of an ER class, with the notable exception of *reading silently* which was rated lowest by participants in all four countries. This finding is surprising because a standard suggestion of ER scholars is that the reading be silent (for example, Day & Bamford, 1998). The reason for this is unclear and needs further investigation.

The data in Table 5 show that some practitioners in Japan and Vietnam did not emphasize *checking comprehension* as much as those in Mongolia and Thailand. The data also reveal telling differences in the variables deemed important, but optional, choices about how to conduct an ER class such as *reading authentic or unsimplified materials*, and *read the same book together as a class*, or not. Japan-based practitioners generally favored traditional ER practice by focusing on simpler texts and less teacher intervention in text choice. In contrast, practitioners in Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam seem to think that an ER class involves a mix of extensive and more intensive reading practices, due to their higher emphasis on comprehension checks, challenging texts, and language-focused activities. These differences reflect either varied educational philosophies and approaches to ER across the countries, or a patchy understanding of ER among some ER practitioners.

The items in Table 6 are more typically associated with intensive reading (IR), although not always exclusively. For example, students doing ER are not usually asked to *listen to a teacher and repeat* in unison, nor would they *read a lot of short passages followed by activities*, or *read in order to learn new vocabulary and grammar*. The data from Japan reflect this understanding with scores near 1 for all these items, again showing a high understanding of the difference between IR and ER. However, this is not as clear in the other countries as ratings above 2.0 were given for *practicing reading strategies*, *practice reading aloud to the class*, and *reading a text for a detailed understanding*. The practitioners in Mongolia seem to think many IR-type activities should be part of an ER program, a finding which is also reflected in their core principles data and in the data in Table 5. Practitioners in Thailand and Vietnam also showed a range of understanding of what ER is and how it is typically practiced. Data in Puripunyanich and Waring (2024), a companion study reporting from the main questionnaire, support this worrying finding with their research reporting about 60% of the reading materials deemed suitable for use in Mongolia, Thailand and Vietnam were non-graded materials despite the practitioners' students being mostly intermediate or below. The use of several predominantly IR type activities in the ER class in Thailand, Vietnam, and Mongolia would explain the lower rating for reading *something easy* and reading *fluently and quickly* and points to the need for more training in understanding of the core principles.

### *ER Training*

All the items in the overall data recorded a rating of 2.14 or over, revealing a comprehensive need for training in all four countries with a particular emphasis on *student motivation*, the *design of post-reading activities*, and *integrating the ER into the curriculum*. Other highly rated items were learning *How to* (a) *search for and understand the up-to-date research on ER*, (b) *gather data on the effectiveness of their program*, (c) *educate other teachers and administration*,

and (d) *convince others that ER is important*. While country-specific needs vary, the overall trend suggests that even the more experienced and knowledgeable practitioners were keen to enhance their understanding and implementation of ER through targeted workshops and training.

Japan's lower scores in several categories such as *How to get funding* suggests funding was not a barrier to conducting the ER class. Similarly, low scores for knowing *How to run and manage an ER library* suggests the practitioners have access to information or support networks that can provide that knowledge. The lower scores on the need for training suggest that overall, Japan is more advanced in its implementation of ER than in Thailand, Vietnam, and Mongolia. Vietnam showed a significant desire for more training, particularly in motivating students and integrating ER into the curriculum with all items above 2.23. Mongolia expressed a higher need for support, particularly in motivating students to read, assessing students' reading, and getting funding for the materials or training. Thailand had the highest demand particularly for student motivation strategies ( $M = 2.88$ ) and designing motivating post-reading activities ( $M = 2.76$ ).

These findings support those in Waring and Husna (2019) and Thongsan and Waring (2024) that show ER training is needed and beneficial. One of Sun's (2020) respondents went further saying "we should be trained for it [ER] because sometimes we were just like blind people. We feel our way ahead, but sometimes when we face the obstacles, we have no idea where to go" (p. 213). Overall, Thailand showed the greatest need for training, while Japan seemed to have adequate access to ER training. Addressing these training needs can enhance ER programs and improve student reading outcomes. Teacher education programs should incorporate a focus on the theoretical underpinnings of ER based on recent research as well as the practical benefits of ER to help shape positive attitudes (Renandya & Jacobs, 2002).

## Limitations

There are several limitations with this study. Firstly, we relied on self-reported perceptions from practitioners, which may not accurately reflect actual classroom practices. There could be discrepancies between what practitioners believe should be done and what is feasible given their resources and constraints. Additionally, cultural and educational differences across Japan, Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam might influence responses, making it challenging to generalize findings across these countries. The use of a limited rubric (*very important*, *important*, and *not so important*) might also have oversimplified complex preferences and attitudes towards ER practices.

Another explanation for the divergence from the standard practice in ER could be that the term itself may have confused the participants. For the question about the most appropriate reading material, the term *a bit difficult* can be interpreted differently with some considering 90% coverage of already known vocabulary and structures *a bit difficult* while others see *easy* as referring to higher coverage. We did consider using a numerical value such as 98% within the question itself but piloting suggested this might confuse the participants who were not familiar with coverage rates.

## Conclusion

The data reveal distinct differences in how ER practitioners in Japan, Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam perceived what an ER program is and how it should be conducted. Japan-based

practitioners generally adhered more closely to traditional ER practices as those suggested by the scholars mentioned above. In contrast, those in Mongolia, Thailand, and Vietnam put forward a wide range of understanding of what constitutes a typical ER class. Very often they suggested ER involves many strategies and practices more closely aligned to intensive reading. This lack of understanding by some ER practitioners highlights a need for more support and resources to align them with ER standards.

While this questionnaire only looked at four countries, comparing a more experienced Japan with three less experienced ER countries with a lower understanding of ER practices, we suspect that the findings would be similar in other countries with a lower experience of ER not mentioned here. The improved understanding of ER reported here compared to the older studies of the perceptions of ER in Thailand and Vietnam where IR is still the dominant force when ‘teaching reading’, suggests it takes time to encourage teachers to see the importance of ER in the overall picture of teaching reading. The relatively quick changes in perception happening in perceptions in Vietnam and Thailand suggest that might not take the decades it took in Japan. It might be that these practitioners did not get adequate training in ER in their pre-service programs. If so, this suggests the need for more comprehensive training in pre-service programs and continued efforts for in-service training programs to ensure the core principles of ER are understood and practiced. That said, these findings underscore the importance of tailoring ER training and support to the unique educational contexts of different regions while promoting the core principles of ER. Addressing the specific training needs and preferences of educators in each country can enhance the effectiveness of ER programs and lead to better reading outcomes for students.

## Acknowledgments

Prior to conducting the study, the researchers obtained ethical approval from Chulalongkorn University’s Research Ethics Review Committee for Research Involving Human Subjects and funding from the Extensive Reading Foundation, grant ERF 23-002. We express our deepest gratitude to the ERF for this funding, the three experts, the questionnaire pilots, and the research participants. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments which helped develop the paper and the editorial team of *Reading in a Foreign Language* for their contributions and assistance.

## References

- Al Seyabi, F., & Al Rashidi, S. (2016). A closer look at extensive reading in Omani public schools: Current practice and teachers’ perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 93–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p93>
- Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (2004). *Extensive reading activities for teaching language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, A. C-S., & Renandya, W. (2017). Current practice of extensive reading in Asia: Teachers’ perceptions. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 17(1), 40–58. <https://www.readingmatrix.com/files/16-4vj138u3.pdf>
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Extensive Reading Foundation. (2011). *Guide to extensive reading*. ER Foundation. [https://erfoundation.org/guide/ERF\\_Guide.pdf](https://erfoundation.org/guide/ERF_Guide.pdf)

- Firda, I. D. L., Widiati, U., Laksmi, E. D., & Hayati, N. (2018). Attitudes toward extensive reading among English teachers of senior high schools. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan [Journal of Education]*, 24(1), 1–9. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8d1d/3aa0b1d2b05da0e253ce012f650b6d9e7dce.pdf>
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching reading*. Longman.
- Grabe, W., & Yamashita, J. (2022). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hedgcock, J. S., & Ferris, D. (2018). *Teaching readers of English*. Routledge.
- Horst, M. (2013). Mainstreaming second language vocabulary acquisition. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 171–188. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/21299>
- Macalister, J. (2010). Investigating teacher attitudes to extensive reading practices in higher education: Why isn't everyone doing it? *RELC Journal*, 41(1), 59–75. [doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688210362609](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688210362609)
- Macalister, J. (2015). Guidelines or commandments? Reconsidering core principles in extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.125/66703>
- Nakanishi, T. (2015). A meta-analysis of extensive reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 6–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.157>
- Nation, P., & Wang, M. (1999). Graded readers and vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12(2), 355–380. <https://doi.org/10.125/66966>
- Nation, P., & Waring, R. (2020). *Teaching extensive reading in another language*. Routledge.
- Puripunyanich, M. (2022). The implementation of a large-scale online extensive reading program in Thailand—From decision-making to application. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 320–360. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/256726>
- Puripunyanich, M. (under review). *Exploring EFL teachers' implementation of extensive reading in undergraduate foundation English courses*. Chulalongkorn University Language Institute.
- Puripunyanich, M., & Waring, R. (2024). Investigating the implementation of extensive reading in four Asian countries. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 31(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.125/67475>
- Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2002). Extensive reading: Why aren't we all doing it? In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 295–302). Cambridge University Press.
- Robb, T. (2022). Encouraging schools to adopt extensive reading: How do we get there? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 34(1), 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.125/67419>
- Robb, T. N., & Ewert, D. (2024). Classroom-based extensive reading: a review of recent research. *Language Teaching*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000319>
- Sun, X. (2020). An exploration of students' and teachers' perceptions of a two-year extensive reading program in a Chinese secondary school. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal* Volume, 20(1), 201–219. <https://www.readingmatrix.com/files/22-a0623w45.pdf>
- Tabata-Sandom, M., & Ikeda, Y. (2024). How practical extensive reading experiences changed the perceptions of L2 Japanese teachers. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 36(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.125/67465>
- Thongsan, N. C., & Waring, R. (2024). Challenges in implementing extensive reading in Thailand. *rEFlections*, 31(2), 457–477. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v31i2.274278>
- Von Frauke, F. (2024). Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Doktors der Philosophie der Universität Mannheim [*Intensive vs. extensive reading: A*



- study on the impact of L2 reading intervention in 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Mannheim]. [https://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de/67210/1/Dissertation\\_FraukeFried\\_final.pdf](https://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de/67210/1/Dissertation_FraukeFried_final.pdf)
- Waring, R., & Chu, V. A., (2017, August 5–7). *Setting up and managing an ER program in Vietnam* [Paper presentation]. The Fourth World Congress on Extensive Reading, Tokyo, Japan. <https://bit.ly/36T1ymY>
- Waring, R., & Husna, N. (2019). Expectations and experiences of Indonesian teachers who have, and have not, done extensive reading. *TEFLIN Journal*, 30(2), 153–170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/153-170>
- Waring, R., & McLean, S. (2015). Exploration of the core and variable dimensions of extensive reading research and pedagogy. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 160–167. <https://doi.org/10.125/66708>
- Waring, R., & Vu, T. H. (2020). Challenges setting up extensive reading programs in Vietnam. *Extensive Reading World Congress Proceedings*, 5, 11–22. <https://jalt-publications.org/content/index.php/jer/article/view/523/74>
- Wulyani, A., Widiati, U., & El Khoiri, N. (2022). Challenges in implementing extensive reading (ER) programs: Voices from English teachers at Indonesian secondary schools. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 12(1), 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.08>
- Yamashita, J. (2015). In search of the nature of extensive reading in L2: Cognitive, affective, and pedagogical perspectives. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 168–181. <https://doi.org/10.125/66709>

## Appendix A

### *Global Extensive Reading Survey 2023*

Thank you for willing to take this survey which is part of the research project entitled *How do EFL Teachers Around the World Implement Extensive Reading?*

Our aim is to find out how ER (in English) is currently being conducted in the formal education system (the one often controlled by school boards and governments) in places where English is not the first language by practitioners currently doing or having done ER. If you have several ER classes, please choose one that best represents how you teach ER. For the purposes of this survey, we do not distinguish between online or paper-based ER programs because our focus is on the overall approach to ER, not on the mode.

Please feel free to read a more detailed explanation [here](#).

**Remark:** This research has been approved by the Office of the Research Ethics Review Committee for Research Involving Human Subjects at Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, where the principal researcher works at. If you wish, you can access the Ethics approval documents [here](#).

### **Part 1: Respondent's Profile Confirmation**

This part asks the respondent to confirm that they are eligible to do the survey.

Please confirm that you meet the following five criteria:

1. I am an English language teacher in an English as foreign language (EFL) context (for example, Brazil, France, Kenya, Thailand, etc.).
2. I am currently implementing or have implemented extensive reading in my teaching.

3. I teach students in a formal education setting (that is, at a public or private school/university or international school/university), not in the non-formal education system (for example, cram school, private language programs, or evening school).
4. I am willing to participate in the study.
5. I consent to the use of the survey data for publications and presentations.
  - a. I can confirm the above. > Part 2
  - b. No, I cannot confirm the above. > Part 8 exit A

---

## Part 2: Respondent's Background

This part collects the respondent's background information.

2.1 *Years of teaching English*: How long have you been teaching English?

- a. 0-2 years
- b. 3-5 years
- c. 6-10 years
- d. 11-20 years
- e. More than 20 years

2.2 *Years of implementing ER*: How long have you implemented ER in your teaching?

- a. 0.5-2 years
- b. 3-5 years
- c. 6-10 years
- d. 11-20 years
- e. More than 20 years

2.3 *Location (region)*: Where do you teach?

2.3.1 Region

- a. Africa
- b. Americas
- c. Asia
- d. Europe
- e. Oceania

2.3.2 Country (dropdown items)

Please see the attached list of countries after Question 7.2.

2.4 *Institution*: I teach at a/an \_\_\_\_.

- a. elementary/primary school (local/international)
- b. middle/junior high school (local/international)
- c. university/college (local/international)
- d. vocational school

2.5 *Proficiency*: The average English proficiency of my students is \_\_\_\_\_. (Think about your students in your representative ER class.)

- a. beginner
- b. elementary
- c. intermediate
- d. advanced
- e. near native

2.6 *ER Training*: How did you learn about ER? (Check all that apply.)

- in my teacher training course(s)
- joining ER training sessions (online or face to face)
- watching YouTube videos about ER

- reading articles and books about ER  
 from colleagues/friends  
 Other
- 

### Part 3: Respondent's Understanding of ER

This part assesses how well ER practitioners understand ER. The first three statements (Items 3.1a–3.1c) check the respondent's understanding of the basic aspects of ER, and the second statement (Item 3.2) explores how they actually implement ER with their students.

**Reminder: If you teach several ER classes, please select ONE that best represents how you teach ER.**

3.1a When doing ER, students should read \_\_\_\_.

- a. a lot  
b. a little

3.1b When doing ER, students should read \_\_\_\_.

- a. something easy  
b. something a little difficult

3.1c When doing ER, students should read \_\_\_\_.

- a. fluently and quickly  
b. slowly and carefully

3.2 When I do ER, I want my students to \_\_\_\_.

*Very important (3), important (2), not so important (1)*

Topic	3	2	1
1. build their reading confidence			
2. build reading speed and fluency			
3. choose what they want to read			
4. have their comprehension checked after reading			
5. listen to me reading to them			
6. listen to me read and then they repeat			
7. read a lot			
8. read something they can enjoy			
9. read something a little difficult			
10. read authentic or unsimplified texts			
11. read lots of short passages followed by activities			
12. read a text for the detailed understanding of the content			
13. read their stories to others			
14. read something I chose for them			
15. read the same book together in class			
16. read silently			
17. practice reading aloud to the class			

18. practice reading strategies			
19. practice the skill of reading			
20. help manage the library			
21. select something at their own comfortable reading level			
22. intentionally look for and learn a lot of new grammar and vocabulary			
23. try to read without a dictionary			

-----

### Part 7: Topics for Future ER Training

This part focuses on the topics for future ER training.

- 7.1 If you were to attend an ER workshop or training session, how important would these topics be for you to learn about?  
*Very important (3), important (2), not so important (1)*

<b>Topic: I want to learn how to ____.</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
1. get funding for the materials or training etc.			
2. search for and understand the up-to-date research on ER			
3. choose materials for ER programs			
4. motivate students to read			
5. assess the students' reading			
6. convince others that ER is important			
7. run and manage an ER library			
8. integrate the ER into our curriculum			
9. educate other teachers/administrators about ER			
10. gather data on the effectiveness of my ER program			
11. co-ordinate with other ER teachers and the administration			
12. design post-reading activities that could motivate students			
13. keep records of what students have read			
14. share my experiences with other ER practitioners			

- 7.2 Are there **other things** you would like to learn about in ER workshops or training sessions?  
 <Long answer>

### List of Countries

#### 1. Africa

No.	Africa	No.	Africa
1	Algeria	31	Libya
2	Angola	32	Madagascar
3	Benin	33	Malawi
4	Botswana	34	Mali
5	British Indian Ocean Territory	35	Mauritania
6	Burkina Faso	36	Mauritius
7	Burundi	37	Mayotte
8	Cabo Verde [Cape Verde]	38	Morocco
9	Cameroon	39	Mozambique
10	Central African Republic	40	Namibia
11	Chad	41	Niger
12	Comoros	42	Nigeria
13	Congo [Republic of the Congo]	43	Réunion
14	Côte d'Ivoire [Ivory Coast]	44	Rwanda
15	Democratic Republic of the Congo	45	Saint Helena [Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha]
16	Djibouti	46	Sao Tome and Principe
17	Egypt	47	Senegal
18	Equatorial Guinea	48	Seychelles
19	Eritrea	49	Sierra Leone
20	Eswatini [Swaziland]	50	Somalia
21	Ethiopia	51	South Africa
22	French Southern Territories	52	South Sudan
23	Gabon	53	Sudan
24	Gambia	54	Togo
25	Ghana	55	Tunisia
26	Guinea	56	Uganda
27	Guinea-Bissau	57	United Republic of Tanzania
28	Kenya	58	Western Sahara
29	Lesotho	59	Zambia
30	Liberia	60	Zimbabwe

## 2. Americas

No.	Americas	No.	Americas
1	Anguilla	28	Guatemala
2	Antigua and Barbuda	29	Guyana
3	Argentina	30	Haiti
4	Aruba	31	Honduras
5	Bahamas	32	Jamaica
6	Barbados	33	Martinique
7	Belize	34	Mexico
8	Bermuda	35	Montserrat
9	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	36	Nicaragua
10	Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba	37	Panama
11	Bouvet Island	38	Paraguay
12	Brazil	39	Peru
13	British Virgin Islands	40	Puerto Rico
14	Cayman Islands	41	Saint Barthélemy
15	Chile	42	Saint Kitts and Nevis
16	Colombia	43	Saint Lucia
17	Costa Rica	44	Saint Martin (French part)
18	Cuba	45	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
19	Curaçao	46	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
20	Dominica	47	Sint Maarten (Dutch part)
21	Dominican Republic	48	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
22	Ecuador	49	Suriname
23	El Salvador	50	Trinidad and Tobago
24	French Guiana	51	Turks and Caicos Islands
25	Greenland	52	Uruguay
26	Grenada	53	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
27	Guadeloupe		

### 3. Asia

No.	Asia	No.	Asia
1	Afghanistan	27	Malaysia
2	Armenia	28	Maldives
3	Azerbaijan	29	Mongolia
4	Bahrain	30	Myanmar [Burma]
5	Bangladesh	31	Nepal
6	Bhutan	32	Oman
7	Brunei Darussalam	33	Pakistan
8	Cambodia	34	Philippines
9	China	35	Qatar
10	China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region	36	Republic of Korea [South Korea]
11	China, Macao Special Administrative Region	37	Saudi Arabia
12	Cyprus	38	Singapore
13	Democratic People's Republic of Korea [North Korea]	39	Sri Lanka
14	Georgia	40	State of Palestine
15	India	41	Syrian Arab Republic
16	Indonesia	42	Taiwan
17	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	43	Tajikistan
18	Iraq	44	Thailand
19	Israel	45	Timor-Leste [East Timor]
20	Japan	46	Türkiye
21	Jordan	47	Turkmenistan
22	Kazakhstan	48	United Arab Emirates
23	Kuwait	49	Uzbekistan
24	Kyrgyzstan	50	Viet Nam
25	Lao People's Democratic Republic	51	Yemen
26	Lebanon		

#### 4. Europe

No.	Europe	No.	Europe
1	Åland Islands	25	Liechtenstein
2	Albania	26	Lithuania
3	Andorra	27	Luxembourg
4	Austria	28	Malta
5	Belarus	29	Monaco
6	Belgium	30	Montenegro
7	Bosnia and Herzegovina	31	Netherlands
8	Bulgaria	32	North Macedonia
9	Croatia	33	Norway
10	Czechia [Czech Republic]	34	Poland
11	Denmark	35	Portugal
12	Estonia	36	Republic of Moldova
13	Faroe Islands	37	Romania
14	Finland	38	Russian Federation
15	France [French Republic]	39	San Marino
16	Germany	40	Sark
17	Greece	41	Serbia
18	Guernsey	42	Slovakia
19	Holy See [Vatican City]	43	Slovenia
20	Hungary	44	Spain
21	Iceland	45	Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands
22	Italy	46	Sweden
23	Jersey	47	Switzerland
24	Latvia	48	Ukraine



## 5. Oceania

No.	Oceania
1	American Samoa
2	Christmas Island
3	Cocos (Keeling) Islands
4	Cook Islands
5	Fiji
6	French Polynesia
7	Guam
8	Heard Island and McDonald Islands
9	Kiribati
10	Marshall Islands
11	Micronesia (Federated States of)
12	Nauru
13	New Caledonia
14	Niue
15	Norfolk Island
16	Northern Mariana Islands
17	Palau
18	Papua New Guinea
19	Pitcairn [Pitcairn Islands]
20	Samoa
21	Solomon Islands
22	Tokelau
23	Tonga
24	Tuvalu
25	Vanuatu
26	Wallis and Futuna Islands

### About the Authors

Rob Waring, Ph.D., is an Emeritus Professor at Notre Dame Seishin University and is an Executive Board member of the Extensive Reading Foundation. He is also author and series editor of six series of graded readers and recently published *Teaching Extensive Reading in Another Language* with Paul Nation. E-mail: waring.rob@gmail.com.

Mintra Puripunyanich, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of English at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI). She was a co-founder and is Immediate Past Chair of the Thailand Extensive Reading Association (TERA). Her research interests include extensive reading, L2 reading, and materials development. E-mail: mintra.p@chula.ac.th.