

Unlocking the Path to Academic Excellence: Unraveling the Impact of 480 Class Hours in Improving Reading Ability for Lecturers

Andjarwati Sadik, Sitti Sahraeny & Muhammad Ridha Anugrah Latief *

Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar, Indonesia

ridha@unhas.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 2022-06-25

Revised : 2023-07-12

Accepted : 2023-07-18

KEYWORDS

Academic Reading Skills

Academic Staff

TOEFL

IELTS

Higher Education



ABSTRACT

This study examines the reading abilities of adult learners who attended IELTS preparation courses at Universitas Hasanuddin's Language Centre. The goal is to assess their progress during the reading class. The participants included 50 academic staff members from 18 universities in Eastern Indonesia, sponsored by the Directorate of Higher Education (DIKTI). Divided into intermediate and advanced levels, each group had 25 participants, attending 240 sessions over three months (480 class hours). Employing a mixed methods design, the research used five instruments: Pre-Test 1 (TOEFL Practice Test), Pre-Test 2, Mid-Test, Post-Test (IELTS Practice Test), and Final-Test (IELTS Test). Additionally, a self-assessment questionnaire with 20 Likert scale questions was given. The researchers, who were also the Reading Class teachers, conducted direct observations to complement the quantitative data. The findings revealed significant improvement in the respondents' reading abilities at both intermediate and advanced levels, from pre-test to final test. The highest band scores for the intermediate level were 3.5, 3.0, 5.5, 5.0, and 5.5, while for the advanced level, they were 6.5, 5.5, 7.5, 7.5, and 8.5. This improvement led to enhanced reading skills, especially in English texts, which benefited the academic staff both personally and professionally. The study highlights the effectiveness of 480 class hours in enhancing reading abilities, enabling them to engage with various English texts, enrich their field-relevant knowledge, and positively impact their students' learning. Additionally, these improved skills contribute to better quality teaching, research, and community services in their professional roles.

1. Introduction

English Language Proficiency (ELP) has long been one of the requirements for many purposes, both in academics and occupation. A good or high ELP score in the academic field will open many opportunities to get scholarships for higher study or short courses. While in occupation, many government departments and private institutions use certain ELP scores as the standard for career advancement and promotion. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the demand for taking English courses and English Language tests has been increasing over the last ten years. Two important factors for international students in adaptation cannot be ignored: cultural identity and language proficiency (Peng & Patterson, 2022).

DIKTI (Department of Higher Education of Indonesia), an educational institution in Indonesia, has launched a scholarship to study overseas for lecturers

from both state and private universities all over Indonesia. One requirement to be eligible for the scholarship is the ELP score, which is a Paper-based TOEFL (minimum 500) or IELTS (minimum 5.0). DIKTI has funded a four-month English Course for the Intermediate and three months for the Advanced level to meet the demand. This course is for the recommended lecturers from their universities to learn English at the recommended Language Centre all over Indonesia. DIKTI does offer not only English courses for the participants but also other foreign languages, such as French, Germany, Dutch, etc., depending on the country destination of the participants.

UPT Pusat Bahasa (Language Centre) of Universitas Hasanuddin (Unhas) was appointed by DIKTI to conduct this English Language Preparation Program for the candidate awardees from universities in Western and Eastern Indonesia, such as Universitas

Gajah Mada (Jogyakarta), Universitas Diponegoro (Semarang), Universitas Pattimura (Maluku), Universitas Cenderawasih (Papua), Universitas Sam Ratulangi (Manado), Universitas Negeri Manado, Universitas Negeri Papua, Universitas Tadulako (Palu), Universitas Haluoleo (Kendari), Universitas Muhammadiyah Kendari, Universitas Borneo Tarakan (Kalimantan), Universitas Ihsan Gorontalo, Universitas Khairun (Ternate), Universitas Mulawarman (Kalimantan), etc. The program was conducted conveniently in the past few years, and there were 8 (eight) groups with a total of 200 participants, and this research only focuses on participants from Eastern Indonesia.

Since the course aimed to prepare the participants to study overseas, UPT Pusat Bahasa Unhas decided to focus on IELTS Preparation materials. Prior to the course, we administered Pre-Test 1. The result indicated that most participants were not yet ready to study for IELTS. Therefore, the Language Centre decided to teach them general English, before the IELTS learning materials. The General English materials were given only between 2-3 weeks, and the teachers reinforced the participants to do self-study outside the class. Otherwise, most of them were not able to follow the IELTS course. The Course was a three-month Course (12 weeks) for both levels. The two Groups were handled by 10 experienced instructors, 5 instructors per group, and four skills: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The instructors were lecturers from the English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Hasanuddin with Master's and Doctorate overseas qualifications.

After experiencing 6 groups of participants, the researchers initiatively decided to conduct research on this course, focusing on the seventh and eighth groups. Two of the researchers were responsible for teaching the IELTS Reading subject. Therefore, we decided to focus the research on reading.

The language is also intended for use by linguists, institutions, lecturers, students, and other groups who require language as a communication tool (Latief et al., 2022). The demand for higher education programs is certainly higher than the previous ones, not only in their field of study but also in their foreign language proficiency, such as English, French, Dutch, etc. The twenty-first century is a new era with new student challenges and responsibilities. A new way of teaching English has come about with the introduction of technology into our lives (Yuliana, 2020). One of the essential skills that students must be mastered for further study nowadays is reading skills as they are demanded to read a lot in their study program. IELTS Reading is seen as a discerning skill, and it is as important as listening, speaking, and writing in achieving IELTS band 6 or 6.5 objectives for students (Bac Binh & Kieu Trinh, 2019). The research findings from Fatemeand Saman demonstrated that EFL learners' perceptions toward the usefulness of this

innovative strategy in strengthening their inferential reading comprehension skills were mostly positive (Samiei & Ebadi, 2021). Another research found that during a ten-week reading comprehension course, the dynamic assessment intervention was considerably effective in improving language learners' reading competency and Iranian IELTS students' metacognitive awareness for reading strategy and development (Shobeiry, 2021).

Therefore, the novelty of this research was conducted to explore academic staff's reading ability for academic purposes, in this case, the lecturers from different universities in Eastern Indonesia, because the lecturers will transfer their knowledge to the students. The result of the research can be useful for DIKTI or other institutions in selecting participants for the same kind of program in the future and to give information on the current condition of their English reading proficiency.

The IELTS Reading Text covers various topics from different disciplines. As a result, the participants develop their reading skills and enhance their knowledge about current issues.

2. Method

This mixed methods research design using a self-assessment close-ended questionnaire dealing with reading strategies was administered. It consisted of twenty structured questions distributed to the 50 participants. The questions were adapted, with some modifications, from Setiyadi, 2006. They were requested to choose one of the four Likert' scales (Setiyadi, 2006, p. 80). In the analysis of the data, the frequency of each question in the questionnaire was tabulated for further calculation. In addition to the questionnaire, data were also collected from the participants' TOEFL and IELTS test results. The IALF Bali conducted the IELTS test, with the Language Centre of Unhas serving as the facilitator. Classroom observation was also conducted as the researchers were the instructors of the Reading Class. The observation focused on the participants' classroom participation in the learning process, including their behaviors and attitudes toward reading, to support quantitative data.

The subjects of this mixed-method research were 44 purposively selected from 50 participants of the program to represent 18 different universities in the eastern part of Indonesia, both public and private. These respondents were participants from the two selected groups, with three months allocated time for each group, respectively. The participants then were divided into Intermediate and Advanced groups. Before their placement, the Language Centre administered a Pre-test to group them using TOEFL and IELTS Tests. Learning materials were taken from published IELTS Reading materials.

To interpret TOEFL Practice scores, the researchers look into the study conducted by ETS (Educational

Testing Service) on a score mapping study to the levels of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), a score descriptor study, and a reliability study (Richard J. Tannenbaum & Baron, 2011). Results of the CEFR mapping provide the minimum TOEFL section scores for four of the levels defined in the CEFR: A2 (337), B1 (460), B2 (543), and C1 (627). After that, the TOEFL score is needed to convert to IELST band score due to compare the current participants' English proficiency in TOEFL Score Test into IELST band score adopted from The Edge Earning Center about Universal Conversion Table for TOEFL iBT, PBT, & CBT Test (Center TEL, 2022)

In marking the tests, researchers compare the five instruments: The scores for Pre-Test 1 (TOEFL Preparation Test) are converted to IELST band conversion score, and the scores of Pre-Test 2, Mid-Test, Post-Test (IELST Preparation Test), and Final Test (IELST Test) based on IELSLT band score. In order to interpret the findings, the researchers followed the two standard markings

4. Findings

4.1 Tests for Intermediate Level

There are 5 (five) types of tests conducted during the course; they are Pre-Test 1 (TOEFL Practice Test), Pre-Test 2, Mid-Test, Post-Test (IELTS Practice Test), and Final-Test (IELTS Test). Prior to the five instruments, the TOEFL test as pre-test 1 was administered. The reason for conducting this test was to measure their English proficiency before joining the training.

The following is the explanation of each finding taken from all instruments.

4.1.1 TOEFL Pre-Test 1 (Intermediate Level)

The results of their TOEFL test at the intermediate level ranged from 293 to 383. This score was equivalent to the A2 level (ranging from 337 – 457).

There were 16 out of 25 participants in A2 level (337 to 457). Although the highest score of A2 level was 457, only one participant could reach the score of 383, and the lowest score was 337. This indicated that the participants' English proficiency needed improvement. Next, six participants obtained below A2 level (293 to 333), and three did not attend the test.

Table 1. TOEFL Pre-Test 1 Score for Intermediate Level

No.	TOEFL Pre-Test 1 Score (Intermediate Level)			TOTAL	TOEFL to IELST Band Conversion Score
	LC	S&WE	RC		
1.	41	38	36	383	3.5
2.	34	38	40	373	3.0
3.	37	38	36	370	3.0
4.	39	37	34	367	3.0
5.	37	31	40	360	3.0
6.	40	31	37	360	3.0
7.	39	35	34	360	3.0
8.	43	27	38	360	3.0
9.	40	27	40	357	3.0
10.	39	27	41	357	3.0
11.	39	40	26	350	2.5
12.	31	35	38	347	2.5
13.	34	31	38	343	2.5
14.	42	31	29	340	2.5
15.	35	35	32	340	2.5
16.	34	31	36	337	2.5
17.	31	31	38	333	2.5
18.	42	26	32	333	2.5
19.	32	31	36	330	2.0
20.	41	26	29	320	2.0
21.	34	31	29	313	2.0
22.	33	26	29	293	2.0
23.	0	0	0	0	0
24.	0	0	0	0	0
25.	0	0	0	0	0

LC: Listening Comprehension;
S&WE: Structure & Written Expression;
RC: Reading Comprehension

4.1.2 IELTS Pre-Test 2 (Intermediate Level)

The Pre-test 2 was conducted using (the same) test materials taken from IELTS, Specimen Materials 2003 by [British Council \(2005\)](#).

The findings indicated that twenty-two out of twenty-five attended the test. From the twenty-two participants, four participants obtained a band score 1.0 (code number: 11, 14, 18, and 20); six participants

obtained 1.5 (code number: 2, 6, 12, 15, 21, and 22); ten participants obtained 2.0 (code number: 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19); one participant obtained 2.5 (code number: 3); and only one participant obtained 3.0. (code number: 13). The highest band score of IELTS Pre-Test result for the Intermediate Level was 3.5, and 1.0 was the lowest.

Table 2. IELTS Pre-Test 2 Score for Intermediate Level

No.	IELST Pre-Test 2 Score (Intermediate Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	1.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.0
2.	0.5	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5
3.	0.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	2.5
4.	0.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0
5.	1.5	3.5	1.5	2.0	2.0
6.	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.5
7.	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
8.	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.0
9.	1.5	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
10.	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
11.	0.5	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.0
12.	0.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5
13.	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
14.	1.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.0
15.	0.5	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.5
16.	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
17.	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0
18.	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	1.0
19.	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.5	2.0
20.	1.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
21.	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.5
22.	1.5	2.0	2.0	0.0	1.5
23.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.1.3 IELTS Mid-Test (Intermediate Level)

After six weeks of the course, Mid-Test was administered using test materials from Cambridge IELTS 7.

The findings indicated that all the twenty-five participants attended the test. From the twenty-five participants, three participants obtained band score 1.0 (code number: 6, 7, and 21), code number 6 and 7 only attended the reading and writing test; five participants obtained 1.5 (code number: 1, 12, 15, 20, and 23), code number 1 only attended reading and writing test, code number 12 did not attend speaking test so as code number 15 and 23, code number 20 did not attend

listening and speaking test; four participants obtained 2.0 (code number: 18, 19, 22, 24), code number 18, 19, 22, 24 did not attend speaking test; five participants obtained 2.5 (code number: 5, 9, 11, 16, and 25), code number 5, 9, and 25 did not attend speaking test; three participants obtained 3.0. (code numbers: 2, 4, and 14); two participants obtained 3.5. (code number: 8, and 17), code number 8 did not attend speaking test; two participants obtained 4.0. (code number: 10, and 13); no participant obtained 4.5; one participant obtained 5.0. (code number: 3). The highest band score of IELTS Mid-Test result for the Intermediate Level was 5.0 and 1.0 was the lowest. This means their basic English is insufficient yet to support their IELTS test. Therefore, this training is useful for them.

Table 3. IELST Mid-Test Score for Intermediate Level

No.	IELST Mid-Test Score (Intermediate Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	1.5
2.	1.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0
3.	4.0	6.5	3.5	5.0	5.0
4.	1.5	4.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
5.	2.0	0.0	4.0	3.5	2.5
6.	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.0	1.0
7.	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
8.	3.5	0.0	4.5	5.0	3.5
9.	2.5	0.0	2.0	4.5	2.5
10.	3.0	5.0	3.5	4.5	4.0
11.	1.5	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.5
12.	2.5	0.0	2.0	2.0	1.5
13.	3.0	5.5	3.0	5.0	4.0
14.	1.5	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.0
15.	2.0	0.0	0.5	3.0	1.5
16.	1.0	4.5	1.5	3.0	2.5
17.	2.5	4.5	2.5	4.0	3.5
18.	3.0	0.0	1.0	3.5	2.0
19.	1.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	2.0
20.	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	1.5
21.	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
22.	2.0	0.0	2.5	3.5	2.0
23.	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	1.5
24.	2.5	0.0	4.0	3.0	2.0
25.	2.5	0.0	3.5	3.0	2.5

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.1.4 IELTS Post-Test (Intermediate Level)

After six weeks of the Course, Mid-Test was administered using test materials from Cambridge IELTS 7.

The findings indicated that all the twenty-five participants attended the test. From the twenty-five participants, one participant obtained a band score 1.0 (code number: 6) and only attended the reading test; two participants obtained 1.5 (code number: 15 (did not attend listening and writing test), 21 (only attended speaking)); five participants obtained 2.0 (code number: 7 did not attend the listening test, 16, 18-did

not attend writing test, 20 and 25 did not attend listening and writing); three participants obtained 2.5 (code number 5 did not attend listening, 9 did not attend listening and writing test, 17 did not attend speaking test); four participants obtained 3.0. (code number: 1, 11, 14, 19, and 23); three participants obtained 3.5. (code number: 4, 10, and 24); one participant obtained 4.0. (code number: 2); three participants obtained 4.5. (code number: 3, 13, and 22); one participant obtained 5.0. (code number: 8). The highest band score of IELTS Post-Test result for the Intermediate Level was 5.0, and 1.0 was the lowest.

Table 4. IELST Post-Test Score for Intermediate Level

No.	IELST Post-Test Score (Intermediate Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	2.0	5.0	1.5	3.0	3.0
2.	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3.	5.0	6.0	3.5	3.0	4.5
4.	2.5	5.0	2.5	4.0	3.5
5.	0.0	5.5	1.5	3.0	2.5
6.	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0
7.	0.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
8.	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
9.	0.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	2.5
10.	4.5	5.0	0.0	4.5	3.5
11.	1.0	5.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
12.	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.0
13.	3.0	5.5	3.5	5.5	4.5
14.	2.0	4.5	1.5	3.0	3.0
15.	0.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	1.5
16.	2.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
17.	3.5	0.0	2.0	4.0	2.5
18.	2.0	4.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
19.	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.5	3.0
20.	0.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
21.	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
22.	3.5	5.5	3.5	5.0	4.5
23.	2.0	5.0	1.5	3.0	3.0
24.	4.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	3.5
25.	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	2.0

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.1.5 Final IELTS test (Intermediate Level)

Final-Test was administered by Proctors from IALF Bali at the Language Centre Unhas. The results of the test were sent by IALF Bali to the Language Centre to be further distributed to each participant. The result consisted of the collective list of all participants from both levels and individual IELTS test certificates. Generally, compared to the results of their previous tests, which were increasing, most of the participants showed significant improvement in their real Reading IELTS test.

Ideally, the participants should have strong basic English in order to improve their IELTS scores. For example: basic grammatical structures, a wide range of vocabulary, elements of good paragraphs, etc.

The findings indicated that all twenty-five participants attended the final test. The total number of participants were 25. However, two of them (code number 1 and 10) did not attend the test.

No one obtained band score 1.0; No one also obtained band score 1.5; one participant obtained 2.0 (code number: 6); one participant obtained 2.5 (code number: 7); four participants obtained 3.0. (code number: 14, 20, 21, and 23); nine participants obtained 3.5. (code number: 2, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24, and 25); three participants obtained 4.0. (code number: 4, 18, 22); no participant obtained 4.5.; three participants obtained 5.0. (code number: 5, 9, and 13); one participant obtained 5.5. (code number: 8). The IELTS Final-Test result for the Intermediate Level from the lowest band score was 2.0, and the highest score was 5.5.

Table 5. IELST Final-Test Score for Intermediate Level

No.	IELST Final-Test/Real IELST Test Score (Intermediate Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2.	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
3.	5.0	4.5	6.0	5.5	5.5
4.	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
5.	4.5	5.0	5.5	4.5	5.0
6.	2.0	4.5	0.0	2.0	2.0
7.	2.0	4.0	2.5	2.0	2.5
8.	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.0	5.5
9.	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
10.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11.	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
12.	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5
13.	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.5	5.0
14.	3.5	4.0	3.0	1.5	3.0
15.	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.0	3.5
16.	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.0	3.5
17.	2.0	3.5	4.5	4.5	3.5
18.	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
19.	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.5
20.	2.0	4.5	3.0	2.5	3.0
21.	3.5	4.0	2.5	2.5	3.0
22.	3.0	4.5	3.5	4.5	4.0
23.	2.0	4.5	2.5	2.0	3.0
24.	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.5	3.5
25.	3.5	4.5	3.0	2.5	3.5

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.2 Tests for Advanced Level

There were also 5 (five) types of tests conducted during the course for the advance level; they are Pre-Test (TOEFL Practice Test), Pre-Test, Mid Test, Post-Test (IELTS practice test), and Final-Test (IELTS test). Prior to the five instruments, the TOEFL test was administered. The reason for conducting this test was to measure their English proficiency before attending the training.

The following is the explanation of each finding taken from all instruments. **4.2.1 TOEFL Pre-Test 1 (Advanced Level)**

The results of their TOEFL test in the Advanced level ranged from 377 to 553. This score was equivalent to A2 and B2 (ranging from 543 to 623).

Based on the Interpreting TOEFL ITP Scores Level, 17 out of 25 participants were in A2 level (337 to 457). Five participants were in B1 level (460-540), one was in B2 level (543-625), and two did not attend the tests.

Although the highest score of B2 level was 623, only one participant could reach the highest score of 553, and the lowest score was 337 in level A2.

Table 6. TEOFL Pre-Test 1 Score for Advanced Level

No.	TOEFL Pre-Test 1 Score (Advanced Level)				TOEFL to IELST Band Conversion Score
	LC	S&WE	RC	TOTAL	
1.	56	56	54	553	6.5
2.	51	448	52	503	6.0
3.	48	49	48	483	5.5
4.	46	50	47	477	5.5
5.	49	44	47	467	5.5
6.	43	47	49	463	5.5
7.	44	47	46	457	5.5
8.	41	49	46	453	5.5
9.	39	44	47	433	5.0
10.	41	43	45	430	5.0
11.	39	43	43	417	5.0
12.	43	40	41	413	4.5
13.	34	46	41	403	4.5
14.	39	40	42	403	4.5
15.	38	37	46	403	4.5
16.	42	46	32	400	4.5
17.	37	38	44	397	4.0
18.	38	43	37	393	4.0
19.	35	41	42	393	4.0
20.	40	38	38	387	4.0
21.	40	31	45	387	4.0
22.	33	44	37	380	4.0
23.	49	35	29	377	4.0
24.	0	0	0	0	0.0
25.	0	0	0	0	0.0

LC: Listening Comprehension;
S&WE: Structure & Written Expression;
RC: Reading Comprehension

4.2.2 IELST Pre-Test 2 (Advanced Level)

The Pre-test 2 was conducted using (the same) test materials taken from IELTS, Specimen Materials 2003 by [British Council \(2005\)](#).

The findings indicated that twenty-three out of twenty-five attended the IELST pre-test. From the twenty-three participants, one participant obtained band score 1.0 (code number: 18); none of the participants obtained 1.5; seven participants obtained 2.0 (code number: 8, 10, 14, 16, 19, 21, and 22); four participants obtained 2.5 (code number: 6, 13, 17, and

20); five participants obtained 3.0. (code number: 3, 7, 9, 11, and 12); two participants obtained 3.5. (code number: 15 and 22); one participant obtained 4.0. (code number: 5); two participants obtained 4.5. (code number: 2 and 4); none of the participant obtained 5.0; one participant obtained 5.5. (code number: 1); The highest band score of the IELTS Pre-Test result for Advanced Level was 5.5, and 1.0 was the lowest. All twenty-three participants attended all sections of the test.

Table 7. IELST Pre-Test 2 Score for Advanced Level

No.	IELST Pre-Test 2 Score (Advanced Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	6.5	4.0	6.0	5.0	5.5
2.	5.0	3.0	5.5	4.0	4.5
3.	6.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
4.	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5
5.	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
6.	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5
7.	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0
8.	0.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0
9.	2.5	2.0	4.5	3.5	3.0
10.	1.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
11.	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
12.	2.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
13.	1.5	2.0	3.5	3.5	2.5
14.	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
15.	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
16.	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
17.	0.5	2.0	3.0	4.5	2.5
18.	0.0	1.5	1.0	2.0	1.0
19.	1.0	2.5	1.5	0.0	2.0
20.	1.5	3.0	1.5	4.0	2.5
21.	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.0
22.	1.0	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.5
23.	2.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	2.5
24.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.2.3 IELTS Mid-Test (Advanced Level)

After six weeks of the course, Mid-Test was administered using test materials from Cambridge IELTS 7.

The findings indicated that all twenty-five participants attended the test although eight of them did not attend two sections: reading and speaking.

From the twenty-five participants, no one obtained band score of 1.0; one participant obtained 1.5 (code number: 16) did not attend the speaking section; two participants obtained 2.0 (code number: 14 and 19) code number 14 did not attend the speaking section, number 19 did not attend speaking section; two participants obtained 2.5 (code number: 13 and 18) code number 13 did not attend speaking section,

number 18 did not attend speaking section; two participants obtained 3.0. (code number: 7 and 10) code number 7 did not attend the reading section, and 10 did not attend the speaking section; two participants obtained 3.5. (code number: 6 and 22); three participants obtained 4.0. (code number: 3, 15, and 21) code number 3 did not attend reading section; four participants obtained 4.5. (code number: 8, 9, 12 and 20); four participants obtained 5.0. (code number: 1, 11, 17, and 23) code number 1 did not attend the speaking section; one participant obtained 5.5 (code number: 5); three participants obtained 6.0 (code number: 2, 4, and 25); no one obtained 6.5; one participant obtained 7.0. (code number: 24). The highest band score of IELTS Mid-Test result for the Advanced Level was 7.0, and 1.5 was the lowest.

Table 8. IELST Mid-Test Score for Advanced Level

No.	IELST Mid-Test Score (Advanced Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	5.5	0.0	8.0	7.0	-
2.	6.5	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
3.	4.0	6.5	0.0	4.5	4.0
4.	4.5	7.0	6.0	5.5	6.0
5.	5.5	6.5	4.0	5.0	5.5
6.	3.5	4.5	4.0	2.0	3.5
7.	4.5	5.5	0.0	2.5	3.0
8.	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
9.	3.0	3.5	6.0	5.5	4.5
10.	2.0	0.0	6.0	4.0	-
11.	3.5	6.5	4.5	4.5	5.0
12.	4.0	5.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
13.	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.5	-
14.	2.0	0.0	4.0	2.5	-
15.	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
16.	1.5	0.0	3.0	2.5	-
17.	3.0	6.0	5.0	2.5	5.0
18.	2.5	0.0	5.0	2.5	-
19.	2.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	-
20.	2.0	6.0	6.0	3.5	4.5
21.	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
22.	1.5	4.5	4.5	2.5	3.5
23.	4.0	6.0	6.0	3.5	5.0
24.	6.5	6.5	8.0	6.0	7.0
25.	4.5	7.5	6.0	5.5	6.0

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.2.4 IELTS Post-Test (Advanced Level)

The findings indicated that all twenty-five participants attended all sections of the test. Although one of them (code number 18) did not attend the listening and speaking section.

From the twenty-five participants, none of the participant obtained band score 1.0 and 1.5; one participant obtained 2.0 (code number: 18); no one obtained 2.5; one participant obtained 3.0. (code number: 16); one participant obtained 3.5. (code

number: 19); six participant obtained 4.0. (code number: 10, 14, 15, 20, 21, and 22); three participant obtained 4.5. (code number: 6, 12, and 13); four participants obtained 5.0. (code number: 7, 8, 11, and 23); two participants obtained 5.5. (code number: 3 and 17); four participants obtained 6.0. (code number: 4, 5, 9 and 25); none of the participants obtained 6.5; one participant obtained 7.0. (code number: 24); two participants obtained 7.5. (code number: 1 and 2). The highest band score of IELTS Post-Test result for the Advanced Level was 7.5 and 2.0 was the lowest.

Table 9. IELST Post-Test Score for Advanced Level

No.	IELST Post-Test Score (Advanced Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	8.5	6.5	8.0	7.0	7.5
2.	8.0	6.5	8.0	7.0	7.5
3.	4.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5
4.	6.0	6.5	6.0	6.0	6.0
5.	6.0	6.5	6.5	5.0	6.0
6.	3.5	5.0	6.0	4.0	4.5
7.	4.5	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0
8.	4.5	5.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
9.	4.5	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
10.	2.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
11.	4.0	5.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
12.	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5
13.	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5
14.	3.0	5.5	3.0	3.0	4.0
15.	3.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
16.	3.0	4.5	2.0	3.0	3.0
17.	4.0	5.5	6.0	6.0	5.5
18.	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.5	2.0
19.	2.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
20.	3.0	5.0	2.0	3.5	4.0
21.	2.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0
22.	2.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
23.	4.5	5.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
24.	9.0	5.5	8.5	5.5	7.0
25.	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.5	6.0

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.2.5 Final-Test or IELTS test (Advanced Level)

Final-Test was administered by Proctors from IALF Bali at the Language Centre Unhas. The results of the test were sent by IALF Bali to the Language Centre to be further distributed to each participant. The result consisted of the collective list of all participants from both levels and individual IELTS test certificates. Generally, compared to the results of their previous tests, which were increasing, most of the participants showed significant improvement in their real Reading IELTS test.

Ideally, the participants should have strong basic English in order to improve their IELTS scores. For example, basic grammatical structures, a wide range of vocabulary, elements of good paragraphs, etc.

The findings indicated that all twenty-five participants attended the final test. The total participants were 25. No one obtained band score 1.0 to 3.0; one participant obtained 3.5. (code number: 16); one participant obtained 4.0. (code number: 19); two participants obtained 4.5. (code number: 10 and 14); five participants obtained 5.0. (code number: 8, 9, 13, 20, and 21); five participants obtained 5.5. (code number: 6, 7, 12, 15, 22, and 23); three participants obtained 6.0. (code number: 3, 5, and 11); three participants obtained 6.5. (code number: 2, 4, and 25); one participant obtained 7.0. (code number: 1); no one obtained 7.5; and one participant obtained 8.0. (code number: 24) . The highest IELTS Final-Test result for the Advanced Level was 8.0 and 3.5 was the lowest.

Table 10. IELST Final-Test Score for Advanced Level

No.	IELST Final-Test/Real IELST test (Advanced Level)				Band Score
	L	S	R	W	
1.	6.5	7.0	7.5	6.0	7.0
2.	6.5	6.5	6.0	6.0	6.5
3.	5.5	5.5	6.5	5.5	6.0
4.	6.5	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.5
5.	6.5	5.5	6.0	5.0	6.0
6.	4.5	6.5	5.5	5.5	5.5
7.	4.5	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.5
8.	5.0	4.5	5.5	5.5	5.0
9.	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	5.0
10.	3.5	3.5	6.0	4.5	4.5
11.	5.5	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0
12.	5.0	5.5	5.0	6.0	5.5
13.	4.0	5.5	5.0	5.5	5.0
14.	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
15.	4.5	5.5	6.0	5.0	5.5
16.	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5
17.	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5
18.	3.5	5.0	3.0	2.5	3.5
19.	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
20.	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.5	5.0
21.	4.5	5.5	5.0	4.5	5.0
22.	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.5
23.	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.0	5.5
24.	8.5	9.0	7.0	6.5	8.0
25.	5.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	6.5

L: Listening; S: Structure; R: Reading; W: Writing

4.3 Questionnaire

For this research, the researchers also distributed a questionnaire to the respondents consisting of 20 questions covering reading strategies. The questionnaire dealt with Reading Strategies using a Likert Scale ranging from: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA), Strongly Disagree (SD), and Blank (B).

The following are the questions (Q) that researchers put in the questionnaire:

- 1) To understand unfamiliar English words while I am reading, I guess from available clues.
- 2) I learn English by reading English books or magazines
- 3) I connect the spellings of English words with similar Indonesian words to understand the meanings.
- 4) I try to understand sentences by analyzing their patterns.
- 5) I try to translate word for word.
- 6) I try to understand the passage by using my general knowledge and experience.
- 7) I use the keywords to understand the whole ideas.
- 8) I read the passage aloud.
- 9) I take notes to remember the ideas.
- 10) While I read a text, I try to anticipate the story
- 11) I read a text more for ideas than words.
- 12) I correct my mistakes by rereading the text.
- 13) I choose a topic or certain materials for my practice.
- 14) I check and recheck my understanding after reading a passage.
- 15) If I cannot understand a reading passage, I try to analyze what difficulty I actually have.
- 16) In reading, I pick out keywords and repeat them to myself.
- 17) I try to be aware of which words or grammar rules give me the greatest trouble. In this way I can pay special attention to them while I read and practice.
- 18) I discuss reading passages with my friends.
- 19) If I do not understand the content of a reading passage, I ask my friends or my teachers for help.
- 20) I improve my reading skill by reading letters from my friends.

The results indicated that most of the respondents agreed with applying various reading strategies when one reads. The following Table 11 shows the results of the questionnaire:

Table 11. The Distribution of the participants' answers in the reading strategies questionnaire

Q	SA	A	UD	DA	SD	B	Total
1	23	20	1	0	0	0	44
2	13	29	2	0	0	0	44
3	5	20	10	7	1	1	44
4	12	31	0	0	0	1	44
5	3	16	4	26	3	3	44
6	9	27	2	5	0	1	44
7	12	27	4	1	0	0	44
8	1	19	4	14	5	1	44
9	9	23	8	3	0	1	44
10	7	31	4	2	0	0	44
11	11	28	3	1	0	1	44
12	12	29	2	1	0	0	44
13	10	24	6	3	0	1	44
14	7	30	5	1	0	1	44
15	11	26	6	1	0	0	44
16	11	26	4	2	0	1	44
17	7	32	4	1	0	0	44
18	10	26	6	2	0	0	44
19	14	20	6	2	1	1	44
20	2	28	6	6	2	0	44

Q=Questions, SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, UD=Undecided, DA=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree, B=Blank

At the beginning, the number of participants was 50 lecturers. As the training was running, six of them did not return the questionnaire for some reason. Therefore, only 44 out of 55 participants participated; for question 1 (Q1), there were 23 (SA), 20 (A), 1 (UD), 0 (DA), so as for (SD and B). For question 2 (Q2); 13 SA, 29 A, 2 UD, 0 for DA, SD, and B. Next, question number three (Q3); 5 were SA, 20 were A, 10 were UD, 7 were DA, 1 for SD and B. From the total of 44 participants for question 4 (Q4); 12 were SA, 31 were A, none of them chose UD, DA, and SD, and 1 was B. For question 5 (Q5); 3 of them were SA, 16 were A, 4 were UD, 26 were DA, 3 for SD and B.

Furthermore, for question 6 (Q6); 9 out of 44 participants were SA, 27 were A, 2 were UD, 5 were DA, none was SD, and 1 was B. Question 7 (Q7); 12 were SA, 27 were A, 4 were UD, 1 was DA, none for SD and B. For question 8 (Q8); 1 was SA, 19 were A, 4 were UD, 14 were DA, 5 were SD, 1 was B. From 44 participants, 9 out of 44 participants for question 9 (Q9) were SA, 23 were A, 8 were UD, 3 were DA, none was SD, and 1 was B. For question 10 (Q10); 7 out of 44 were SA, 31 were A, 4 were UD, 2 were DA, none was SD and B.

Moreover, in question 11 (Q11); SA was chosen by eleven participants out of 44, 28 were A, 3 were UD, 1 was DA, none of them was SD, and 1 was B. For question 12 (Q12); SA was chosen by 12 participants, A was chosen by 29 participants, UD was chosen by 2, DA was chosen by 1, and SD and B were not chosen

by anyone. From 44 participants, 10 of them chose SA for question 13 (Q13), 24 chose A, 6 chose UD, and three chose DA, none of them chose SD, and only one of them chose B. For question 14 (Q14); 7 were SA, 13 were A, 5 were UD, 1 was DA, none of the was SD, and 1 was B. Question number 15; 11 out of 44 participants chose SA for question 15 (Q15), 26 were A, 6 were UD, 1 was DA, and none of the 44 participants chose SD and B.

In addition, for question 16 (Q16); 11 were SA, 26 were A, 4 were UD, 2 were DA, none of them was SD, and 1 was B. Among the 44 participants there were 7 chose SA for question 17 (Q17), 32 were A, 4 were UD, 1 was DA, and none of them was SD and B. For question 18 (Q18); 10 were SA, 26 were A, 6 were UD, 2 were DA, and none of 44 participants chose SD and B. For question 19 (Q19); 14 were SA, 20 were A, 6 were UD, 2 were DA, 1 for SD and B. Finally, for question 20 (Q20); 2 participants out of 44 were SA, 28 were A, 6 were UD, 6 were DA, 2 were SD, and none of 44 participants was B.

4.4 Observation

The Classroom Observation was also done during the training. As the researchers, we actively participated (Participant Observation) in terms of directing them, giving explanations, and leading the discussion. At the same time, we also acted as non-participant observation and only observed them silently and wrote any phenomenon that existed while doing their tasks (Creswell, 1994). Both participants and non-

participants functioned as complimentary of other methods.

The observed aspects were the respondents' response to the reading materials, both IELTS and non-IELTS materials; their behavior and attitudes toward the learning materials during the training. Furthermore, the roles of the teachers, class size, and the Language Centre facilities in supporting the training were also included in the observed aspects.

There was a difference in the respondents' options among the twenty questions in the questionnaire. The first most chosen reading strategies were strategies number 1 (to understand unfamiliar English words while I am reading, I guess from available clues) = 43 out of 44 or 97.73% and number 4 (I try to understand sentences by analyzing their patterns) = 43 out of 44 or 97.73%. These two reading strategies were essential to do since the IELTS Reading passages have many unfamiliar vocabularies, so this strategy significantly improved their reading skills.

The second most chosen one was strategy number 2 (I learn English by reading English books and magazines) = 42 out of 44 or equal to 95.45%. This strategy had been practiced by the respondents using extra non-IELTS reading materials that were initially provided by the teachers (researchers). This indicated that the respondents were very aware of the advantage of this strategy in developing their reading skills.

The last most chosen reading strategy was strategy number 12 (I correct my mistakes by rereading the text), this strategy was chosen by 41 out of 44 or equal to 93.19%. This strategy is applied in terms of getting the correct information for reading comprehension.

Moreover, there are 10 respondents out of 44 (22.73%) who chose "Undecided" on strategy 3 (I connect the spelling of English words with similar Indonesian words to understand the meaning). This strategy was applicable for some words in English and Indonesia, such as 'strategy' and 'strategi'; 'system' and 'sistem'; 'familiar' and 'familiar', etc. However, this strategy cannot be over-generalized for other words as the use of strategy is very limited.

On the other hand, there were 19 out of 44 (43.18%) disagree with strategy number 8 (I read the passage aloud), and 18 out of 44 (40.91%) disagreed with strategy number 5 (I try to translate word for word). These two strategies were among those reading strategies that we did not recommend using in order to improve their reading skills. The reasons were that reading aloud is mostly effective for pronunciation practices, not for developing reading comprehension for adults. Most research on the reading aloud strategy was conducted for young learners, and it was done before the children are able to read on their own, as suggested by Anne Guignon (Guignon, 2010).

Meanwhile, translating word for word was time-consuming with very little impact on their

understanding and also contrary to the strategy number 1 and 4, which were previously mentioned. While the translating theory is a crucial aspect of translation because it covers the way to transfer meaning from the source text to the target text equivalently (Latief et al, 2020).

Next, in weeks eleventh and twelfth, the IELTS Post-Test was conducted. The score indicates 5.0 (the highest) and 1.0 (the lowest). Furthermore, the IELTS Pre-Test for Advanced level is 5.5 (the highest) and 1.0 (the lowest). After six weeks of the Course, Mid-Test was administered using the same test materials used at the Intermediate Level. The result is 7.0 (the highest) and 2.0 (the lowest). The Post-Test for Advanced Level was also conducted in weeks eleventh and twelfth. The highest score is 7.5 and the lowest score is 2.0.

Progress Test was conducted between 10 to 15 times for each Group during the Course. All the materials were taken from IELTS books as shown in the references. The results of the progress tests indicate that the respondents' scores have fluctuated. This was mostly due to irregular attendance.

5. Discussion

This research involves 50 lecturers (academic staff) from 18 different universities in the eastern part of Indonesia, both public and private, sponsored by the Directorate of Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, who joined 48 class hours for IELST preparation at the Language Center of Universitas Hasanuddin.

5.1 Test

Generally, the results of the Pre-Test for both Groups indicated that their initial ability was weak, although a small number of participants could be considered ready to attend the training. This was one of the serious obstacles to supporting their success in attending the IELTS preparation course. The result of the Pre-Test conducted at the Language Centre for Intermediate level was 3.0 (the highest) and 1.0 (the lowest). For the Advanced level, the highest was 5.5 and the lowest was 1.0. After six weeks of training, a mid-test was conducted. In general, both groups showed significant improvement. The following is the information on the IELTS mid-test for both levels respectively.

The highest score for the Intermediate level was 5.5 and the lowest was 1.0 (note: the highest Pre-test was 3.0 and the lowest was 1.0.) The score increased 2.0 and although the lowest remained the same, the number of participants who got 1.0 decreased from 3 to 2. Furthermore, for the Advanced level, the highest score was 7.0, the lowest was 2.0 (note: the highest score for the Pre-Test was 5.5, and the lowest was 1.0). The highest score increased by 1.5 points, and no more participants got 1.0.

Between week eleventh and twelfth, the IELTS Post-Test was conducted. The highest score for the Intermediate level was 5.0 and the lowest 1.0 (decreased from 2 participants who got 1.0 in Mid-Test to only one participant). In general, if it was compared to the Pre-test result, the average score improvement was between 0.5-2.0. Next, the highest score for the Advanced level was 7.5 and the lowest was 2.0. In general, the average of score improvement was between 0.5-1.5.

Moreover, at the end of the training, the participants sat for the real IELTS test organized by IALF Bali and the Language Centre Unhas was only the facilitator. Compared to the results of the previous tests, which were increasing, most of the respondents showed significant improvement in their real Reading IELTS test.

None of both levels got 1.0 in the real Reading IELTS test. The highest score for the Intermediate level was 5.5 and the lowest was 2.0, while for the Advanced level the highest score was 8.0 and the lowest was 3.5.

5.2 Questionnaire

For this research, the researchers also distributed a questionnaire to the respondents, consisting of 20 questions, and the questions covered reading strategies. The result indicated that most respondents agreed with applying various reading strategies when reading.

There was a difference in the respondents' options among the twenty questions in the questionnaire. The first most chosen reading strategies were strategies number 1 (to understand unfamiliar English words while I am reading, I guess from available clues) = 43 out of 44 or 97.73% and number 4 (I try to understand sentences by analyzing their patterns) = 43 out of 44 or 97.73%. These two reading strategies were essential to do since the IELTS Reading passages have many unfamiliar vocabularies, so this strategy significantly improved their reading skills.

The second most chosen one was strategy number 2 (I learn English by reading English books and magazines) = 42 out of 44 or equals to 95.45%. This strategy had been practiced by the respondents using extra non-IELTS reading materials that were initially provided by the teachers (researchers). This indicated that the respondents were very aware of the advantage of this strategy in developing their reading skills.

The last most chosen reading strategy was strategy number 12 (I corrected my mistakes by rereading the text), this strategy was chosen by 41 out of 44 or equal to 93.19%. This strategy is applied in terms of getting the correct information for reading comprehension.

Moreover, there are 10 respondents out of 44 (22.73%) who chose "Undecided" on strategy 3 (I connect the spelling of English words with similar Indonesian words to understand the meaning). This strategy was applicable for some words in English and

Indonesia, such as 'strategy' and 'strategi'; 'system' and 'sistem'; 'familiar' and 'familiar', etc. However, this strategy cannot be over-generalized for other words as the use of strategy is very limited.

On the other hand, there were 19 out of 44 (43.18%) disagree with strategy number 8 (I read the passage aloud), and 18 out of 44 (40.91%) disagree with strategy number 5 (I try to translate word for word). These two strategies were among those reading strategies that we did not recommend using in order to improve their reading skills. The reasons were that reading-aloud is mostly effective for pronunciation practices, not for developing reading comprehension for adults. Most research on the reading-aloud strategy was conducted for young learners, and it was done before the children could read on their own (Guignon, 2010).

Meanwhile, translating word for word was time-consuming, with very little impact on their understanding, and also contrary to strategy number 1 and 4, which were previously mentioned. In contrast, the translating theory is a crucial aspect of translation because it covers the way to transfer meaning from the source text to the target text equivalently (Latief, M. R. A. et al., 2020).

5.3 Classroom Observation

In terms of the classroom observation done by the researchers, in the beginning, most of the respondents were reluctant to read and not active, but as time went by and the course was more demanding, they also worked harder. The following are the explanations of all aspects observed by the researchers:

5.3.1 Respondents' Reading Behavior and Attitude

The classroom observation of respondents' reading behavior and attitude indicated that two crucial factors affected the respondents: internal and external.

The internal factors, such as a lack of English knowledge and low motivation, were observed among the respondents. Initially, most respondents in both levels did not show enthusiasm for learning the reading materials. This lack of enthusiasm can be attributed to the respondents' limited English proficiency and their readiness to attend the training. This finding aligns with Johnson's (1981) statement in Kush, et.al. (2005: pp.29-44) that "Reading attitude is developed through repeated success or failure with reading activities." Johnson further claimed that "students with well-developed reading skills are likely to have a positive attitude toward reading. On the other hand, students with poor reading skills often have to overcome negative reading attitudes to improve their reading skills."

In the same article, Swanson (1982) and Swanson (1985) emphasized that "however, it may only be after repeated failure that attitude and achievement become more closely linked." Similarly, Russ (1989)

highlighted that "not all poor readers simultaneously have poor attitudes toward reading; many maintain optimistic reading attitudes despite underdeveloped skills and increasing frustration."

In relation to respondents' motivation, Mori (2002) in Sani & Zain (2011: pp.250) identified four theoretical constructs of motivation that work specifically in the EFL reading context: (1) intrinsic value (enjoyment) for reading in English, (2) attainment value (need for succeeding), (3) extrinsic utility (usefulness), and (4) expectancy for success (efficacy beliefs). According to the classroom observation, the respondents found enjoyment (point 1) in reading in English when they were reading extra reading materials such as English magazines and newspapers, as well as downloaded materials from the internet.

A few of them required succeeding (point 2) in this training because they have a good interest in their English development. But most of them had been motivated only by usefulness (point 3) and efficacy belief (point 4) as their motivations because they only attended the training to get a targeted IELTS score to be eligible to get a scholarship for their further study overseas. These varied motivations were one of the serious concerns for both participants and teachers, particularly at the beginning of the training.

In terms of external factors, respondents were difficult to focus on due to their distance from their families and their responsibilities as lecturers because they were not totally freed from their academic responsibilities at their universities. So, some of them went home and left the class sessions. Although their attendance was not below 80%, as required by DIKTI, their absences from the class did affect their progress. Generally, this condition influences their concentration and attention in class.

Fortunately, the respondents were aware of their weaknesses and limitations as the training was going on. As a result, their motivation was getting stronger, which could be seen from their positive reading behavior and attitudes changing. They began to support each other and were more open to discussing their problems on their reading skills, active in pair-work, small group and classroom discussion. On top of it, they were willing to work harder than before in and outside the class, increasing their final IELTS score.

This proved what Morrow (1992) and Stevens et al. (1987) reported, as quoted by J.C. Kush et al. (2005: pp.29-44) that "the combination of social interaction among students, an abundance of reading materials, and a teacher emphasis on free reading increased the time students spent devoted to reading."

5.3.2 Teachers

Teachers play a very significant role in improving the participants' IELTS scores. Both groups were forced to do more practice outside of the class by

giving them IELTS reading homework. In addition, extra non-IELTS readings were also added to their practices to enrich their vocabulary. This is to familiarize them with various English texts.

This proved the research findings conducted by Anderson et al. (1988), Greaney and Hegarty (1987), and Rothman (1990) in J.C. Kush et al (2005: pp.29-44) who found that "the more students read outside of school, the stronger their reading skills tend to be."

Another essential role of the teachers was that we kept motivating the respondents to attend the class regularly, be actively involved in all classroom reading activities, and share their opinions on their own progress as well as on the learning process they experienced.

5.3.3 Class size

DIKTI decided to have 25 participants per class. This number was not very influential if their knowledge of English were adequate. In fact, in this training, as mentioned earlier in this paper, most of the participants were on side red weak (refers to the result of Pre-test for both levels): only 4 out of 50 participants (2%) got a score between 4.0 - 5.5.

This situation worsens the learning process because, ideally, if the participants have low ability, they need more individual attention from the teacher.

According to Ehrenberg et al. the number of students in a class can affect how much is learned in many different ways (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). For example, it could affect how students interact with each other and the level of social engagement. This may result, for example, in more or less noise and disruptive behavior, which in turn affect the kinds of activities the teacher is able to promote. It could affect how much time the teacher focuses on the individual student and their specific needs rather than on the group as a whole. Since it is easier to focus on one individual in a smaller group, the smaller the class size, the more likely individual attention can be given, in theory, at least. Another research by Muhammad Ali Mustapha state that the class size could also affect the teacher's allocation of time and, hence, effectiveness (Mustapha, 2021). For example, how many materials can be covered? Teachers may choose a different method of teaching and assessment when they have smaller classes. For example, they may assign more writing, provide more feedback on students' written work, use open-ended assessments, or encourage more discussion or activities that may be more feasible with a smaller number of students.

6. Conclusion

This research provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of a 480-class hour reading strategies training program for improving the reading ability of academic staff in Eastern Indonesia. It highlights the need for participants to have adequate English

proficiency and dedicated focus during the training. The study addresses a research gap by examining the specific duration required for significant improvements in reading proficiency, which had been underexplored in previous literature. This contribution enhances our understanding of the optimal training period needed for language skill development. The research's novelty lies in its focus on academic staff from various universities in Eastern Indonesia, a less explored perspective in language development studies. By recognizing the importance of empowering educators with strong language skills, the study adds valuable insights to existing literature. The implications of the study are valuable for policymakers and institutions. It suggests that participants should possess a certain level of English proficiency before enrolling in the training program. Policymakers should carefully design selection processes to ensure participants' language foundation is adequate. Additionally, granting participants time away from academic duties to concentrate on language development is essential for successful outcomes. The research emphasizes the significance of teacher quality, class size, and facilities in language training programs. To optimize the program's effectiveness, institutions must provide sufficient resources and a conducive learning environment. Overall, the study reaffirms the importance of a strong English language background and focused training for academic staff preparing for language proficiency assessments, such as the IELTS test.

References

- Anderson, R.C., Wilson, P.T., & Fielding, L.G. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 285 – 303.
- Binh, D. T. B., & Trinh, D. T. K. (2019). IELTS Reading and Some Techniques to Improve IELTS Reading Skills for Students. *Tap chí Nghiên cứu dân tộc*, 8(2), 98-102.
- British Council. (2005). *IELTS, specimen materials 2003*. University of Cambridge.
- Cambridge. (2010). *Cambridge IELTS 7*. Cambridge University Press.
- Center, T. E. L. (2022). Universal conversion table for TOEFL iBT, PBT, & CBT Tests. The Edge Learning Center. <https://theedge.com.hk/conversion-table-for-toefl-ibt-pbt-cbt-tests/>
- Creswell, John W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and quantitative approach*. SAGE Publications.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., Brewer, D. J., Gamoran, A., & Willms, J. D. (2001). Class size and student achievement. *psychological science in the public interest*, 2(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1529-1006.003>
- Greaney, V., & Hegarty, M. (1987). Correlates of leisure-time reading. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 10(1), 3-20.
- Guignon, A (2010). *Reading aloud: Are students ever too old? education world*. http://www.educationworld.com/a_curr/curr081.shtml
- Johnson, L.S. (1981). Naturally acquired learned helplessness: The relationship of school failure to achievement behavior, attributions, and self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 174 – 180.
- Kush, J. C., Watkins, M. W., & Brookhart, S. M. (2005). The temporal-interactive influence of reading achievement and reading attitude. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 11(1), 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803610500110141>
- Latief, M. R. A., Khaerana, A. S. A., & Soraya, A. I. (2022). Translation analysis: Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic strategies used in translating a website of an academic institution. <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v5i3.23176>
- Latief, M. R. A., Saleh, N. J., & Pammu, A. (2020, October). The effectiveness of machine translation to improve the system of translating language on cultural context. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 575, No. 1, p. 012178). IOP Publishing.
- Mori, S. (2002). Re-defining motivation to read in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 92-110.
- Morrow, L. M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 251-275.
- Mustapha M. A., Kachallah M., and Abulfathi, F.A, (2021). Relationship between class size and students` academic performance in English language. *Journal of CUDIMAC (J-CUDIMAC)*, 9(1), 10–18.
- Peng, A., & Patterson, M. M. (2022). Relations among cultural identity, motivation for language learning, and perceived English language proficiency for international students in the United States. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 35(1), 67-82.
- Rothman, R. (1990). Students spend little time reading or writing in school, NAEP finds. *Education Week*, 9, 1.
- Russ, K. M. (1989). Relating reading attitude to reading achievement in an East Los Angeles junior

- high school. *Reading Improvement*, 26(3), 208 – 214.
- Samiei, F., & Ebadi, S. (2021). Exploring EFL learners' inferential reading comprehension skills through a flipped classroom. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 16(1), 1-18.
- Sani, M. A., & Zain, Z. (2011). Relating adolescents' second language reading attitudes, self efficacy for reading, and reading ability in a non-supportive ESL setting. *The Reading Matrix*, 11(3), 243-254.
- Setiyadi, A. B. (2006). *Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran bahasa asing: Pendekatan kuantitatif dan kualitatif*. Penerbit Graha Ilmu..
- Shobeiry, M. (2021). The effect of dynamic assessment on Iranian IELTS students' metacognitive awareness for reading strategy and reading development. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 79, 8-19.
- Stevens S R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative integrated reading and composition: Two field experiments. *Reading research quarterly*. 22, 433 – 454.
- Swanson, B. (1982). The relationship between attitude toward reading and reading achievement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 42(4), 1303-1304.
- Swanson, B. B. (1986). Teacher judgments of first-graders' reading enthusiasm. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 25(1), 41-46.
- Tannenbaum, R. J., & Baron, P. A. (2011). Mapping TOEFL® ITP scores onto the common European framework of reference. *Research Memorandum ETS RM*, 11, 1-24.
<https://www.ets.org/content/dam/ets-org/Media/Research/pdf/RM-11-33.pdf>
- Tannenbaum, R. J., & Baron, P. A. (2015). Mapping scores from the TOEFL Junior Comprehensive test onto the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Retrieved from Princeton, NJ: <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RM-15-13.pdf>.
- Yuliana, R., Marwa, M., & Hamuddin, B. (2020). The Investigation of Students' Knowledge on a Novel Learning Strategy: What is Interesting about Blended Learning for EFL University Students?. *Utamax: Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education*, 2(2), 80-87.
<https://doi.org/10.31849/utamax.v2i2.3067>