รายงานการวิจัย

กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ :

กรณีศึกษาของผู้เรียนที่มีความรู้พหุระดับ

Metacognitive English Reading Strategies of EFL Learners: The Case of

Multi-level Proficiency Students

ฉัตรณรงค์ ชัยเดช

มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏมหาสารคาม

2562

ลิขสิทธิ์ของมหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏมหาสารคาม

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaires

1. **Gender** ☐ Female ☐ Male

2. **Grade** Paragraph Reading strategies course ....

   Reading for Text Interpretation course ....

3. **Total GPA** ☐ Above or equal 3.25 ☐ Below 3.25

Instruction: As you read the following list of metacognitive reading strategies, assess the frequency use of each strategy, '5' as always use, '1' as never use.

Strategies	Frequency				
	5	4	3	2	1
Problem Solving Strategies					
1. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.					
2. When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.					
3. When text becomes difficult I pay close attention to what I am reading.					
4. I read slowly and carefully to make sure understand what I am reading.					
5. I stop from time to time and I think about what I am reading.					
6. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.					
7. When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrase.					
8. I try to visualize information to help me remember					
Support Strategies					
9. When reading, I translate from English into Thai.					
10. I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read					
11. I underline/ circle information in the text to help me remember it.					
12. I paraphrase to better understand what I read.					
13. When reading, I think about information in both English and Thai.					

Strategies	Frequency				
	5	4	3	2	1
14. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.					
15. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.					
16. When the text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.					
Global Strategies					
17. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.					
18. I have a purpose when I read.					
19. I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.					
20. I check my understanding when I come across new information.					
21. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.					
22. When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.					
23. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.					
24. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.					
25. I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.					

กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ : กรณีศึกษาของผู้เรียนที่มีความรู้พหุระดับ

ฉัตรณรงค์ ชัยเดช

บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษาครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษากลวิธีการอ่านของนักศึกษาสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่มีความสามารถในการเรียนสูงและความสามารถในการเรียนไม่สูงใช้ในการอ่านเพื่อสร้างความเข้าใจ รวมทั้งศึกษาความแตกต่างของการใช้กลยุทธ์ในการอ่านของนักศึกษาทั้งสองกลุ่ม กลุ่มตัวอย่างในการศึกษาครั้งนี้ เป็นนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 3 ที่กำลังเรียนในหลักสูตรสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏมหาสารคาม จำนวนทั้งสิ้น 44 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการเก็บข้อมูลครั้งนี้ คือ แบบสอบถามที่ดัดแปลงมาจากแบบสอบถามการวัดกลวิธีการอ่าน ผลวิจัย พบว่า นักศึกษาที่มีความสามารถในการเรียนสูงใช้กลวิธีในการอ่านมากกว่านักศึกษาที่มีความสามารถในการเรียนไม่สูง โดยที่นักศึกษาทั้งสองกลุ่มใช้กลวิธีการอ่านแบบแก้ปัญหามากที่สุด รองลงมาคือกลวิธีการอ่านแบบสนับสนุนและกลวิธีการอ่านแบบองค์รวมตามลำดับ นอกจากนี้ยังพบว่า นักศึกษาที่มีความสามารถในการเรียนสูงใช้กลวิธีการอ่านแบบแก้ปัญหาแตกต่างจากนักศึกษาที่มีความสามารถในการเรียนไม่สูง อย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ 0.05

คำสำคัญ: *กลวิธีการอ่าน, กลวิธีอภิปริชาน*

Metacognitive English Reading Strategies of EFL Learners: The Case of Multi-level
Proficiency Students

Chatnarong Chaidet

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate what reading strategies which high-proficiency
and low-proficiency English major students use to comprehend reading comprehension
and whether there are differences in strategy use among high-proficiency students and
low-proficiency students. For data collection, 44 third-year English major students of
Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University completed SORS questionnaires (Mokthaki &
Sheorey, 2002). The data were statistically processed. The result revealed that (i) HPS
participants tend to adapt more strategies than LPS participants, (ii) both participants
preferred using Problem Solving Strategies, follow by Support Strategies and Global
Strategies respectively, (iii) there is statistical difference between HPS participants and
LPS participants in the use of Problem Solving Strategies, t = 3.818, df = 294, α = .05, p
= .000.

Keywords: Reading strategy, Metacognitive

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Chatnarong Chaidet

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale of this study

Nowadays, our world completely becomes a digital and globalized world which ones can easily access to the information around them. Everyone perceives that being a proficient reader in the age of digital and globalized world is extremely crucial in order to get the reliably exact information among any other sources of information that readers could obtain from various reading materials (Zhang & Seepho, 2013). Then, the reader who is always exposed to those mentioned reading materials should acknowledge the importance of critically reading ability in order to clarify and identify the useful information (AL-Sohbani, 2013).

Specifically, being proficient reader is particularly important for students in general education, and especially for students majoring in English majors in particular, which reading purposes are for study. Saying that, reading skill is one of important skills for students in order to maintain previous knowledge and acquire new knowledge in any courses. As Britton and Glynn (2013) emphasized, the reading processes for academic purposes also involved with metacognitive processes. And Zhang & Wu (2009) pointed

out that most of the comprehension activities of efficient readers take place at the metacognitive level. Metacognitive strategies assist students to "think about their thinking" before, during, and after they read (Boulware-Gooden, Carreker, Thornhill, and Joshi, 2007).

Metacognitive reading strategies are those strategies which are designed to increase readers' knowledge of awareness and control, to improve their reading comprehension (Zhang & Seepho, 2013). The strategies that learners take into account when reading are metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, monitoring of comprehension or production, and self-evaluation of learning after the language activity is completed (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Mazanares, Russo, and Kupper, 1985). However, high and low proficiency students displayed different levels of metacognitive awareness (Zhang & Seepho, 2013). Poor readers are less aware of effective metacognitive reading strategies and of the counterproductive effects of poor strategies, and are less effective in their monitoring activities during reading (Cubukcu, 2008). However, The readers who have less reading skills will be able to become skilled readers of the academic text if those readers are given the appropriate instruction in effective reading strategies and taught to monitor and check their comprehension while reading (*ibid*).

The aim of this study is to find out what reading strategies which high-proficiency and low-proficiency English major students use to comprehend reading comprehension and whether there are differences in strategy use among high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students in order to improve reading materials used in English curriculum and also enhance reading strategies of students in both group with the appropriate strategies.

1.2 Purposes of the study

1. To investigate metacognitive reading strategies do High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students use in their academic reading comprehension

2. To investigate similarities and differences in High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students reading strategy use

1.3 Research questions

1. What metacognitive reading strategies do High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students use in their academic reading comprehension?

2. Are there significant differences in High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students reading strategy use?

1.4 Significance of the study

This study aims to investigate reading strategies which high-proficiency and low-proficiency English major students use to comprehend reading comprehension and whether there are differences in strategy use among high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students in order to improve reading materials used in English curriculum and also enhance reading strategies of students in both group with the appropriate strategies.

1.5 Scope of the study

The participants in this study consist of 44 third-year English major students of Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University who were randomly selected. The total GPA and students' grades from two previous courses, Paragraph Reading strategies and Reading for Text Interpretation using questionnaire (see Appendix A) adapted from the survey of reading strategies (SORS).

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

The definition of key terms used in this study is listed as follows;

1. Student: the third-year English major students of Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University

2. high-proficiency students (HPS): the students who got A (scores above 80), B+ (scores of 75–79), and B (scores of 70–74) grades in Paragraph Reading strategies and Reading for Text Interpretation courses, and total GPA which is above 3.25.

3. Low-proficiency students (LPS): the students who got C+ (scores of 65–79), C (scores of 60-64), D+ (scores of 55-59), and D (scores of 50–50) grades in Paragraph Reading strategies and Reading for Text Interpretation courses, and total GPA which is below 3.25

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents the related literature of this study. It comprises of three main components. First of all, the information concerning reading strategies is revealed. Secondly, the overview information of metacognition is explained. Finally, the background and related study concerning metacognitive reading strategies are explored.

Reading Strategies

Individuals will employ different strategies on the basis of their ability, personality, cognitive style, and the task at hand (Ok, 2003). The use of various strategies has been found to be effective in improving students' reading comprehension (Singhal, 2001). Song (1998) revealed that reading strategies enhance and improve students' proficiency and reading comprehension ability.

Hosenfeld (1977) used a think-aloud procedure to identify relations between certain types of reading strategies and successful or unsuccessful second language

reading. The successful reader, for example, kept the meaning of the passage in mind while reading, read in broad phrases, skipped inconsequential or less important words, and had a positive self-concept as a reader. The unsuccessful reader on the other hand, lost the meaning of the sentences when decoded, read in short phrases, pondered over inconsequential words, seldom skipped words as unimportant, and had a negative self-concept.

Metacognition

Metacognition was first introduced in 1976 (Karbalaei, 2010; Iwai, 2011) as "one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and outcomes or anything related to them" (Flavell, 1976, p. 232; cited in Iwai, 2011). Anderson (2002) simplified the definition of metacognition as "thinking about think". "Metacognitive strategies are those strategies which require students to think about their own thinking as they engage in academic tasks." (Cubukcu, 2008, p.1). To put it more simply, metacognition is self-awareness that can control the metal processes of human. Seemingly, we can say that metacognition is generally basic ground in various areas, such as oral skills, reading, writing, language acquisition, attention, memory, and social interactions (Iwai, 2011). Metacognition is referred as metacognitive (Zhang, 2001).

Metacognitive strategies are those strategies which involve self-reflection and thinking about reading and learning. The three aspects of metacognition include: Declarative knowledge, such as knowing what the strategy is; procedural knowledge, such as knowing how the strategy works, and conditional knowledge; knowing why the strategy is used (Jacobs & Paris, 1987). Metacognitive involves "thinking about the reading process, planning for reading, monitoring comprehension while reading – overseeing, supervising, regulating, evaluating the reading process and the effectiveness of strategies used in reading, and verifying what is read" (Zhang, 2001).

Related Studies

Indeed, the consensus view is that strategic awareness and monitoring of the comprehension process are critically important aspects of skilled reading. Such awareness and monitoring is often referred to in the literature as ''metacognition,'' which can be thought of as the knowledge of the readers' cognition relative to the reading process and the self-control mechanisms they use to monitor and enhance comprehension (Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001).

Research in L2 and FL contexts has focused much on the differences in reading-strategy use among learners of different language proficiency levels (Zhang & Wu, 2009).

Zhang (2001) conducted metacognitive strategies in learning to read English text of 10 Chenese EFL readers. He found that high score readers knew the strategies that could be use more effectively in order to understand texts. In contrast, low score readers did not realize reading strategies to support them to encounter problems while reading.

Lau and Chan (2003) compared usage of reading strategies of good readers and poor readers in Chinese context. The results revealed that poor readers scored lower than good readers both cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

Mónos (2005) conducted a study on metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of a group of Hungarian university students majoring in English. The result showed that there is a fairly high awareness of all the strategies included in the survey, with a preference among the respondents for problem solving strategies, followed by global and support strategies.

Karpicke et al (2009) studied the metacognitive reading strategies used among students. The study surveyed 177 college students and asked them (1) to list strategies they used when studying (an open-ended, free report question) and (2) to choose whether they would reread or practice recall after studying a textbook chapter (a forced report question). The results revealed that 'repeated reading' was by far the most frequently listed strategy with 84% of students reporting it. Not only did students

9

indicate that they repeatedly read while studying but they also indicated that 'rereading' was a favored strategy; 55% of students reported that rereading was the number one strategy they used when studying.

Zhang (2009) explored metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use of Chinese senior high school students who are learning English as a foreign language (EFL). A total of 270 students responded to a 28-item survey of reading strategies (SORS). Both the main effect for strategies and the main effect for learners' proficiency were significant. The high-proficiency group outperformed the intermediate group and the low-proficiency group in 2 categories of reading strategies: global and problem-solving; but no statistically significant difference was found among the 3 proficiency groups in using support strategies.

Karbalaei (2010) investigated the differences and similarities of metacognitive reading strategies used of Iranian and Indian students (96 Iranians and 93 Indians). The result revealed that the Iranian students tended to used Problem-solving strategies the most while the Indian students tended to apply all metacognitive reading strategies. Additionally, the reading strategy that both groups of students used with the nearly same score was in Problem-solving strategies; Re-reading for better understanding.

Alsheikh (2011) investigated the metacognitive reading strategies of three advanced proficient trilingual readers whose native language is Hausa. The study

examines the reading strategies employed by the three readers in English, French and Hausa. The results showed that the three multilingual readers demonstrate high awareness of reading strategies, they deploy more reading and strategies were used more in their second and third language than first language, the most proficient readers employ a wider range of strategies than the least proficient reader who relies heavily on translation.

Alhaqbani & Riazi (2012) found the different results of one hundred and twenty-two undergraduate L2 Arabic students who mostly from Africa and Asia in their metacognitive awareness of reading strategy. Results indicated that these students perceived problem-solving African background students reported more global strategy use than Asian background students, and junior and senior students reported consistently higher strategy use in all the three strategy categories compared to the first and second year students.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

1. What metacognitive reading strategies do High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students use in their academic reading comprehension?

2. Are there significant differences in High Proficiency Students and Low Proficiency Students reading strategy use?

Participants

The participants in this study consist of 44 fourth-year English major students of Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University who were randomly selected. The total GPA and students' grades from two previous courses, Paragraph Reading strategies and Reading for Text Interpretation, were used to categorize participants into two groups: high-proficiency students (HPS) and low-proficiency students (LPS). The HPS referred to the

students who got A (scores above 80), B+ (scores of 75–79), and B (scores of 70–74) grades, and total GPA which is above 3.25. The LPS referred to the ones with C+ (scores of 65–79), C (scores of 60-64), D+ (scores of 55-59), and D (scores of 50–50) grades and total GPA which is below 3.25.

Instruments

The data for this study was collected through a questionnaire (see Appendix A) adapted from the survey of reading strategies (SORS) by AL-Sohbani (2013) that was developed to measure metacognitive reading strategies use by Yemeni EFL undergraduate university students. It comprises 25 items measuring three broad categories of reading strategies:

Problem Solving Strategies, the strategies which are used when readers face with problems while reading e.g. read slowly, guessing, re-reading. Support Strategies, the supportive tools which are used when text becomes difficult e.g. underline, reference materials, taking notes. And Global Strategies, the strategies used when readers willing to plan the reading act e.g. setting the purpose for reading, previewing text content, and predicting what the text is about. A 5-point Likert scale is used to indicate the frequency of strategy use ranging from 1 (never do) to 5 (always do). The averages for metacognitive strategy use based on the SILL scale value by Oxford (1990) which is used

to measure and interpret the frequency of strategies use of students. This questionnaire is translated into Thai which the participants are most proficient in and comfortable with. In Table 1 shows the scale of frequently strategy use.

Data Analysis

The data was statistically analyzed. Descriptive statistics; means and standard deviations were employed to analyze the overall frequency use of each strategy. The t' test was used to determine if there is any significant difference between the HPS and LPS concerning their reading strategies use. Table 3.1 shows the frequency scalses of strategy use in this study.

Table 3.1 Frequency scales of strategy use (Oxford, 1990)

Mean Score	Frequency	Evaluation
4.5–5.0	High	Always or almost always used
3.5–4.49		Usually used
2.5–3.49	Medium	Sometimes used
1.5–2.49		Generally not used
1.0–1.49	Low	Never or almost never used

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Question 1 What metacognitive reading strategies do high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students use in their academic reading comprehension?

Overall strategies used by HPS and LPS

This study willing to investigate the use of metacognitive reading strategies by multilevel proficiency EFL learners. The averages for metacognitive strategy use based on the SILL scale value by Oxford (1990) mentioned above were applied to indicate the level of usage for the nine three-categories.

The overall mean scores of the three types of reading strategies showed which were used by high-proficiency students (HPS) and low-proficiency students (LPS) third-year English major students of Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University are shown in Table 4.1. As the result shows that, almost mean scores of three subscales of HPS and Problem Solving Strategies and Support Strategies of LPS are regarded as strategies use with high frequency, except Global Strategies of LPS is regard as medium frequency of usage, this scale ranking based on SILL scale value by Oxford (1990).

However, HPS were preferred and tended to use Problem Solving Strategies outstandingly (4.08), follow respectively by Support Strategies (3.58) and Global Strategies (3.55) with trifling difference. On the other hand, LPS slightly preferred to use Problem Solving Strategies more than Support Strategies and Global Strategies with score 3.70, 3.65, and 3.42 respectively. The participants mostly preferred Problem Solving Strategies; consistent with a number of previous reading strategies' studies which used SORS (Alsheikh, 2011; Zhang & Wu, 2009; Mokhtari, 2008; Mónos, 2005; Lui, 2004).

Table 4.1 Means, Standard deviations of learners' self-reported frequency of Their Overall Reading Strategies use

Types of Strategies	HPS		LPS	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Problem Solving Strategies	4.08	0.886	3.70	0.822
Support Strategies	3.58	0.958	3.64	1.070
Global Strategies	3.55	0.906	3.42	0.859
Overall mean score	3.73		3.58	

A further analysis of the result shows that both HPS and LPS mainly have a high level of metacognitive reading strategies use. As seen in the table 2, the overall mean scores of metacognitive reading strategies are similar and high. Specifically, HPS

participants slightly use strategies more than LPS participants, especially Problem Solving

Strategies whereas LPS use Support Strategies more than HPS.

From the result of Table 2, it can be taken as strategies which teachers able to

use in order to promote students' reading ability. Students can practice their reading

skill with the appropriate ways, students will receive a good result when reading

because the strategies which are used in the classroom are the strategies that students

mostly prefer.

Metacognitive reading strategies used by all individuals

Responses from both high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students

were examined for all individual strategies as shown in Table 4.2, all individual items of

the three subscales are generally used with high and medium frequency by HPS and LPS

participants. None of the strategies in this study was used with low frequency.

Table 4.2 Mean scores of learners' self-reported frequency of their Overall

Individual Metacognitive Reading Strategies use

Strategies	Mean score of HPS	Mean score of LPS
Problem Solving Strategies		
1. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	3.17	3.47
2. When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my	4.33	3.68

Strategies	Mean score of HPS	Mean score of LPS
understanding.		
3. When text becomes difficult I pay close attention to what I am reading.	4.33	3.68
4. I read slowly and carefully to make sure understand what I am reading.	4.28	3.74
5. I stop from time to time and I think about what I am reading.	4.28	3.89
6. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.	4.39	4.32
7. When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrase.	3.67	3.26
8. I try to picture or visualize information to help me remember what I read.	4.17	3.53
Support Strategies		
9. When reading, I translate from English into Thai.	3.39	3.84
10. I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read	3.72	4.53
11. I underline/ circle information in the text to help me remember it.	3.89	3.58
12. I paraphrase to better understand what I read.	3.67	3.32
13. When reading, I think about information in both English and Thai.	3.61	3.68
14. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	3.83	3.42
15. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.	2.94	3.26

Strategies	Mean score of HPS	Mean score of LPS
16. When the text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.	3.56	3.53
Global Strategies		
17. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.	3.61	3.58
18. I have a purpose when I read.	3.94	3.42
19. I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.	3.83	3.63
20. I check my understanding when I come across new information.	3.83	3.63
21. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.	3.00	3.32
22. When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	3.50	3.11
23. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.	3.61	3.53
24. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	3.44	3.21
25. I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.	3.17	3.21

Problem Solving Strategies

The most use metacognitive reading strategies use by HPS and LPS was Problem Solving Strategies. Surprisingly, the most use strategies in Problem Solving subscale is 'I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading', HPS scored 4.39 and LPS scored 4.32. Followed by 'When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding', 'When text becomes difficult I pay close attention to what I am reading' for HPS participants with score 4.39, 4.33, and 4.33 respectively, and 'I read slowly and carefully to make sure understand what I am reading', 'I stop from time to time and I think about what I am reading' for LPS participants with score 4.32, 3.89, and 3.74 respectively. Both HPS participants and LPS participants adopt this strategies, 'I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading', to get deeper and more understanding, reduce their reading speed when they encounter with difficulty of the text that they are reading, it means that if the texts are more complex, difficult, and confusing, the reading speed will be reduced whereas if the texts are easier, less complex, the speed will be speed up. It shows that understanding depends on speed of reading.

However, according to the second and third rank of both HPS and LPS, there are similarities. Even though the result of the second and third place is different but the strategies that they prefer to use seem similar. The strategies that they satisfy concerns speed of reading. It shows that they prefer to get more understanding concerning the

contents of the text that they read; they tend to read slower and pay more attention if the texts are more difficult.

In order to conclude this first strategy, saying that when both HPS and LPS are facing with difficulties of the text they will adjust their reading speed, read closely, and pay more attention to the text in order to get more deep understanding of the texts.

Conversely, looking at the least use of strategies that HPS and LPS preferred to use when facing with reading comprehension tasks, they preferred not to use 'I try to get back on track when I lose concentration', LPS scored 3.47 and HPS scored 3.17, 'When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrase, LPS scored 3.26 and HPS scored 3.67. These two points have consistency; if the text becomes difficult the readers will intentionally ignore that problem and continue reading. They do not pay much concentrate on the vocabulary that they do not familiar with, so that guessing the meaning and using context clue of unseen words are not employed.

Support Strategies

For this strategy, the items that received the highest points of HPS participants are 'I underline/circle information in the text to help me remember it' with score 3.89, follows by 'I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it' with score 3.83, and 'I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read' with score 3.72. It can be implied that the strategies that HPS participants use in

order to get more comprehension is that they underline and circle the main idea of the passage, sometime students mark the words that display the main points of article for identify the crucial part. From this point, they mark not only to mention the importance but also for remembering and finding the connection. When ones read through the text, they may found that they forget some part of it, the underlined strategy and circled strategy are the best way for students to locate the connection. Furthermore, the required strategy that ranks the third place is 'reference materials', it revealed that HPS still, nonetheless, use dictionary in order to increase understanding. However, from this point, it can be implied that HPS participants understand overall image of the text, not small part, it is evident when looking at the lowest item that they preferred to use.

Going back to the result of LPS participants, the items that obtain the highest score are 'I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read' with score 4.53, and 'When reading, I translate from English into Thai' with score 3.84. It seems like LPS participants tend to focus on small part of the sentences, they take an interest in meaning word by word, phrase by phrase, and when they completely translate they will link small parts into overall image whereas HPS participants prefer less to use this strategies.

The items that obtained the lowest score are 'I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read' which HPS scored 2.94, and 'When reading, I translate from

English into Thai' which HPS scored 3.39. Though these two strategies were less manipulated by HPS participants, LPS participants preferred to use this strategy and rank it in the second most use, score 3.84, which slightly related with the study of Swanborn & De Glopper (2002) and Alsheikh (2011), they found that low-ability readers hardly learned any words incidentally and applied heavily on translation. HPS participants did not prefer to take notes and translate English into their L1 language; the explanation could be it may because taking notes waste more time than underlining or circling. It is said earlier, HPS participants tend to keep the meaning in their mind (Hensenfeld, 1977), find the connections of the overall image of the text, translation was not used because of the amount of lexical coverage that they gain help them step beyond translating word by word.

Surprisingly, the least preferable strategy use of LPS participants is 'I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read', with score 3.26, which is the same result as HPS participants. These results are consistent with Zhang (2001) and Hosenfeld (1977).

Global Strategies

The most frequently use of HPS participants in Global strategies is 'I have a purpose when I read', with score 3.94. Students can focus and comprehend better when they set their own purpose for an assigned reading than when they read without

purpose, after that, when they set reading purpose, it facilitate them to determine the appropriate approach for reading. Finally, when the strategies match, the good results of reading will be displayed (Schraw & Dennison, 1994; Knutson, 1997; Berardo, 2006; Tovani, 2005). According to the second most use of HPS participants, it is 'I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it', this point emphasizes the discussion HPS participants' Problem Solving Strategies use.

The most preferable strategies use of LPS are 'I check my understanding when I come across new information', and 'I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it' with equally same score 3.63. It shows that LPS participants take overall image of the article into account, but still use dictionary in order to acquire exact meaning of particular sentence.

However, there is interesting point in LPS least preferable strategies use. 'When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore' gains lowest score, 3.11. It can be implied that LPS participants unable to determine crucial part of the article, they tend to read along all words, phrases, lines, paragraphs until they understand because their ability to specify cannot utilized. This finding relate with previous study of Hosenfeld (1977).

Question 2 Are there significant differences in high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students reading strategy use?

This question deals with the relationship between strategy use and proficiency of participants. As shown in table 4.3, HPS participants and LPS participants differed significantly in the use of Problem Solving Strategies (t = 3.818, df = 294, α = .05, p = .000).

It can be concluded that there is statistical difference between HPS and LPS participants in the use of Problem Solving Strategies. However, there is no statistical difference between HPS and LPS participants in both Support Strategies (t = -.058, df = 294, α = .05, p = .564) and Global Strategies (t = 1.385, df = 331, α = .05, p = .166), this result is similar to the study of Zhang and Wu (2009).

Table 4.3 Strategic Differences in the use of Metacognitive Reading Strategies between HPS and LPS participants

Type of Strategies	Participants	$\bar{X}$	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t	d	Sig. (2-tailed)	Note
				F	Sig.				
Problem Solving	HPS	4.08	.886	.038	.846	3.818	294	.000	Significant
	LPS	3.70	.822						
Support	HPS	3.58	.958	4.123	.043	-.058	294	.564	Not significant
	LPS	3.64	1.070						

Type of Strategies	Participants	$\bar{X}$	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t	d	Sig. (2-tailed)	Note
				F	Sig.				
Global	HPS	3.55	.906	.745	.389	1.385	331	.166	Not significant
	LPS	3.42	.859						

To sum up, even though both HPS and LPS participants preferred different strategies in order to support and plan their reading, but they still acknowledge that which strategies fit with their styles and usefully utilize it. Nevertheless, according to the strategies that they use to solve problems that they face while reading, HPS participants able to manifest and utilize appropriate strategies assisting them to bestride those problems.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The results of this study are consistent with findings from the majority of previous strategy studies (e.g., Bruen, 2001; Chamot et al., 1988; Chen, 2002; Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Park, 1997; 2000). Additionally, this study provides more detailed information regarding use of individual metacognitive reading strategies and reveals new evidence regarding the difference between high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students in choosing available reading strategies.

This study compared metacognitive reading strategies which are used by high-proficiency students and low-proficiency students. The participants in this study consist of 44 third-year English major students of Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University who are

taking a "Reading for Text Interpretation Course". Participants were categorized by their total GPA and students' grades from two previous courses, Paragraph Reading strategies and Processes in Reading Continuous Texts. SILL scale value, mean score, standard deviation, and t-test were used to analyze the results. SORS questionnaires were used for collecting data. The result revealed that (a) HPS participants tend to adapt more strategies than LPS participants, (b) both participants preferred using Problem Solving Strategies, follow by Support Strategies and Global Strategies respectively, (c) there is statistical difference between HPS participants and LPS participants in the use of Problem Solving Strategies, t = 3.818, df = 294, α = .05, p = .000.

Pedagogical implications

The findings of this study have some implications for teaching. From an instructional perspective, this study indicated that the participants employed strategies in reading comprehension. Teachers, therefore, may consciously raise students' awareness of reading strategies through explicit instructions of strategies use.

Moreover, teachers should become more aware of the metacognitive reading strategies and learner strategies that their students are (and are not) using, so that teachers can develop instructional materials, teaching styles and strategies that are compatible with their students' ways of learning.

Limitation of this study was also detected. That is, the participants of this study cannot be generalized due to the size itself. Therefore, limited to this study and may not be generalizable to language learners with different native languages, cultural backgrounds, or language learning settings.

Further research

Interpretations of the findings of this study also lead to several recommendations for further research. First, it is recommended that further study can be done by investigating the strategies use of participants who have various proficiencies in other language skills e.g. listening, speaking, and writing. Another recommendation is that the subjects of this study are compared with EFL learners in different settings.

Looking at the factor influent the use of strategies, effective factors such as motivation and anxiety might relate to the use of different metacognitive strategies.

REFERENCES

Alhaqbani, A., & Riazi, M. (2012). Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Use in

    Arabic as a Second Language. *Reading in a Foreign Language*,*24*(2), 231-255.

Alsheikh, N. O. (2011). Three readers, three languages, three texts: The strategic reading

    of multilingual and multiliterate readers. *The Reading Matrix*, 11, 34–53.

AL-Sohbani, Y. A. Y. (2013). *Metacognitive Reading Strategies Use by Yemeni EFL*

    Undergraduate University Students. Frontiers of Language and Teaching, Vol. 4,

    121-133.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second/foreign language teaching

    and learning. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and

    Linguistics.

Berardo, S. A. (2006). The use of authentic materials in the teaching of reading. *The*

    reading matrix, 6(2).

Boulware-Gooden, R., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A. and Joshi, R. M. (2007*). Instruction of

    Metacognitive Strategies Enhances Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary

    Achievement of Third-Grade Students. The Reading Teacher, 61: 70–77.

Cubukcu, F. (2008). Enhancing vocabulary development and reading comprehension

    through metacognitive strategies. *Issues in Educational Research, 18*(1), 1-11.

Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), The

    nature of intelligence (pp. 231-235). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful

    and nonsuccessful second language learners. *System 5,* 110-123.

Iwai, Y. (2011). The effects of metacognitive reading strategies: pedagogical implications

    for EFL/ESL teachers. *The Reading Matrix 11 (2), 150, 159*.

Jacobs, J. E., & Paris, S. G. (1987). Children's metacognition about reading: Issue in

    definition, measurement, and instruction. *Education Psychologist*, 28, 255-278.

Karbalaei, A. (2010). A comparison of the metacognitive reading strategies used by EFL

    and ESL readers. *The Reading Matrix, 10*(2).

Karpicke, J. D., Butler, A. C., & Roediger III, H. L. (2009). Metacognitive strategies in student

learning: do students practise retrieval when they study on their

own?. *Memory*, *17*(4), 471-479.

Knutson, E. M. (1997). Reading with a purpose: Communicative reading tasks for the

foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(1), 49-57.

Lau, K. L., & Chan, D. W. (2003). Reading strategy use and motivation among Chinese

good and poor readers in Hong Kong. *Journal of Research in Reading*,*26*(2), 177-

190.

Liu, D. (2004). EFL proficiency, gender and language learning strategy use among a group

of Chinese technological institute English majors. *ARECLS e-Journal*, *1*(5).

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2008). The impact of reading purpose on the use of reading

strategies. In K. Mokhtari & R. Sheorey (Eds.), Reading strategies of first-and second

language learners (pp. 85-97). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Mónos, K. (2005). A study of the English reading strategies of Hungarian university

students with implications for reading instruction in an academic

context. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, Inaugural Volume*, 1-23.

Ok, L. K. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of

learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students. *Asian

EFL Journal*, *5*(3), 1-36.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Mazanares, G., Russo, R., & Kupper, L. (1985).

    Learning strategies applications with students of English as a second language.

    TESOL Quarterly, 19, 285-296.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*.

    Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Schraw, G. & Dennison, R. S. (1994). The Effect of Reader Purpose on Interest and Recall.

    Journal of Reading Behavior 26,1:1-17.

Sheorey, R. A., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of

    reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*,*29*(4), 431-449.

Singhal, M. (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness and

    L2 readers. *The Reading Matrix*, *1*(1).

Song, M. J. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in an ongoing EFL university reading

    classroom. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *8*(1), 41-54.

Swanborn, M. S. L., & De Glopper, K. (2002). Impact of reading purpose on incidental

    word learning from context. *Language learning*, *52*(1), 95-117.

Tovani, C. (2005). The power of purposeful reading. *Educational Leadership*.

Britton, B. K., & Glynn, S. M. (2013). *Executive control processes in reading*. Routledge.

Zhang, L. & Seepho, S. (2013). *Metacognitive Strategy Use and Academic Reading Achievement: Insights from a Chinese Context.* Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 2013, Vol. 10, No. 1, 54–69.

Zhang, L. J. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. *Language Awareness*, *10*(4), 268-288.

Zhang, L. J., & Wu, A. (2009). Chinese Senior High School EFL Students' Metacognitive Awareness and Reading-Strategy Use. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *21*(1), 37-59.