กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ[*]

วิภาศิริ แจ้งแสงทอง[**]

บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษาครั้งนี้มีจุดมุ่งหมายเพื่อเปรียบเทียบการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษา ระดับ
ปริญญาตรี มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏเพชรบุรีที่ศึกษาอยู่ในคณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ คณะวิทยาศาสตร์
และคณะครุศาสตร์ จำนวน 177 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการเก็บข้อมูลครั้งนี้คือ แบบสอบถามที่ดัดแปลงจาก
แบบสอบถามการวัดกลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ ผลการวิจัย พบว่า นักศึกษาที่มีผลสัมฤทธิ์ในการอ่านสูงและ
ต่ำทั้ง 3 คณะใช้กลวิธีในการอ่านแบบองค์รวม กลวิธีแบบแก้ปัญหาและกลวิธีแบบสนับสนุนอยู่ในระดับ
ปานกลาง นอกจากนี้เมื่อแบ่งกลุ่มคณะ พบว่า นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรีในคณะมนุษยศาสตร์และ
สังคมศาสตร์ มีการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านแตกต่างจากนักศึกษาคณะวิทยาศาสตร์และคณะครุศาสตร์
อย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .05

คำสำคัญ: กลวิธีอภิปริชาน, กลวิธีการอ่านแบบองค์รวม, กลวิธีการอ่านที่ใช้แก้ปัญหา,
กลวิธีการอ่านที่ใช้สนับสนุน

---

[*] บทความวิจัย คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏเพชรบุรี

[**] อาจารย์ประจำสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏเพชรบุรี, E-mail: rocketlek@hotmail.com

2

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by Thai EFL University Students[*]

Wipasiri Jaengsaengthong [**]

Abstract

This study investigated the use of reading strategies of 177 undergraduate students at Thepsatri Rajabhat University, Lopburi. The participants were from faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences, Science and Education. They were classified by their grade point average (GPA). The instruments used was a Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) comprising 36 items to measure reading strategies in the aspect of metacognition including the global reading strategies (GLOB), the problem solving strategies (PROB), and the support strategies (SUP), respectively. The data collected were analyzed using mean ($\overline{x}$), standard deviation (S.D.), and t-test to determine different reading strategies used between high proficient students and low proficient students. In addition, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare reading strategies in terms of metacognition among students under three different faculties used the metacognition in term of global reading strategies (GLOB), problem solving strategies (PROB), support reading strategies (SUP) at medium level. Both high and low proficient students used problem solving strategies (PROB), support reading strategies (SUP), and global reading strategies (GLOB). In overall, there was a significant difference at the level of .05 (p=.009) in reading strategies used in terms of metacognition between students under faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and a significant difference at the level of .05 (p=.000) between students under faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences and Education.

Keywords: Metacognitive strategies, Global reading strategies, Problem solving strategies,
Support reading strategies

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

3

Introduction and background of the study

Many parts of the world knowledge, reading seems often important to academic studies, professional success, and personal development (Alderson & Urquhart, 1984). For EFL/ESL readers, reading is the most important skill to understand in order to ensure success in academic learning and to make progress in language learning. (Carrel, 1989), Thus, to comprehend in context in reading academic aspect, "reading is regarded to be central means not only for learning new information but also gaining access to alternative explanations and interpretations." (Yukselir, 2014, p. 66)

In Thailand, many researchers in the field of English language reading have pointed out to problems in students' reading ability both primary and higher education. It found that English reading comprehension in Thailand is based on the system of translating. The process of reading are mostly translated into Thai rather than trying to read in English including the process of teaching. Thai teachers too often use Thai language instead of using English. It makes students think in Thai rather than thinking in English. Silapasatham (1999) pointed out teaching and learning in Thailand is in crisis because of a great number of university graduates' useless of English effectively.

Chandavimol (1998) stated that the problems in English reading for comprehension in Thailand can be summarized as being due to several factors. The texts that are used in Thai schools are often abstract and dry, furthermore, texts often have little or no connection to what the students do in their everyday life, what they see or read through various media and to what is genuinely important and interesting. Importantly, English reading comprehension in Thailand is based on the system of translating. The process of reading are mostly translated into Thai rather than trying to read in English including the process of teaching. Thai teachers too often use Thai language instead of using English. It makes students think in Thai rather than thinking in English. Silapasatham (1999) pointed out teaching and learning in Thailand is in crisis because of a great number of university graduates' useless of English effectively. Prapphal & Opanon-amata (2002) conducted a study of "An Investigation of English Proficiency of Thai Graduates". This study found that English proficiency of Thai graduates with bachelors' degree from universities in Thailand was lower than the International standard. Graduates from Thailand who wanted to further their studies abroad had the average TOEFL scores of below 500. Similarly, Prapphal (n.d.) studied English Proficiency of Thai Learners and Directions of English Teaching and Learning in Thailand. This study

indicated that the average English proficiency of Thai students was lower than other ASEAN students. Although reading skill of science and non‑science graduates excel their writing and listening, their score of reading are still lower than 50% as well as International program graduates had lower score in reading skill. In addition, Mekhayai & Phuthong (2003) studied "Need and Problems in English Usage of Graduate Students at Maejo University". It found that 273 graduates had reading problems. Their problems were the lack of vocabulary knowledge, translation and reading comprehension. Additionally, Yimwilai (2008) found that the cause of reading problems of English major students in Srinakharinwirot University lacked of reading extensively and most texts they read were in Thai.

As a result of the problems, Thai students lack of effective in reading skill and reading strategies for comprehend in reading. Because of the importance of reading strategies, Sheorey & Mokthari (2001) claimed that "Strategic awareness and monitoring of the comprehension process are critically important aspects of skilled reading." Oxford (1990) stated that the use of appropriate language learning strategies often results in improved language proficiency or achievement. It is, therefore, important to study what their reading strategies are used by their students. The information obtained will be advantageous for teachers who are teaching graduates, as well as graduate students.

Reading Strategies

Several researchers have defined reading strategies. For example, Sheorey & Mokhtari (2001) defined here as "deliberate, conscious procedures used by readers to enhance text comprehension." Paris.et al (1983) defined reading strategy as "deliberate, cognitive steps that learners can take to assist in acquiring, storing and retrieving new information and that can be accessed for a conscious use". As well as Garner (1987, p. 50), reading strategy defines as "Generally deliberate, playful activities undertaken by active learners, many times to remedy perceived cognitive failure" In addition Carrel (1998, p. 97) stated that "reading strategies are of interest not only for what they reveal about the ways readers manage interactions with written text but also for how the use of strategies is related to effective comprehension" According to Chavez (1994), he classified reading strategies into four level based on the derivation of meaning. The first level is supertextual strategies, which help reader expose the cultural framework of the text. The second level is contextual strategies, which reveal the syntactic structure of cohesion underlying the text. The third level is intratexual strategies, which aim at understanding individual constituents in the

text, especially at the lexical levels. The fourth level is subtextual strategies, which help reader translate text-bound into text-independent meaning.

Furthermore, Jimenez et al. (1996) classified reading strategies into three major groups. Firstly, text-initiated strategies include (a) using text structure, (b) summarizing and (c) rereading. Secondly, interactive strategies consist of (a) inferencing, (b) predicting and (c) questioning. Thirdly is reader-initiated strategies, which comprise (a) visualizing, (b) evaluating and making prior knowledge.

That is to say, reading strategies can define as reader's method to for use and comprehend in contexts by knowing how and what do they do when they do not understand.

Metacognition in Reading

Sheory & Mokhtari (2001) pointed out that reading whether in L1 or L2 is a "cognitive enterprise" which occurs, in part as a result of the interaction among the reader, the text and the context in which reading take place. Moreover, to accomplish the task of comprehending the text successfully, the reader must utilize metacognitive knowledge and must invoke conscious and deliberate strategies.

In Metacognitive strategies, the metacognition plays a vital (Brown & Baker, 1986), important (Decker, 1994), critical (Livingston, 1997), Zang (2001) claimed that metacognition refer to "a person's cognition about cognition. It means the person's metacognitive knowledge of cognitive process such as memory, attention, knowledge, conjecture (and) illusion." Metacognitive component of strategy use is extremely important for reading comprehension (Wirotanan, 2002). As well as McLain (1991) viewed that metacognitive strategies are important to reading comprehension that involed predicting self-monitoring, self-questioning and study skills. In addition, Anderson (2003) divided into five components of metacognitive: 1) preparing and planning, 2) deciding when to use particular reading strategies, 3) monitoring reading strategies use, 4) evaluate reading strategies use.

There are different parts of metacognition, for instance, knowledge about cognition, self-regulation (Österholm, 2006), having understanding, control over, and appropriate use of that knowledge (Tei&Stewart, 1985). Therefore, metacognition involves both conscious awareness and the conscious control of one's learning (Decker, 1994).

According to Mokhtari & Shrorey (2002), a brief description of three categories are given: Global reading strategies (GLOB) are intentional, carefully planned techniques by which learners monitor

6

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

or manage their reading, such as having a purpose in mind, previewing the text as to its length and organization, or using typographical aids and tables and figures. Problem solving strategies (PROB) are the reader's actions to use while reading the text, such as adjusting one's speed of reading when the material becomes difficult or easy, guessing the meaning of unknown words, and rereading the text to improve comprehension and Support strategies (SUP) are the strategies that the readers use to comprehend in the text, such as using a dictionary, taking notes, underlining, or highlighting textual information.

For all that, in today's ESL, EFL classrooms, whether the context is history, social science or computer science, academic subject content is the context which the target language is studied. (Dubin & Bycina, 1991). This is to say, reading English for academic purpose (EAP) focuses on reading strategies and reading skill development to comprehend in academic texts (Huang, 2006). Thus, to be successful in reading, readers must have utilize the knowledge of reading strategies because the use of reading strategies is an important role in almost every academic field of study in higher educational level (Suwantarathip, 2012).

Therefore, it seems that Thai students lack of effective in reading skill and reading strategies for comprehend in reading. So that, this study is conducted to explore and compare the types of reading strategies with academic reading task for guiding ways of using reading strategies and applying reading strategies for reading comprehension efficiently.

Objective of the study

The present study is to explore and compare the types of reading strategies in reading context of students who are studying in three different faculties both high and low proficient undergraduate students at Thepsatri Rajabhat University, Lopburi, Thailand.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following research questions.

1. What reading strategies do the undergraduate students use?

2. What reading strategies do the high proficient and low proficient students use?

3. Do the undergraduate students from different faculties use reading strategies different?

4. Are there any significant differences in the use of reading strategies among the undergraduate in three faculties?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of this study consist of 177 students who are undergraduate students at Faculty of Humanities and Social and Sciences, Faculty of Science and Faculty of Education at Thepsatri Rajabhat University. The participants are required to pass English for study skills course (GE 033014) because this course required students to re-practice four skill; listening, speaking, reading and writing. In reading aspect, the activities of this course assigned the students to read academic texts and presented their assignments. For this reason, it assumed that students must use reading strategies to practice reading skill for reading comprehension. The participants, then, will be divided into two groups according to their grade point average (GPA): high proficient students and low proficient students. The high proficient students have GPA of 3.00 - 4.00 and the low proficient students have GPA of 2.00 – 2.99. The participants are required to complete the SORS. All questionnaires are collected approximately 15 minutes, then the data from their questionnaires are analyzed.

Instrument

The instrument used, The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS), is the questionnaire adapted from Kouider Mokhtari and Ravi Sheorey (2002). The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) focuses on metacognitive strategies use within the academic reading context. A total of 36 items are included on this SORS that measure three categories: global reading strategies (16 items), problem solving strategies 11 items) and support strategies (9 items).

Data Analysis

After the participants completed the questionnaire, the data from the returned questionnaires are computed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows (SPSS). The following statistical devices are employed in this study: Mean ($\bar{x}$), Standard Deviation (S.D.), t-test, and ANOVA

To facilitate the interpretation of the data by Oxford (1990). The following score was as follows:

Mean of 3.5 or higher	=	High
Mean of 2.5 to 3.4	=	Medium
Mean of 2.4 or lower	=	Low

8

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

Results

Research question 1: What reading strategies do the undergraduate students use?

Table 1 The Use of Reading Strategies by undergraduate students

Types of Strategies	$\overline{\text{X}}$	S.D.	Level of use
Global Reading Strategies (GLOB)	2.86	.56	Medium
Problem solving Strategies (PROB)	3.01	.62	Medium
Support Strategies (SUP)	2.95	.58	Medium
Overall	2.94	.56	Medium

Table 1 reveals the use of reading strategies by the undergraduate students. It was found that all of 177 students use three types of reading strategies in the medium level with the mean of 2.94. When each type of reading strategies was analyzed, it was found that the undergraduate students used the PROB strategies highly with the mean of 3.01, while they used the SUP strategies with the mean of 2.95, and the GLOB strategies with the mean of 2.86 respectively.

Research question 2: What reading strategies do the high proficient and low proficient students use?

Table 2 The Use of Reading Strategies by undergraduate students

Types of Strategies	High (N=120)		Low (N=57)		Level of Use
	$\overline{\text{X}}$	S.D.	$\overline{\text{X}}$	S.D.	
Global Reading Strategies (GLOB)	2.90	.52	2.84	.57	Medium
Problem solving Strategies (PROB)	3.05	.57	2.99	.64	Medium
Support Strategies (SUP)	2.99	.53	2.94	.60	Medium
Overall	2.98	.51	2.92	.58	Medium

According to table 2, overall, both high proficient and low proficient students used reading strategies at the medium level with the mean of 2.98 and 2.92 respectively. When each types of reading strategies was analyzed by high and low proficient students, it was found that both group use the PROB strategies highly, then SUP strategies and GLOB strategies accordingly.

Research question 3: Do the undergraduate students from different faculties use strategies different?

Table 3 Comparison of reading strategies used by the undergraduate from different faculty

Faculty	N	Overall		GLOB		PROB		SUP	
		$\overline{\text{x}}$	S.D.	$\overline{\text{x}}$	S.D.	$\overline{\text{x}}$	S.D.	$\overline{\text{x}}$	S.D.
Humanities and Social Sciences	79	3.11	.56	3.03	.56	3.20	.62	3.10	.60
Science	57	2.86	.55	2.78	.55	2.92	.61	2.89	.56
Education	41	2.73	.47	2.64	.45	2.77	.54	2.78	.51
Overall	177	2.94	.56	2.86	.55	3.02	.62	2.95	.58

Overall, the undergraduate students from 3 faculties used the reading strategies at the medium level with the mean of 2.94. When each types of reading strategies was analyzed, it was found that the undergraduate students from faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of sciences used the PROB strategies highly, then the SUP strategies, and the GLOB strategies accordingly while the undergraduate students from faculty of education used the SUP strategies highly, then the PROB strategies, and the GLOB strategies respectively.

Research question 4: Are there any significant differences in the use of reading among the undergraduate in three faculties?

Table 4 The multiple Comparisons by the LSD of three faculties on overall strategies

Dependent Variable	(I) Faculty	(J) Faculty	Mean difference (I - J)	Sig
Overall	Humanities	Science	.24	.009*
		Education	.38	.000*
	Science	Humanities	-.24	.009*
		Education	.13	.228
	Education	Humanities	-.38	.000*
		Science	-.13	.228

*p < .05

10

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

As can be seen in table 4, Overall, there were significant differences between the undergraduate students of faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of science (p=.009) as well as faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of Education (p=.000).

Table 5 The multiple comparisons by the LSD of three faculties among three strategies

Dependent Variable	(I) Faculty	(J) Faculty	Mean difference (I - J)	Sig
GLOB	Humanities	Science	.24*	.010*
		Education	.38	.000*
	Science	Humanities	-.24*	.010*
		Education	.14	.195
	Education	Humanities	-.38*	.000*
		Science	-.14	.195
PROB	Humanities	Science	.29	.007*
		Education	.43	.000*
	Science	Humanities	-.29	.007*
		Education	.14	.232
	Education	Humanities	-.43	.000*
		Science	-.14	.232
SUP	Humanities	Science	.21	.035*
		Education	.32	.004*
	Science	Humanities	-.21	.035*
		Education	.11	.346
	Education	Humanities	-.32	.004*
		Science	-.11	.346

The results of the comparison that shows in table 5 were:

1. For the global reading strategies, statistically significant differences were observed between undergraduate students of faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of science (p= .010) and between faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of Education (p= .000).

2. For the Problem Solving strategies, statistically significant differences were observed between undergraduate students of faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of science (p = .007) and between faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of Education (p = .000).

3. For the Support Strategies, statistically significant differences were observed between undergraduate students of faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of science (p = .035) and between faculty of humanities and social sciences and faculty of Education (p = .004).

4. There were no significance differences between undergraduate students of faculty of science and faculty of Education.

Discussion

The results indicated that the students used three types of reading strategies in the medium level. The finding from the present study showed that strategies are the conscious that L2 use appropriate strategies to improve their language and communication in order to understand information. To comprehend in second language or foreign language of academic texts, the ability to read academic texts is considered one of the most important skill that university students of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) need to acquire (Levine, Ferenz & Reves, 2000). Thus, to accomplish L2 language, reading strategies are essential for readers. They are comprehension process which readers used to make sense of what they read.

Overall, undergraduate students used problem solving strategies more often than others strategies. Both high and low proficient used problem solving reading strategies to comprehend in Thai academic texts, for example, trying to get back on track when they lost concentration, rereading, reading slowly and carefully, guessing the unknown words. Also, this finding corresponds to the results of early research studies (Sheorey&Mokhthari, 2001; Anderson, 2003; Tercanlioglu, 2004; Li, 2010; Oranpattanachai, 2010; Chaya, 2012; Tengku Nor Rizan Tg Mohd Maasum & Maarof, 2012; Al-Saadi & Al-Dawaideh, 2013; Saengpakdeejit, 2014). The results in this study showed that reading ability of Thai students are limited although they have been learning English as a foreign language for many years, It suggests that metacognition is necessary to understand how the task is performed and Thai students instinctively employ how to use metacognitive strategies to advocate their reading comprehension. (Zhang, 2010; Munsakorn, 2012).

An interesting finding was found that there were differences in the use of reading strategies by the undergraduate students among three faculties. Overall, the undergraduate students from Humanities used the

12

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
GNRU Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities

reading strategies different from Science and Education in the Global strategies and Problem solving strategies. This finding supports several studies which indicated that language learning strategies used differently in field of study or career of EFL or L2. It seemed to had an effect on the use of reading strategies. (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Mochizuki, 1999; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Peacock, 2001; Kantaridou, 2011; Rao&Liu, 2011; Dabaghi & Akvan, 2014) as well as Alhaqbani & Riazi (2012) mentioned, the students in Humanities and Social Sciences used strategies more frequently than students who study in the Science.

Conclusion

This study intended to explore the use of reading strategies by undergraduate students from three faculties at Thepsatri Rajabhat University, Lopburi. The result of this study illustrated that the use of the strategies depend on students' reading skills in English. High proficient students showed the larger number and frequently of strategies usage than low proficient students. It indicated that reading proficiency is one factor that is important in influencing the strategies use.

In order to construct the meaning from texts, readers engage mental activities to success in texts for employing consciously or unconsciously in specific behavior to enhance their comprehension of texts (Singhal, 1995; cited in Liu, 2010) Therefore, it suggests that metacognitive strategies plays an important role to enhance L2 contexts.

Hence, the results of this study will help teachers know what types of strategies undergraduate students in different faculties use in academic reading and recognize the differences in the use of reading strategies use between high proficient and low proficient students in different fields. This will also be beneficial for course designers and teachers to create or provide courses that enhance reading skills.

REFERENCES

Anderson, N. J. (2003). *Scrolling, Clicking, and Reading English: Online Reading Strategies in A Second/ Foreign Language.* Retrieved (August 9, 2015), from: http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/anderson/article.pdf

Al Dawaideh & Al Saadi. (2013). Assessing Metacognitive Awareness of reading strategies used for students from the faculty of Education at University of King Abdulaziz. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE).* 3(4), 223-235.

Alderson, J. C. & Urquhart, A. H. (Eds.). (1984). *Reading in a Foreign Language.* New York: Longman.

Ceyhun Yukselir. (2014). An Investigation into the Reading Strategy Use of EFL Prep-class Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 158 (2014) 65–72.*

Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 120-134.

_____. (1998). *Can Reading Strategies be Successfully Taught?*. Georgia State University: United States.

****

วารสารวิชาการเครือข่ายบัณฑิตศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภาคเหนือ
Journal of Graduate Studies in Northern Rajabhat Universities