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ABSTRACT

This paper explores the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies and the use of reading strategies among Thai EFL learners. Fifteen female university students doing their fourth-year undergraduate study in an English major at the faculty of education participated in this study. The current study used a mixed-methods approach. To collect the quantitative data, the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) was used to investigate the participants’ metacognitive awareness involved in reading. Also, to insightfully assess and analyze the participants’ reading strategies while they were reading the academic texts, a think-aloud protocol was used. Four participants who gained high and low scores from the standardized comprehension test were chosen in the think-aloud session. The findings reveal that the participants’ overall use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies (Global, Problem-solving, and Support reading strategies) was at a high level (Mean = 2.85, S.D. = 0.31). Among 30 individual reading strategies, the most frequently used was underlining and circling (Mean = 3.60, S.D. = 0.74), which falls under the Support Reading Strategy (SUP) category. On the other hand, it can be seen that the least frequently used reading strategy was asking self-questions (Mean = 1.93, S.D. = 0.70), which is also under the category of SUP strategies. When considering the appropriate and effective use of metacognitive reading strategies in the think-aloud protocol by the participants in successful reading...
comprehension, it was discovered that using background knowledge, previewing text, reading slowly and carefully, pausing to reflect on reading, taking notes while reading, and summarizing were frequently used.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of (1) background of the study, (2) statement of problem, (3) objectives of the study, (4) definitions of terms, (5) scope of the study, (6) significance of the study, and (7) organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Reading is very important for learners who learn English as a foreign language (EFL) because they have to use it as a fundamental tool for all areas of learning. Nowadays, most Thai EFL learners tend to have difficulties reading English texts, especially the academic texts. The problems that Thai EFL learners encounter come from the traditional teaching reading methods and the learners themselves. According to the teaching method for comprehension, students are regularly taught to read and translate the text from English into Thai. In a traditional classroom, they can only learn from what the teacher knows. Additionally, many learners find reading difficult because they, as struggling readers, cannot simultaneously use both bottom-up and top-down processes (Aebersold & Field, as cited in Sinthopruangchalee, 2011). Murtagh (as cited in Anderson, 2003) emphasizes that the most successful readers are those who can effectively use both bottom-up and top-down processes. Another reason why a lot of learners struggle with reading is that they have neither enough lexical knowledge nor syntactic knowledge (Chawang, 2008). They do not have appropriate reading strategies and cannot apply these strategies to help them understand what they read.

Thus, to read successfully, learners need to realize the use of a reading strategy that helps them tackle the problems while reading, and their reading comprehension, as a result, becomes better (Ismail and Tawalbeh, 2014). The strategy used in reading involves metacognition that basically refers to thinking about thinking, or an awareness of what and how a reader knows (Samuels et al., 2005). Therefore, the reading strategy and metacognition are the major components leading to learners’ successful reading.
1.2 Statement of problem

In the EFL context, many learners encounter challenges in reading, while learners need to be able to strengthen their reading skills. Learners who are studying in universities have to read a large number of various texts, especially academic texts. Many previous studies have shown the importance of reading strategy and metacognition in reading. Lin and Yu (2015) carried out a think-aloud study of reading strategies used by EFL college students reading Chinese (L1) and English (L2) texts. It was revealed that when students read an English text, they used various reading strategies more frequently and effectively in order to comprehend the text successfully. Wang (2016) also found that readers with higher language proficiency were aware of applying appropriate and effective reading strategies to deal with the problems throughout the reading process. They were more likely to become proficient readers because they comprehended what they read better than readers who could not use the reading strategies and failed to understand the text. Furthermore, Chamot (2009) stated that learners who become aware of metacognitive strategies can monitor, regulate their learning processes, find solutions to achieve their reading tasks and evaluate themselves after the task completion. Griffith and Ruan (2005) cited Dole, K. J. Brown, and Trathen (1996) by asserting that readers who use their proper and specific strategies can metacognitively comprehend better than those who do not. When taking a closer look at university learners, Tavakoli (2014) reported that Iranian university EFL students with higher and frequent metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use tended to have greater reading ability. This implied idea agrees with Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) when stating that unskilled readers are relatively low in metacognitive knowledge.

The participants in this research studied in only two English reading courses, which were English for Academic Purposes I and II. This suggested that they lacked study in reading courses specifically aiming at enhancing their effective comprehension despite the fact that they cannot avoid exposure to a large number of reading texts or inputs. In other words, learning to read better was not easy for them. With not many opportunities to increase the ability to read as skilled and successful readers, it is a prerequisite for teachers to assess and examine the metacognitive awareness of reading
strategies among learners for better understanding the phenomena by which Thai EFL learners try to construct meaning while they are reading the texts.

In brief, learners can be skilled readers if they have the ability to control and monitor the reading strategies they use while reading, and also if they have more awareness while doing the reading tasks. For example, they should have a purpose in mind when they read the text. They should know when to read carefully, or when to pay less attention to unimportant ideas, to help them understand the text (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). As a result, this study aimed to answer these following research questions:

1.2.1 To what extent do Thai EFL learners use metacognitive awareness of reading strategies?

1.2.2 What reading strategies do Thai EFL learners use while reading academic texts?

1.3 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1.3.1 To explore the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies that Thai EFL learners use.

1.3.2 To investigate the reading strategies that Thai EFL learners use while reading the academic texts

1.4 Definitions of terms

The definitions of terms in this study are as follows:

1.4.1 English as a Foreign Language or EFL is a use of the English language in non-native speaking countries in which English is typically not the first language and it is taught in universities.

1.4.2 Metacognitive awareness is a state in which learners are aware of using the reading strategies while they are reading academic texts. In reading comprehension, they are aware of what to do in performing a reading task, and they are able to choose the effective strategies they will use to read successfully. They also realize what reading strategies they should plan to do or not to do when reading for better understanding.
1.4.3 **Reading strategies** refers to specific planned activities which learners are aware of and intend to effectively select with a view to making sense of a text.

1.4.4 **Academic texts** refer to types of written texts which are educational journals, research articles, and other relevant studies about English language learning and teaching. Regularly, university instructors assign their learners to read such academic texts because they are useful in the university courses.

1.4.5 **Thai EFL learners** refer to Thai undergraduates who were studying for a bachelor’s degree in the fourth year of their English major, in a faculty of education in a university located in the central part of Thailand. They did not generally use English in their everyday lives, but they used Thai as their first language. Also, they studied English and used it mostly in the classroom.

1.5 **Scope of the study**

The target population of this study was fourth-year undergraduates, who had registered in the second semester of the 2016 academic year in an English major in the faculty of education of a university located in the central region of Thailand.

1.6 **Significance of the study**

The findings obtained from this study provide fruitful and useful information to EFL learners, especially undergraduates, so that they can improve their reading ability by becoming more aware of their own thinking when they read. Therefore, they will gain more metacognitive knowledge and confidence that will actively help them get involved in processing the text and successfully become skilled readers. Additionally, as teachers and researchers, we can use the results of this study as an initiative idea to help unskilled learners become more strategic readers with effective metacognitive instructions. Thus, they are able to use appropriate strategies when dealing with reading texts and they will eventually achieve a high level of reading ability.

1.7 **Organization of the study**

A Study of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies in Thai EFL Learners is divided into five chapters as follows:
1.7.1 Chapter one presents the background of the study, research questions, research objective, definitions of terms, scope of the study, significance of the study, and organization of the study.

1.7.2 Chapter two consists of a review of literature and previous studies concerning the topic of this study.

1.7.3 Chapter three explains the research methodology to be used in this study.

1.7.4 Chapter four describes the results of the study and discussion.

1.7.5 Chapter five consists of a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The chapter presents a review of related literature and the relevant studies. It is organized into six sections: (1) reading strategies, (2) metacognition in reading, (3) think-aloud protocols, and (4) previous studies.

2.1 Reading strategies

A number of research studies have examined how strategies affect students’ reading comprehension. Reading strategies are defined as self-directed actions that readers are aware of and manage to achieve reading goals, for example retrieving, regulating, and evaluating the information (Erler & Finkbeiner, 2007; Paris, Lipson & Wixson, 1994, as cited in Wang, 2016). According to Jimenez, Garcia and Pearson (1996, as cited in Lin & Yu, 2015), a reading strategy refers to an action or a specific plan consciously done by a reader who is trying to make sense of the text. In addition, Zang, Gu, and Hu (2008, as cited in Wang, 2016) stated that the reading strategy that learners used depended on their levels of English proficiency. The students who often used reading strategies tended to have high proficiency level of English. They mainly used top-down reading strategies (e.g. using prior knowledge, predicting and integrating information, recognizing text structure, and using inferences) and monitored their reading processes more frequently. On the other hand, students who used fewer reading strategies had low level of English proficiency because they only focused on bottom up strategies, for example, rereading, translating, and looking up unfamiliar words.

The reading strategy use reflects the reading performance. Successful readers are considered good strategy users. As shown by studies on the reading strategies used by successful readers (Carrel et al, 1989; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Wen, 2003, as cited in Pei, 2014), it is indicated that the reading comprehension tasks completed by successful readers happen at the metacognitive level. As a result, the importance of metacognitive awareness or metacognition in reading has become recognizable with participants in various settings.
2.2 Metacognition in reading

Metacognition is related to thinking about learning processes, planning, monitoring, and evaluating one’s thinking ability (Baker & Brown, 1984; Chamot & Kupper, 1989). Metacognition is associated with reading awareness, and readers who have great metacognitive awareness tend to be more successful or skilled readers (Chamot, 1998, as cited in Hong-Nam, K., & Page, L., 2014). Phakiti (2003) studied Thai university EFL students and revealed that those who often use metacognitive strategies gained significantly better reading performance. Kummin and Rahman (2010) agreed that students who were proficient in English frequently used various strategies. They reported that those who were less proficient had little knowledge of metacognition. They were unable to use appropriate and effective strategies to evaluate their own reading comprehension. Ismail and Tawalbeh (2014), who conducted a study about metacognitive reading strategies with 41 EFL non-English major students, found that the reading strategy use helped readers solve their reading difficulties and increase their reading ability. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2008, as cited in Iwai, 2016) also stated that students with high English proficiency seemed to use a greater variety of strategies while reading English texts.

This study is based on the work of Mokhtari and Reichard (2002), who designed and developed the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII) as a tool for assessing readers’ metacognitive awareness and strategy use while reading. The MARSII contains three categories or subscales: Global Reading Strategies (GLOB), Problem-Solving strategies (PROB), and Support Reading Strategies (SUP). The Global Reading Strategies include a set of intended reading strategies oriented toward analyzing text globally. Examples are setting purpose for reading, activating prior knowledge, predicting and previewing text. The Problem-Solving Strategies represent the strategies to solve problems when readers find texts difficult to comprehend. Examples include reading slowly and carefully, pausing to reflect on reading, rereading, visualizing information, and guessing meaning of unknown words. The Support Reading Strategies include functional strategies to help readers understand the text better. Examples are underlining, taking notes, paraphrasing, and using outside reference materials like dictionaries. With the aforementioned, the MARSII can help categorize readers into unskilled and skilled readers.
According to the study of Saricoban and Behjoo (2017), the results indicated that the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies affected reading comprehension skills of Turkish EFL students. Successful reading students were more likely to use metacognitive reading strategies so that they could become skilled readers. They used problem-solving strategies the most, followed by global and support reading strategies. Panchu, Bahuleyan and K (2016) also conducted a study to explore the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among first year medical students in India. The findings revealed that all students used problem-solving strategies the most compared to other subscales. As for the students with very good academic scores, they used support reading strategies more frequently than global reading strategies. Thus, the role of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies has an important role in the students’ academic performance.

Boyraz and Altinsoy (2017) carried out a study investigating university student teachers’ use of metacognitive reading strategies. The study revealed that the student teachers used reading strategies differently depending on their levels. The students who were in senior and prep levels used metacognitive reading strategies at a higher level. Based on the three subscales of MARSI, problem-solving reading strategies were commonly used among student teachers in all levels; however, the difference in the strategy use compared in terms of the student teachers’ levels was not statistically significant.

2.3 Think-aloud protocols

Think aloud protocols have been rooted in cognitive science and psychology. Also, they have been used in second language reading studies to analyze reading processes. Due to the fact that reading is a silent and hidden process, the best way to access this process is using think-aloud protocols (Yoshida, 2008). Using this technique is a powerful means to explore mental data and the researchers will be able to get insightful inner speech from readers (Afferbach, 2000; Smith, 2006, as cited in Wang, 2016). Think aloud-protocols can be classified into retrospective and concurrent. In a form of retrospective think-aloud protocols, participants are asked to recall what they were thinking after completing the reading task whereas in concurrent think-aloud
protocols participants are allowed to say any words aloud and keep telling what they are thinking during the process of completing the task (Yoshida, 2008).

Many studies provide evidence that think-aloud protocols are valued as a way to elicit individual human thought processes to study the readers’ metacognitive awareness and strategy use in reading. Yayli (2010) conducted a study and analyzed EFL university students’ cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies using think-aloud protocols. It revealed that the students with higher English proficiency used cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies more frequently than those with lower English proficiency. Jahandar, et al., (2012) also conducted an experimental study about the think-aloud method in foreign language reading comprehension among upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners. They found out that there was a positive effect when using a think-aloud method with a view to improving learner’s reading comprehension, thus learners who used various effective metacognitive reading strategies improved their reading comprehension.

2.4 Previous studies

Many empirical studies on reading strategy use and metacognitive awareness of strategies in reading comprehension have been conducted among various groups of students. Cantrell and Carter (2009) found that sixth-and ninth-grade students who had higher scores on reading comprehension more frequently used reading strategies, especially global and problem-solving strategies, than those who had low scores. Also, Othman and Jaidi (2012) investigated the use of metacognitive strategies in reading among EFL students. The results showed that the EFL students frequently used metacognitive reading strategies so that they became strategic or good readers. In terms of metacognitive reading strategy use, Zhang and Seepho (2013) examined the metacognitive strategies in academic reading among university students in China. It revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between metacognitive strategy use and English reading performance. Zhang and Wu (2009) furthermore explored the metacognitive awareness and reading strategies used among Chinese high school students. The results revealed that the students had a high usage rate in global, problem-solving, and support reading strategies. The students with high reading
proficiency performed better than those with intermediate low reading proficiency, particularly in global reading and problem-solving strategies.

In addition, Shah et al. (2010) examined the strategies used and then compared those strategies used by second language students with different reading ability at secondary schools in Malaysia. The results indicated that there were differences in reading strategies used among good and average reading students. The good reading students were more likely to use strategies appropriately compared to the average ones. AL-Sohbani (2013) investigated reading strategies of university students in order to determine if male and female students used different reading strategies. It was discovered that most of the male and female students were strategic users. They used problem-solving strategies rather than global and support reading strategies.

Dreyer and Nel (2003) aimed to find out whether the students following metacognitive strategic reading instruction outperformed on their reading comprehension tests in English. The results showed that the students who were taught by the metacognitive strategic reading instruction gained higher scores on reading comprehension tests than those who were not.

To summarize, it is evident that metacognition in reading or metacognitive reading strategies has been recognized as an important factor affecting students’ development to become strategic or good readers.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the research methodology including (1) research design, (2) participants, (3) research instruments, (4) data collection procedures, and (5) data analysis.

3.1 Research design

In the study of Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), it is suggested that integrating both quantitative and qualitative data as a mixed-methods approach helps researchers gain a more complete and reasonably accurate understanding of the research problems and research questions addressed by the researchers. Also, the basic design of the mix-methods research provides a sufficient support when interpreting and validating the research. To answer the research questions of this study, it was designed as mixed-methods research that involves collecting and analyzing data quantitatively and qualitatively. Therefore, the questionnaires were initially used as quantitative research in order to investigate the metacognitive reading strategies that Thai EFL learners use. Then a think aloud protocol was used as qualitative research for in-depth understanding about the use of reading strategies among Thai EFL learners.

3.2 Participants

As suggested by Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), the purposive sampling can be used in both quantitative and qualitative research to identify and select appropriate participants who are knowledgeable and experienced with a topic based on the researchers’ interest. Since the purpose of this study was to investigate reading strategies of Thai EFL learners, it was important that the participants had sufficient knowledge of English. The strategy to seek participants was a maximum variation method although the number of the participants was relatively small. In terms of the purposeful selection of the participants, it was possible to contact an instructor at the university to discuss participants’ academic performance and their English language backgrounds. This was very helpful to confirm that the participants’ qualifications were appropriate for this study.
As a result, the participants were Thai EFL learners who were doing their fourth-year undergraduate study at that time in an English major in a faculty of education in a university located in the central region of Thailand. Each of the participants was at the average age of 22. They had been studying English as a Foreign Language for more than 15 years. Based on their transcripts, they had studied in only two English reading courses at the university (English for Academic Purpose I and II) when they were in the second year. Having been in the field of education, they had been familiar with reading educational academic texts, particularly research journals in language pedagogy and linguistics. The number of students in a typical class was seventeen (in this case, one male and sixteen females). To establish the fairness and equity in research participation, one male needed to be excluded. There were sixteen females but one of them was not an EFL learner. She also needed to be excluded. Therefore, there were only fifteen females who participated in this study.

3.3 Research instruments

To answer the research questions addressed, there are four main research instruments depending on the mixed-methods approach of this study. The instruments used to collect the quantitative and qualitative data were: 1) questionnaires on metacognitive awareness of reading strategies; 2) standardized tests of reading comprehension; 3) academic texts; and 4) think-aloud protocols. Below are the descriptions of the research instruments in this study.

3.3.1 Standardized tests of reading comprehension

In this study, a standardized test of reading comprehension in English was used as a tool to purposefully measure the participants’ reading ability. The reading section in the test was adapted from Barron’s Paper-Based TOEFL (PBT) model test (Sharpe, 2011). The participants were assigned to read three passages and choose the best alternative for each item. The passages were expository texts which allowed the participants to use various reading strategies. Each passage, with the average word count of 250, was followed by ten multiple-choice items. Each item had four alternatives of which one was the correct answer. The total test score was 30. The participants had to finish 30 questions within 50 minutes.
3.3.2 Questionnaires on metacognitive reading strategies

In this study, the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory or MARSI (Mokhtari and Reichard, 2002) was used to explore the use of various metacognitive strategies in English reading comprehension among the participants. The MARSI was adopted and adapted. Then it was translated into Thai, which was the participants’ first language, in order to avoid language barriers and get accurate information. 30 statements under the three reading categories were adopted and translated into Thai, and a Likert scale was adapted for the responses. The original instrument was a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (“Never or Almost never”) to 5 (“Always or Almost always”). To enhance the clarity of the response options, this was modified to a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (“Never”) to 4 (“Always”). The mean scores were categorized into three levels of reading strategy use: high (≥2.68), medium (1.34-2.67) and low (≤1.33).

Before using the questionnaires, a pilot study was carried out to determine the clarity of the instructions and statements in the questionnaires. This involved randomly selected undergraduate students who were studying in their fourth year majoring in English, but in another Thai university the internal consistency of reliability coefficient was determined by Cronbach’s alpha. Among the 30 items of all three reading strategies, the Cronbach’s alpha result was 0.896, indicating high inter consistency in the items relating to the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. This instrument can be used to assess the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of Thai EFL learners well.

In each questionnaire there were two parts: the demographic data, and the adapted Thai version of MARSI. With regard to the demographic data, the procedure aimed to draw out the participants’ background information containing age, undergraduate major at the university, year they were studying, number of years they had been studying English, and previous grades of reading courses they took. As for the adapted Thai version of MARSI, there were 30 items that were divided into three categories or subscales of reading strategies: global reading strategies or GLOB, problem-solving strategies (PROB), and support reading strategies (SUP). The participants were required to mark the reading strategies they use on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (“Never”) to 4 (“Always”).

3.3.3 Academic texts

In this study, three academic texts in English were used. Since the participants were accustomed to reading academic research journals in English language teaching and linguistics, the texts used were only the abstracts excerpted from the research. However, they still represented and summarized the major aspects of the entire research papers in a prescribed sequence, so the participants could assess the overall important information in the research papers. All the texts used in the think-aloud session were suitable for the reader’s age and college level.

The first text was an abstract on ‘Task-based language teaching: An empirical study of task transfer from SAGE online publishing.’ It had 194 words in length. The second text was a 152-word abstract about ‘Effects of task repetition on learners’ attention orientation in L2 oral production’. It was taken from the same online source as the first text. The first two texts were used for demonstrating and training how think-aloud protocols work. The last text discussed language teaching, and the topic was on ‘Communicative Language Teaching and Its Impact on Students’ Performance.’ It consisted of 184 words taken from the online Journal of Educational and Social Research (MCSER Publishing). This text was used to collect the data during the actual think-aloud session.

3.3.4 Think-aloud protocols

A think-aloud protocol was used to analyze if the participants comprehended the texts they were reading and what strategies they used while reading the academic texts. The think-aloud sessions were divided into three phases: a demonstration phase, a practice phase, and an actual study. The participants were only recorded while reading the last text in the actual think-aloud session (the other two texts were used for demonstration and practice periods). The primary data from the think-aloud session was transcribed and analytically coded for individual insights and themes based on the metacognitive reading strategies.

3.4 Data collection procedures

The participants were scheduled to meet during class hours after cooperating with the university instructor at the Faculty of Education. In the two-hour class period, the participants were given an explanation of the nature of this study and the tasks they
were going to perform. First, they were asked to complete the standardized tests of reading comprehension. Then, they were asked to do the questionnaires. After completion, the tests and the questionnaires were all collected.

With regard to the think-aloud sessions, only four participants, those who gained the highest and lowest scores from the standardized tests of reading comprehension, were selected. All the selected participants then gave their consent to participate in the study. They were informed that the session would be divided into three main phases: a demonstration period, a practice period, and the actual study. In a demonstration period, the participants were exposed to the think-aloud procedures. The participants were told that they should express what they were thinking while reading the academic texts for comprehension. They were allowed to make notes and use online dictionaries if they wished. Then, it was demonstrated to them how to do the think-aloud process using the first academic text about ‘Task-based language teaching: An empirical study of task transfer.’

After that, the participants could ask questions about think-aloud protocol while reading for more accurate procedures. Then, they were given the second text about ‘Effects of Task Repetition on Learners’ Attention Orientation in L2 Oral Production’ to practice thinking out loud. After the practice phase, the participants were given the text about ‘Communicative Language Teaching and Its Impact on Students’ Performance.’ They were given time to verbalize while comprehending the text. They were also able to make additional comments and recall the ideas of the text.

3.5 Data analysis

According to the standardized test of reading comprehension, the scores collected from all the participants were calculated to identify their level of reading proficiency. The participants who gained scores greater than or equal to 24 (80 percent of the test) were categorized into a high level ranking of reading ability while those who gained scores less than 15 (50 percent of the test) were deemed to be in a low level of reading ability.

Regarding the data obtained from questionnaires, the demographic data about the participants in part 1 of the questionnaires was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage. Part 2 was investigated to examine the participants’
metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. The overall and the individual levels of reading strategy use in the three main categories (GLOB, PROB, and SUP strategies) were analyzed by calculating the means and the standard deviation on each item responded to by the participants. To interpret the score averages, the levels of usage were set up into three levels based on the questionnaires (which had been adapted and translated into Thai) modifying the averages into five-point Likert scales. The three levels of reading strategy use were high (a mean of 2.68 or higher), medium (a mean of 1.34 - 2.67), and low (a mean of 1.33 or lower).

In the analysis of the think-aloud protocols, the data obtained were coded and classified into the three main categories of reading strategies described in Mokhtari and Reichard’s (2002) MARSI.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents results of the study. The analyzed data were presented to answer the research questions. The results are divided into three main parts: (1) the demographic data of the participants, (2) the participants’ overall use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, and (3) the participants’ use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies while reading academic texts.

4.1 Demographic data of the participants

This section describes the demographic data of fifteen female undergraduate students, who were studying in their fourth year, majoring in English at the faculty of education in a university situated in the central region of Thailand. The demographic data includes age, undergraduate major at the university, year they were studying, number of years they had been studying English, and previous grades of reading courses they enrolled in.

Table 1. Demographic data of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic data</th>
<th>Numbers of participants</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate year of study</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of studying English</td>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the numbers of the participants and percentage calculated according to their age, major, undergraduate year of study and numbers of years studying English. All fifteen participants were female; most of them were at the age between 21-23. Most of them (60%) were at the age of 22. One-third of the participants (33.33%) were 21 years old and only one (6.67%) was 23 years old. With regard to
their major and current year of study at the university, apparently all of them (100%) were in the fourth year student studying in an English major. With regard to the participants’ years of studying English, all of them (100%) had been studying English for more than 15 years. They normally started studying it when they were in kindergarten or elementary school and they had continued studying English since then. Therefore, none of them had studied English less than 15 years.

Table 2. Grade in English for Academic Purposes I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numbers of participants</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed in Table 2, there were 15 participants who had enrolled in the reading course English for Academic Purposes. They took this course when they were second-year university students. About half of the participants (46.67%) received grade B+. One-third of them (33.33%) received grade A, and a few participants (20%) received grade B. Thus, none of them had less than grade C+ in the course.

Table 3. Grade in English for Academic Purposes II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed in Table 3, all 15 participants had enrolled in English for Academic Purposes II when they were in their second year of university. The majority of the participants (73.33%) got grade A as the highest grade and the minority group (26.67%) got grade B+. None of them had grade B or lower.

4.2 The participants’ overall use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies

The results obtained for the first research question: To what extent do Thai EFL learners use metacognitive awareness of reading strategies?
Table 4. Participants’ overall use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Level of Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global reading strategies (GLOB)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving strategies (PROB)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support reading strategies (SUP)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall reading strategies</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, it is indicated that the participants used problem-solving strategies or PROB the most (Mean = 2.99, SD = 0.382), followed by global reading strategies or GLOB (Mean = 2.94), SD = 0.40), and then support reading strategies or SUP (Mean = 2.59, SD = 0.37). The participants used PROB strategies and GLOB strategies at a high level, and SUP strategies at a medium level, respectively. With regard to the overall reading strategy use, it was discovered that the participants used metacognitive awareness of reading strategies at a high level of frequency (Mean = 2.85, S.D. = 0.31).

Table 5. Participants’ use of each reading strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reading strategy</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Level of Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>Previewing text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using context clues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using typographical aids</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using background knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using tables, figures &amp; pictures</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checking understanding</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guessing what material is about</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skimming to note</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciding what to read</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting purpose for reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checking if guesses are right</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading strategy</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Level of Usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking if text content fits purpose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROB: Re-reading</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting back when distracted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing unknown words</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing information</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading slowly and carefully</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting reading speed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausing to reflect on reading</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying closer attention when facing text</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facing text difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP: Underlining and circling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going back and forth to find relationships</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using dictionaries</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing reading with others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes while reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading out loud</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking self-questions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5 we can see the participants’ use of each reading strategy. When looking at 13-item global reading strategies (GLOB), 9 strategies were at the high level of usage (69.23%) and 4 strategies were at the medium level of usage (30.77%). This indicates that the participants monitored and managed their reading processes carefully. The most carefully planned strategies used by the participants included previewing text (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.99), using context clues (Mean = 3.33, S.D. = 0.72), using typographical aids (Mean = 3.27, S.D. = 0.70), and using background knowledge (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.56). On the other hand, the GLOB strategies less used by the
participants, at the moderate usage level, were checking if guesses are right or wrong (Mean = 2.53, S.D. = 0.74), and checking if text content fits purpose (Mean = 2.27, S.D. = 1.03).

With regard to 8-item problem-solving strategies (PROB), 7 strategies were used highly (87.50%) in order to solve difficult texts for better understanding. The strategies used were re-reading (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.74), trying to get back on track when distracted (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.68), guessing unknown words (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.68), visualizing information (Mean = 3.13, S.D. = 0.74), reading slowly and carefully (Mean = 3.00, S.D. = 0.76), adjusting reading speed (Mean = 3.00, S.D. = 0.93), and pausing to reflect on reading (Mean = 2.73, S.D. = 0.88). However, another strategy used only moderately (12.50%) was paying closer attention when the participants face text difficulties (Mean = 2.27, S.D. = 0.88). This was considered as the least used PROB strategy.

Apart from GLOB and PROB strategies, 9-item support reading strategies (SUP) were reported. 4 strategies were used at the high level (44.44%). The participants reported that the strategies they used highly included underlining and circling (Mean = 3.60, S.D. = 0.74), going back and forth to find relationships (Mean = 3.00, S.D. = 0.76), paraphrasing (Mean = 2.93, S.D. = 0.70), and using dictionaries (Mean = 2.73, S.D. = 0.80). The other strategies they used were rated at the medium level (55.56%) and they were considered as the least used SUP strategies. These strategies consisted of discussing reading with others (Mean = 2.67, S.D. = 0.90), summarizing (Mean = 2.33, S.D. = 0.90), taking notes while reading (Mean = 2.13, S.D. = 0.99), reading out loud (Mean = 2.00, S.D. = 0.66), and asking self-questions (Mean = 1.93, S.D. = 0.70).

When considering the 30 individual reading strategies, 20 strategies (66.67%) fell into the range of high level usage, and 10 (33.33%) were reported to be at the medium level. None of the reading strategies were reported at a low level. Although the result for overall reading strategy use was a problem-solving strategy, the results for individual reading strategies was different. The most frequently used one was underlining and circling (Mean = 3.60, S.D. = 0.74) categorized into SUP strategies. The second rank was re-reading (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.74) categorized into the problem-solving reading strategies, including previewing text (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.99) in GLOB strategies. The third rank of reading strategy use was using context clues.
(Mean = 3.33, S.D. = 0.72) in GLOB strategies. On the other hand, it can be seen that the least frequently used reading strategy was asking self-questions (Mean = 1.93, S.D. = 0.70)

4.3 The participants’ use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies while reading academic texts

The results obtained for the second research question: What reading strategies do Thai EFL learners use while reading academic texts?

Only the four participants who gained the highest and lowest scores from the standardized comprehension test were chosen to assess more in-depth data about what strategies the participants used while they were reading the academic texts. All of the strategies used by the four participants during the think-aloud session were categorized into three subscales: global reading strategies, problem solving strategies, and support reading strategies.

From the analyses, two participants with high English proficiency repeatedly used a particular set of effective strategies. The strategies they used repeatedly based on the GLOB strategies were: (1) using background knowledge, (2) previewing text, (3) deciding what to read or what to ignore, (4) using context clues, and (5) guessing what the material is about. The strategies they used concerning the PROB strategies included: (1) reading slowly and carefully, (2) pausing to reflect on reading, (3) re-reading, and (4) guessing unknown words. Regarding the SUP strategies, the strategies used frequently were: (1) taking notes while reading, (2) summarizing, (3) underlining and circling, and (4) paraphrasing. The two participants tended to preview the text and tried to focus on the main ideas by underlining and circling them. They tried to use their background knowledge to help them understand the relevant topics in the text. They read and thought along while reading. When they found that they did not understand the important words or ideas, they paid more attention and read again. They stopped to think and tried to summarize or paraphrase in their own words.

When analyzing the data from the other two participants with low English proficiency, the GLOB strategies they used similarly were: (1) previewing text, and (2) guessing what the material is about. Based on the PROB strategies, the participants used the strategies: (1) re-reading and (2) trying to get back on track when distracted.
The participants also frequently used the SUP strategies that included: (1) taking notes while reading, (2) reading out loud, (3) underlining and circling, and (4) using dictionaries. Although the participants tried to preview the text, they focused on word meaning. When they found unknown words or phrases, they tried to re-read. However, they ended up looking up the words in the dictionaries.

4.4 Discussion

The results of this study were consistent with some other relevant studies that investigated the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies by using MARSI. The findings of Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) indicated that the overall reading strategy use among their participants was at the medium level of usage and the order of the strategy use was problem solving, followed by global strategies, and support reading strategies. Furthermore, according to the studies conducted by Panchu, Bahuleyan and K (2016) and Boyraz and Altinsoy (2017), the results support the present study that EFL students used problem solving strategies the most. The students with good and very good academic scores tended to have significant metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. However, when looking at the overall reading strategy use reported in this present study, it was at the high level because the criteria of the average score of the questionnaires had been modified.

When considering the fifteen participants’ overall English proficiency level from doing the standardized tests, none of them gained less than 50 percent (two participants who gained the lowest scores of the group were still chosen.) Because they were Thai EFL learners in fourth-year study in an English major, they could pass the test. In addition, although they had studied in only two reading courses in the university, it can be assumed that the participants improved metacognition in reading by themselves through their long process of learning experience during their general university study.

According to the data from think-aloud protocols, the results were in line with Zang, Gu, and Hu (2008, as cited in Wang, 2016). They stated that learners’ reading strategy use depended on their English proficiency levels. Learners who had higher proficiency levels of English used reading strategies more effectively. Two of the participants who had high English proficiency tended to mainly begin reading with
reference to their prior knowledge, and break down small elements to increase comprehension. They also appeared to be skilled readers because they used top-down reading strategies and they had higher proficiency in English, including the content area knowledge and vocabulary. Furthermore, not only did the participants use top-down strategies, but they also used some of the bottom-up strategies such as re-reading, and guessing unknown words. This supports what Murtagh (as cited in Anderson, 2003) stated, that readers who combined top-down and bottom-up strategies are considered the most successful readers.

On the other hand, the two participants who gained the lowest scores in the group seemed to focus more on word recognition when they tried to preview the text first. The reason why they failed to understand the text was in line with Chawang (2008) in that they lacked academic vocabulary to help comprehend the text. Also, they were not familiar with the selected topic of the text. This indicates that they did not have enough background knowledge to build up their comprehension. Apparently, they used bottom-up reading strategies.

The aforementioned results were in line with the findings of Ismail and Tawalbeh (2014). They mentioned that learners needed to be able to use the reading strategies to help cope with difficult texts and find solutions for successful comprehension. The participants who frequently used appropriate and effective strategies can comprehend the text better; therefore, in this current study, two of the participants with high proficiency of English tended to have greater reading ability. This supports the results of Chamot (2009), Griffith and Ruan (2005), and Tavakoli (2014).

According to the results obtained from the questionnaires and the think-aloud protocols, it is suggested that the most frequently used strategies and the effective use of metacognitive reading strategies that the participants used while reading were: (1) previewing the text to make predictions, (2) underlining and circling to help remember the key information, and (3) re-reading for more understanding. However, one of the problems among the participants was unknown vocabulary. In fact, vocabulary influenced their reading comprehension, but most of them tried to use the strategies to guess difficult words from the contexts. If they thought the words did not affect their interpretations while reading, they decided to ignore them.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents (1) a summary of the study (2) a summary of the findings (3) the conclusions and (4) the recommendation for further studies.

5.1 Summary of the study

The section summarizes the main points of the study based on the following objectives and research methodology.

5.1.1 Objectives of the study

This study aimed to investigate the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies that Thai EFL learners use. Additionally, it was conducted to explore the reading strategies that Thai EFL learners use while reading academic texts.

5.1.2 Participants, instruments, and procedures

This current study was designed as a mixed-methods approach; the participants selected purposively were fifteen female students in a university located in the central region of Thailand. They were studying in their fourth year, majoring in English at the faculty of education.

In order to meet the objectives of the study, four main instruments were used which included adapted standardized tests of reading comprehension in English, the adapted and Thai-translated version of the MARSI questionnaires, three excerpted academic research journals, and think-aloud protocols.

With regard to procedures in conducting this study, the researcher started with asking fifteen participants to do the standardized English reading comprehension tests and the MARSI questionnaires after the researcher had gotten consent from the university instructor. The data obtained from the questionnaires was considered as quantitative data to explore the overall use of the participants’ metacognitive reading strategies. After the questionnaires were collected, four participants out of all the participants were selected for the next step, based on their gained scores from the reading tests. The first two selected participants gained the highest scores whereas the other two gained the lowest ones. They were asked to take part in the think-aloud
sessions which were divided into three periods: a demonstration period, a practice period, and the actual study. Only the data during the actual study was collected. The four participants had to express their thoughts while they were reading the academic texts. Also, they were allowed to make more comments and recall the ideas from the academic texts. Finally, both quantitative and qualitative data was analyzed to answer the research questions addressed in the study.

5.2 Summary of the findings

The findings of this study as presented in the previous chapter can be summarized as follows:

5.2.1 Demographic data of the participants

The participants who participated in the study were female university students and they were studying in their fourth year in the faculty of education at their university. Their undergraduate major was English. The university where they were studying was situated in the central region of Thailand. For the participants the average age was 22. At the time of the study, the participants had been exposed to English classes for more than 15 years. When taking a closer look at their transcripts or academic records, they had enrolled in just two English reading courses at their university, which were English for Academic Purposes I and II. That was when they were second-year students. Their grades gained from these two courses varied in the range from grade A to grade B.

5.2.2 Participants’ overall use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies

According to the data obtained from the questionnaires on metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, it reveals that the fifteen participants used metacognitive awareness of reading strategies at a high level of frequency (Mean = 2.85, S.D. = 0.31). Among the three metacognitive reading strategies, the problem-solving strategies (PROB) were used at a high level whereas support reading strategies (SUP) were used at a moderate level. The problem-solving (PROB) strategies were considered as the most frequently used (Mean = 2.99, SD = 0.382) among the participants. The global reading strategies (GLOB) were ranked in the second order.
among the participants’ reading strategy use (Mean = 2.94, SD = 0.40), and the support reading strategies (SUP) were ranked in the third order respectively.

With regard to the participants’ use of each metacognitive reading strategy, there were three subscales based on the MARSI questionnaires. The first subscale was global reading strategies (GLOB). In GLOB strategies, there were nine strategies which the participants used at the high level of frequency (69.23%). The most used GLOB strategies that the participants reported consisted of previewing text (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.99), using context clues (Mean = 3.33, S.D. = 0.72), using typographical aids (Mean = 3.27, S.D. = 0.70), and using background knowledge (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.56). As for the GLOB strategies, which the participants used at the medium level, these included checking if guesses are right or wrong (Mean = 2.53, S.D. = 0.74), and checking if text content fits purpose (Mean = 2.27, S.D. = 1.03). There were no GLOB strategies used by the participants at a low level of usage.

Additionally, with regard to the second subscale of reading strategy, which is problem-solving strategies (PROB), there were eight strategies. It is obvious that out of these 8 strategies, 7 strategies were used by the participants at the high level of frequency (87.50%). The examples of strategies were re-reading (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.74), trying to get back on track when distracted (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.68), and guessing unknown words (Mean = 3.20, S.D. = 0.68). Regarding the one strategy that the participants used the least, it was still reported at the medium usage level. It was paying closer attention when facing text difficulties (Mean = 2.27, S.D. = 0.88). In this subscale, none of the participants used any PROB strategies at a low usage level.

In addition to the GLOB and PROB strategies, there were support reading strategies (SUP) which include nine strategies needed to be reported as well. There were 4 strategies used with high frequency (44.44%). The obvious examples were underlining and circling (Mean = 3.60, S.D. = 0.74) and going back and forth to find relationships (Mean = 3.00, S.D. = 0.76). As for the other strategies, they were used moderately (55.56%). The good examples were taking notes while reading (Mean = 2.13, S.D. = 0.99), reading out loud (Mean = 2.00, S.D. = 0.66), and asking self-questions (Mean = 1.93, S.D. = 0.70). Again, there were no strategies that the participants used at the low level.
Finally, in terms of the 30 individual reading strategies, there were 20 strategies (66.67%) which fell into the high usage level, and there were 10 strategies (33.33%) which fell into the medium level. When considering the results for overall reading strategy use, it appears that the PROB strategies were used the most, but the result of individual strategies was not similar. The underlining and circling (Mean = 3.60, S.D. = 0.74) was considered as the most frequently used strategy and it was categorized into SUP strategies, followed by re-reading (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.74) which was categorized into PROB strategies, including previewing text (Mean = 3.40, S.D. = 0.99) in GLOB strategies, and using context clues (Mean = 3.33, S.D. = 0.72) in GLOB strategies respectively. Last but not least, asking self-questions was considered as the strategy that the participants used the least (Mean = 1.93, S.D. = 0.70).

5.2.3 The participants’ use of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies while reading academic texts.

To gain in-depth understanding of what metacognitive awareness of reading strategies in the three subscales the participants had while they were reading the texts, there were only four participants in the analysis, those who got the highest and lowest scores from the adapted reading tests. After assessing and analyzing the data, it indicated that the two participants who got the highest scores frequently used many strategies. As for the GLOB strategies, the two participants used (1) using background knowledge, (2) previewing text, (3) deciding what to read or what to ignore, (4) using context clues, and (5) guessing what material is about. Based on the PROB strategies, they used (1) reading slowly and carefully, (2) pausing to reflect on reading, (3) re-reading, and (4) guessing unknown words. With respect to the SUP strategies, they used (1) taking notes while reading, (2) summarizing, (3) underlining and circling, and (4) paraphrasing. The participants with high English proficiency were more likely to preview the texts for getting the main ideas first. Then, they were underlining and circling the important words or ideas. They tried to connect what they already knew to help predict or understand the text being read. When they had problems with word meanings and some ideas, they read them more carefully and slowly again. They paused to think and tried to summarize or even restate in their own words for more understanding.
On the other hand, the other two participants with the lowest scores from the tests used a set of reading strategies which were quite similar to those who gained the highest scores. As for the GLOB strategies, they used (1) previewing text, and (2) guessing what material is about. Regarding the PROB strategies, they used (1) re-reading and (2) trying to get back on track when they get distracted. Based on the SUP strategies, they used (1) taking notes while reading, (2) reading out loud, (3) underlining and circling, and (4) using dictionaries. In brief, these two participants tried to quickly get the general idea at first. The strategies they used were the same as those the first two participants used. Even though they tried to re-read the words or ideas they did not know, they tried to focus on the word definitions by consulting dictionaries.

5.3 Conclusions
As stated at the beginning, the participants were mostly familiar with the traditional teaching reading pedagogy. The participants who were less successful in reading mainly focused on individual word meaning so that they could understand the text. However, when they studied in a university, they could not avoid a large amount of reading materials, especially academic texts. This can cause difficulties for the participants and for EFL learners generally. Thus, the conclusion is that it would be beneficial for both learners and language teachers to promote metacognition in reading. As discussed previously, the participants had hardly ever been trained to become skilled readers because they were exposed to only a few reading courses. Also, teachers might not plan or provide their learners opportunities to approach required texts with meaningful instructions or practical contexts. The EFL learners can improve if teachers help their learners identify their metacognitive reading strategies and use multiple strategies simultaneously to become skilled or successful readers.

5.4 Recommendations for further studies
Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are discussed for future studies.

First, further studies can be expanded to further investigate metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. The results can be compared to find out more about the relationship between metacognitive strategy use and reading skill. The studies can also
examine gender differences in metacognitive strategy use. Learning styles can be investigated in relation to metacognitive reading strategies. Learning styles and reading strategies can be verified and investigated to see why they are important considerations in a foreign language reading comprehension.

Further research about metacognitive awareness through using authentic materials in language skills can be investigated as well. If a researcher is also very interested in a qualitative study using think-aloud protocols with interviews or observations, the investigation of reading strategies and the analysis of reading behavior in reading any forms of texts can be conducted as well. However, it is advisable that think-aloud protocols be demonstrated and trained deliberately and frequently among mature EFL students or readers. If the readers do not verbalize while they are reading the texts or other reading materials, it is quite difficult for a researcher to gain primary and insightful data for analysis and further interpretation.

In addition, due to the fact that this study only involved a small number of single gender undergraduates in a Thai university, the participants of this study could not reflect the whole population of Thai EFL undergraduate students; in other words, the findings of this study might not be able to be generalized to an entire population. Thus, increasing the number of participants from both genders (males and females) and representing other majors or programs in either public or private universities in Thailand could expand the findings as different samples from other universities may provide different results.

Apart from the recommendations above, the results of this study have provided evidence that the participants were aware of using metacognitive strategies and they used a variety of the strategies while reading the academic texts. The results contribute some pedagogical implications. As concluded previously, learners and teachers will find exploring reading strategies helpful in making sense of a text. As teachers, investigating what reading strategies their students use when they read the texts is a prerequisite. Besides, according to the results of the participants’ use of reading strategies, it is indicated that asking self-questions was the least frequently used one of the support reading strategies. If teachers realize that metacognitive awareness of reading strategies is a key to successful reading comprehension, providing more opportunities for students to improve and use new strategies in metacognitive
instruction in classrooms would make students better readers. This should begin with setting good and achievable goals. Students should be taught how to monitor and reflect on the reading process and what reading strategies they use effectively so that they will struggle less in reading and confidently become more skilled or strategic readers.
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APPENDIX A

READING TEST

Test Date: 25 April 2016
Test time: 50 minutes
Numbers of items: 30 (30 Points)
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Directions: Read the passages and choose the best answer for each question in your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passages</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>Items 1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>Items 11-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>Items 21-30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scores</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Precipitation, commonly referred to as rainfall, is a measure of the quantity of water in the form of either rain, hail, or snow which reaches the ground. The average annual precipitation over the whole of the United States is thirty-six inches. It should be understood however, that a foot of snow is not equal to a foot of precipitation.

A general formula for computing the precipitation of snowfall is that ten inches of snow is equal to one inch of precipitation. New York State, for example, twenty inches of snow in one year would be recorded as only two inches of precipitation. Forty inches of rain would be recorded as forty inches of precipitation. The total annual precipitation would be recorded as forty-two inches.

The amount of precipitation is a combined result of several factors, including location, altitude, proximity to the sea, and the direction of prevailing winds. Most of the precipitation in the United States is brought originally by prevailing winds from the Pacific Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Great Lakes. Because these prevailing winds generally come from the West, the Pacific Coast receives more annual precipitation than the Atlantic Coast. Along the Pacific Coast itself, however, altitude causes some diversity in rainfall. The mountain ranges of the United States, especially the Rocky Mountain Range and the Appalachian Mountain Range, influence the amount of precipitation in their areas. East of the Rocky Mountains, the annual precipitation decreases substantially from that west of Rocky Mountains. The precipitation north of the Appalachian Mountains is about 40 percent less than that south of the Appalachian Mountains.

1. What does this passage mainly discuss?
   1. Snowfall  
   2. Precipitation  
   3. New York States  
   4. A general formula

2. Which of the following is another word that is often used in place of precipitation?
   1. Wetness  
   2. Humidity  
   3. Rainfall  
   4. Rain-snow
3. The term precipitation includes __________.
   1. only rainfall  
   2. rain, hail, and snow  
   3. rain, hail, and humidity  
   4. rain, snow, and humidity

4. What is the average annual rainfall in inches in the United States?
   1. Forty inches  
   2. Forty-two inches  
   3. Thirty-six inches  
   4. Thirty-eight inches

5. If a state has 40 inches of snow in a year, by how much does this increase the annual precipitation?
   1. By two feet  
   2. By four inches  
   3. By four feet  
   4. By forty inches

6. The phrase “proximity to” in paragraph 3 is closest in meaning to __________.
   1. nearness to  
   2. similarity to  
   3. dependence on  
   4. communication with

7. Where is the annual precipitation highest?
   1. The Great Lakes  
   2. The Pacific Coast  
   3. The Atlantic Coast  
   4. The Gulf of Mexico

8. Which of the following was NOT mentioned as a factor in determining the amount of precipitation that an area will receive?
   1. Wind  
   2. The sea  
   3. Mountain  
   4. Latitude

9. The word “substantially” in the last paragraph could best be replaced by _________.
   1. slightly  
   2. apparently  
   3. completely  
   4. fundamentally
10. The word “that” in the last line refers to __________.
   1. precipitation  2. mountain ranges
   3. decreases      4. areas

Items 1-10

PASSAGE 2

Course numbers are an indication of which courses are open to various categories of students at the University. Undergraduate courses with the numbers 100 or 200 are generally introductory courses appropriate for freshman or sophomores, whereas courses with the numbers 300 or 400 often have prerequisites and are open to juniors and seniors only. Courses with the numbers 800 or above are open only to graduate students. Certain graduate courses, generally those devoted to introductory material, are numbered 400 for undergraduate students who qualify to take them and 600 for graduate students. Courses designed for students seeking a professional degree carry 500 number for undergraduate students and a 700 number for graduate students. Courses numbered 99 or below are special interest courses that do not carry academic credit. If students elect to take a special interest course, it will not count toward the number of hours needed to complete graduation requirements.

A full-time undergraduate student is expected to take courses that total twelve to eighteen credit hours. A full-time graduate student is expected to take courses that total ten to sixteen credit hours. Student holding assistantships are expected to enroll for proportionately fewer hours. A part-time graduate student may register for a minimum of three credit hours. An overload, that is, more than the maximum number of hours, may be taken with the approval of an academic advisor. To register for an overload, students must submit the appropriate approval form when registering. Overloads above 24 hours will not be approved under any circumstances.

11. Where would this passage most likely be found?
   1. In a syllabus  2. In a graduate course
   3. In a college catalog  4. In an undergraduate course
12. What is the purpose of the passage?
   1. To inform
   2. To criticize
   3. To apologize
   4. To persuade

13. The word “prerequisites” in paragraph 1 is closest in meaning to _________.
   1. courses needed for graduation
   2. courses required before enrolling
   3. courses that include additional charge
   4. courses that do not carry academic credit

14. The word “those” in paragraph 1 refers to _________.
   1. course numbers
   2. graduate courses
   3. introductory courses
   4. graduate students

15. Which classification of students would be eligible to enroll to Mechanical Engineering 850?
   1. A graduate student
   2. A part-time student
   3. A full-time student
   4. An undergraduate student

16. If an undergraduate student uses the number 520 to register for an accounting course, what number would a graduate student probably use to register for the same course?
   1. Accounting 520
   2. Accounting 620
   3. Accounting 720
   4. Accounting 820

17. How is a student who registers for eight credit hours classified?
   1. Full-time student
   2. Graduate student
   3. Part-time student
   4. Non-degree student
18. Which of the following courses would not be included in the list of courses for graduation?

1. English 90
2. English 100
3. English 300
4. English 400

19. A graduate student may NOT ________.

1. enroll in a course numbered 610
2. register for only one-hour course
3. register for courses if he has an assistantship
4. enroll in an introductory course

20. The phrase “under any circumstances” in the last line is closest in meaning to ________.

1. without cause
2. without exception
3. without permission
4. without a good reason

Items 1-10

PASSAGE 3

During the nineteenth century, women in the United States organized and participated in a large number of reform movements, including movements to reorganize the prison system, improve education, ban the sale of alcohol, and, most importantly, to free the slaves. Some women saw similarities in the social status of women and slaves. Women like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucy Stone were feminists and abolitionists who supported the rights of both women and blacks. A number of male abolitionists, including William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Philips, also supported the rights of women to speak and participate equally with men in antislavery activities. Probably more than any other movement, abolitionism offered women a previously denied entry into politics. They became involved primarily in order to better their living conditions and the conditions of others.

When the Civil War ended in 1865, the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution adopted in 1868 and 1870 granted citizenship and suffrage to blacks.
but not to women. Discouraged but resolved, feminists influenced more and more women to demand the right to vote. In 1869, the Wyoming Territory had yielded to demands by feminists, but eastern states resisted more stubbornly than before. A women’s suffrage bill had been presented to every Congress since 1878 but it continually failed to pass until 1920, when the Nineteenth Amendment granted women the right to vote.

21. With what topic is the passage primarily concerned?
   1. Abolitionists
   2. Women’s suffrage
   3. The Wyoming Territory
   4. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments

22. Which of the following purposes is NOT involved with the reform movements?
   1. To deny women entering into politics
   2. To change the prison system
   3. To prohibit the liquor sales
   4. To let the slaves free

23. The word “supported” in paragraph 1 could best be replaced by __________.
   1. contested
   2. promoted
   3. disregarded
   4. acknowledged

24. According to the passage, why did women become active in politics?
   1. To be elected to public office
   2. To amend the Declaration of Independence
   3. To support Elizabeth Cady Stanton for president
   4. To improve the conditions of life that existed at the time

25. What had occurred shortly after Civil War?
   1. Black people were granted the right to vote.
   2. The eastern states resisted the end of the war.
   3. The Wyoming Territory was admitted to the Union.
   4. A woman’s suffrage bill was introduced in Congress.
26. The word “suffrage” in paragraph 2 could best be replaced by which of the following?

1. pain
2. citizenship
3. freedom from bondage
4. the right to vote

27. What does the Nineteenth Amendment guarantee?

1. Voting rights for blacks
2. Citizenship for blacks
3. Voting rights for women
4. Citizenship for women

28. The word “it” in paragraph 2 refers to __________.

1. bill
2. vote
3. Congress
4. Nineteenth Amendment

29. When were women allowed to vote throughout the United States?

1. After 1866
2. After 1870
3. After 1878
4. After 1920

30. Which of the following is NOT true?

1. Many women took part in reform movements.
2. Lucy Stone also supported male abolitionists.
3. Eastern states contradicted the voting rights for women.
4. Some women thought that women and slaves had the same social status.

END OF THE TEST
APPENDIX B

THAI QUESTIONAIRE

แบบสอบถาม

การศึกษาความระนองความตระหนักรู้เกี่ยวกับการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ (A Study of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies in Thai EFL Learners)

ส่วนที่ 1: คำถามทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

คั่นชี้แจง: กรุณาเติมข้อความในช่องว่างให้สมบูรณ์

- อายุ ________ ปี
- วิชาเอก ________________ ชั้นปีที่ ______
-เกรดวิชาการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษที่ผ่านมา
  - วิชา __________________________ เกรดที่ได้ ______
  - วิชา __________________________ เกรดที่ได้ ______
  - วิชา __________________________ เกรดที่ได้ ______
- จำนวนปีที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ________ ปี

ส่วนที่ 2: คำถามเกี่ยวกับกลวิธีในการอ่านของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

คั่นชี้แจง: กรุณาอ่านข้อความกลวิธีการอ่านในแต่ละข้อ และวงกลมหมายเลข (0, 1, 2, 3 หรือ 4) แสดงความถี่ที่ใช้กลวิธีในการอ่านที่ตนเองใช้ตามความจริง

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>หมายเลข</th>
<th>ความหมาย</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ข้าพเจ้าไม่เคยใช้วิธีนี้เลย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ข้าพเจ้าแทบจะไม่ใช้วิธีนี้เลย หรือใช้วิธีน้อยมาก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ข้าพเจ้าใช้วิธีน้อยบ้าง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ข้าพเจ้าใช้วิธีบ่อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ข้าพเจ้าใช้วิธีเสมอ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>กลวิธีในการอ่าน</td>
<td>ไม่เคย ใช้เลย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ข้าพเจ้ามีเป้าหมายในการอ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ข้าพเจ้าจัดตั้งสิ่งที่ไม่ควรอ่าน และอ่านที่อ่านที่ไม่ควร</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ข้าพเจ้าไม่สนใจสิ่งที่ข้าพเจ้ารู้ เพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจสิ่งที่ อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเรื่องที่อ่านที่เป็นที่สนใจมาก</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านออกเสียง เพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ข้าพเจ้าสรุปใจความ เพื่อแสดงข้อมูลสำคัญของ เรื่องที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเนื้อหาของเรื่องที่อ่าน ตามเป้าหมายในการอ่านของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านขั้นตอนชนะเหล่านี้ เพื่อทำความเข้าใจ เข้าใจสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ข้าพเจ้ากำหนดเวลาการอ่านในสิ่งที่อ่านที่ไม่จับผูก ตามความต้องการของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเวลาที่อ่านอย่างรวดเร็ว</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเวลาที่อ่านเพื่อตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเวลาที่อ่านเพื่อตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเวลาที่อ่านเพื่อตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ข้าพเจ้าจัดการเวลาที่อ่านเพื่อตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของข้าพเจ้า</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
กลวิธีในการอ่าน ไม่เคย ใช้เลย แทบไม่เคยใช้ ใช้บางครั้ง ใช้บ่อย ใช้เสมอ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ไม่เคยใช้</th>
<th>แทบไม่เคยใช้</th>
<th>ใช้บางครั้ง</th>
<th>ใช้บ่อย</th>
<th>ใช้เสมอ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจแหล่งข้อมูลอ้างอิงเช่น ผลงานอุตสาหกรรมเพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจในสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ข้าพเจ้าสนใจในสิ่งที่อ่านมากขึ้น เมื่อพบว่าสิ่งที่อ่านนั้นยาก</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ข้าพเจ้าดูตาราง แผนภูมิ และรูปภาพต่างๆ เพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจ สิ่งที่อ่านมากขึ้น</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ข้าพเจ้าหยุดอ่านในบางครั้ง และหยุดคิดในสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ข้าพเจ้าเต็มความหมายจากบริบท เพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจสิ่งที่อ่านมากขึ้น</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านข้อความจากสิ่งที่อ่าน และคำศัพท์ของตนเองเพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจสิ่งที่อ่านมากขึ้น</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. ข้าพเจ้าพยายามบวกภาพจากสิ่งที่อ่าน เพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจมากขึ้น</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ข้าพเจ้าพิจารณารูปแบบตัวอักษร เช่น ตัวหนาและตัวเอียง เพื่อช่วยเข้าใจข้อมูลสำคัญต่างๆ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านและประเมินสิ่งที่อ่านอย่างวิเคราะห์</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านล้อไปล้อมา เพื่อชื่อมองความสัมพันธ์จากสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ข้าพเจ้าตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของตนเอง เมื่อพบข้อผิดพลาดที่ตนเอง</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ข้าพเจ้าพยายามเท่าสิ่งต่างๆที่ต้องการกับอะไร</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. ข้าพเจ้าอ่านใหม่อีกครั้งเพื่อช่วยให้เข้าใจมากขึ้น เมื่อพบว่าสิ่งที่อ่านนั้นยาก</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. ข้าพเจ้ายาวงการแก้ปัญหาเพื่อต้องการคำตอบจากสิ่งที่อ่าน</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ข้าพเจ้าตรวจสอบว่าสิ่งที่คิดค้นไว้เท่ากับสิ่งที่อ่านมากขึ้นหรือไม่</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. ข้าพเจ้าพยายามแสดงความหมาย ของคำศัพท์หรือกลุ่มคำที่ไม่รู้จักจากบริบทต่างๆ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Sheet
ใบสรุปผลการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามรายบุคคล

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOB (Global Reading Strategies)</th>
<th>PROB (Problem-Solving Reading Strategies)</th>
<th>SUP (Support Reading Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ________</td>
<td>8. ________</td>
<td>2. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ________</td>
<td>11. ________</td>
<td>5. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ________</td>
<td>13. ________</td>
<td>6. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ________</td>
<td>16. ________</td>
<td>9. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ________</td>
<td>18. ________</td>
<td>12. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ________</td>
<td>21. ________</td>
<td>15. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ________</td>
<td>27. ________</td>
<td>20. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ________</td>
<td>30. ________</td>
<td>24. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ________</td>
<td></td>
<td>28. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

คะแนนที่ได้ ________  คะแนนเฉลี่ยที่ได้ ________  คะแนนที่ได้ ________  คะแนนเฉลี่ยที่ได้ ________  คะแนนที่ได้ ________  คะแนนเฉลี่ยที่ได้ ________
Task-based language teaching: An empirical study of task transfer

Susan D Benson

Abstract

Since the 1980s, task-based language teaching (TBLT) has enjoyed considerable interest from researchers of second language acquisition (SLA), resulting in a growing body of empirical evidence to support how and to what extent this approach can promote language learning. Although transferability and generalizability are critical assumptions for TBLT, there is little empirical evidence that task-related language abilities are indeed transferable. The current study was conducted to address this need for empirical research on generalizability and transfer critical for the planning of teaching and assessment of learning by specifically investigating whether or not transfer occurs between two similar pedagogic tasks. Fifty-three randomly assigned low-level adult second language learners were trained in a computer lab to complete one of two pedagogic tasks or no task, after which all participants were tested on two transfer tasks. Although the results of a MANCOVA did not provide statistically significant evidence of transfer, a post hoc analysis on a subset of the lowest proficiency learners suggests that task-related language abilities are transferable. Directions for future research and implications for teaching and assessment are discussed in light of the present findings.
Effects of task repetition on learners’ attention orientation in L2 oral production

Janya Fukuta

Abstract

Task repetition facilitates learners’ performance, at least temporarily: Since learners are already familiar with the content of the task at the initial enactment, they are capable of focusing their attention on linguistic form during the following enactment. However, the analysis in previous studies treated various aspects of ‘form’ as one package. This study examined learners’ attention shifts during repeated task engagement by methodological triangulation. The experiment required 28 Japanese learners of English to perform narrative tasks twice. Learners’ performance was analysed, and the protocol data elicited by stimulated recall were coded along their attention orientations. The result partially supported the form-focused effects of task repetition: learners focused more on the syntactic encoding process and less on the conceptualizing process at the second task enactment when they engaged in the same task twice. Possible theoretical and pedagogical implications are discussed.
Communicative Language Teaching and Its Impact on Students’ Performance

PhDc. Hysen Kasumi

Abstract

Communicative Language Teaching as a method of 21st century in terms of learning foreign languages undoubtedly takes a very important place, if not central place in Kosovo curriculum for high schools. In our research, we did a literature review regarding the Method of Communication, in the regional countries, Europe Union and beyond. Initially it is studied Kosovo curriculum and then application of this method in Kosovo schools. Since, CLT shows a number of advantages compared with other standard methods, its impact on students’ performance and motivation. Moreover, it was conducted a research by observing some of the schools in urban and rural areas, to see how this approach is implemented in our schools. Furthermore, there was also conducted an empirical research of student performance based on the four language skills such as reading, writing, speaking and listening. It was also used the experimental method to see the differences of students’ performance, of those who are taught using the Communicative Language Teaching Method and those who are taught with other standard methods.
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