CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of data analyses for this study. The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of reading strategies when university students reading business texts in English. This study also discovers how they use the strategies in actual reading tasks. In addition, the study investigates what similarities and differences exist between the actual use of strategies among high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs).

In this section, the results are organized around the three research questions that guided this study. The results and findings are reported accordingly to the research questions. The results of each research question are described in the following order: 1) What metacognitive strategies do the third year students majoring in business English use when reading English Business texts?; 2) What difficulties do the third year students majoring in Business English encounter when reading English Business texts?; and 3) How differently do the third year students majoring in Business English with high and low English reading proficiency use metacognitive strategies?.

4.1 Research Question One: What metacognitive reading strategies do the third year students majoring in Business English use when reading English business texts?

Descriptive statistics were employed to answer the first research question. The descriptive statistics included mean and standard deviation of each strategy use, the overall use, and the use of three main strategy categories.

The research question one directly indicted the metacognitive reading strategies used by the third -year Business English majors when reading English business texts who voluntarily participated in this research project. The 36 third- year Business English majors were orderly asked to reflect upon each statement and to rate their frequencies of strategy use.

Based on the three levels of interpretation of reading strategy use proposed by Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995), these mean scores can be divided into three levels of interpretation: high ($\overline{X}$ = 3.50 or above), moderate ($\overline{X}$ = 2.50-3.49), and low ($\overline{X}$ below 2.50) (See Table 3.1).

Table 4.1 below indicates the class profile on individual thirty-item MSIBRCS used in terms of the frequency, meaning, standard deviation, Level of use and rank of each item employed by the third year students majoring in Business English.

Table 4.1

Mean, Standard Deviations, Level of Use and Rank of each MSIBRCS Item (N =36)

Strategy	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. I have a purpose in mind when I read about business text.	3.30	0.79	Moderate	21
2. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.	3.25	0.79	Moderate	23
3. I think about what I already know to help me understand what I read.	2.70	1.33	Moderate	29
4. I take an overall view of the business text to see what it is about before reading it.	2.83	0.93	Moderate	27
5. When business text becomes difficult, I read aloud to myself to understand what I read.	3.20	1.24	Moderate	24

Table 4.1.1 (Cont.)

Strategy	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level	Rank
6. I analyze whether the content of the business text fits my reading purpose.	3.97	0.99	High	4
7. I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading.	3.68	0.74	High	11
8. I review the business text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.	3.41	0.71	Moderate	17
9. I try to get back on track what I lose concentration.	4.25	0.79	High	2
10. I underline or circle information in the business text to help me remember it.	4.46	0.86	High	1
11. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.	3.67	1.05	High	12
12. When reading business text, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	3.33	1.30	Moderate	19
13. I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me remember it.	3.12	1.23	Moderate	25
14. When business text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.	4.18	0.85	High	3
15. I use tables, figures, and pictures in business text to increase my understanding.	3.92	1.09	High	6
16. I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.	3.46	1.04	Moderate	16
17. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.	3.23	1.10	Moderate	22
18. I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.	3.90	0.92	High	7
19. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.	3.48	1.06	Moderate	15
20. I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.	3.72	1.15	High	8
21. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	2.77	0.99	Moderate	28
22. I go back and forth in the business text to find relationship among ideas in it.	3.70	0.97	High	9
23. I check my understanding when I come across new information.	3.64	0.84	High	16
24. I try to guess what the context of the business text is about when I read.	3.69	0.99	High	10
25. When business text becomes difficult, I reread it to increase my understanding.	2.90	1.10	Moderate	26
26. I ask myself questions I'd like to have answered in the business text.	2.67	1.13	Moderate	30
27. I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong	3.55	0.92	High	14
28. When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	3.96	0.82	High	5
29. When reading business text, I translate from English into Thai.	3.33	1.30	Moderate	19
30. When reading, I think about information in both English and Thai.	3.37	0.68	Moderate	18
Grand Total	**3.49**	**0.99**	**Moderate**	

As shown in the Table 4.1, the average score of the overall use of metacognitive reading strategies employed by 36 business English students was at the moderate level ($\overline{X}$=3.49, S.D.=0.99). Observationally, fourteen strategies were reported as high usage, and sixteen strategies were reported as moderate usages. There were not any strategies used at a low level. The mean scores of individual strategy items ranged from high were 4.46 to 2.67. The degrees of frequency of reading strategies vary; the most frequently reported strategy was no. 10 "I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it." ($\overline{X}$ = 4.46, S.D. = 0.86), followed by strategies no. 9 "I try to get back on track what I lose concentration." ($\overline{X}$ = 4.25, S.D. = 0.79), and no. 14 "when reading business text become difficult I pay closer attention to what I am reading" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.18, S.D.= 0.85), respectively. The strategy with the lowest mean was no. 26 "I ask myself questions I'd like to have answered in the text." ($\overline{X}$ = 2.67, S.D. = 1.13), followed by No. 3 "I think about what I already know to help me understand what I read." ($\overline{X}$ = 2.70, S.D. = 1.33) and no. 21 "I ask myself questions I'd like to have answered in the business text." ($\overline{X}$ = 2.77, S.D. = 0.99), respectively.

The following part discussed about descriptive statistics were employed to answer the second research question. The descriptive statistics included means and standard deviations of each strategy use, the overall use, and the use of three main strategy categories. To explore the strategy use of students in greater details, the strategy items were categorized into three separate subcategories: global reading strategies (13 items), problem solving reading strategies (8 items), and support reading strategies (9 items). Thirty strategy items which fall into the three categories

of metacognitive reading strategies are listed in the order of mean of the strategy use

score reported by the participants in Table 4. 2 below.

Table 4.2

Mean, Standard Deviation, Meaning and Rank of Three Broad Strategies Used

by Surveyed Students (N = 36)

Strategy	Surveyed Students (N = 36)			
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank
Global Reading Strategies (GRS)				
1. Setting the purpose of reading	3.30	0.79	Moderate	21
3. Using prior knowledge	2.70	1.33	Moderate	29
4. Previewing the text before reading	2.83	0.93	Moderate	27
6. Checking how text content fits the purpose	3.97	0.99	High	4
8. Noting length and organization	3.68	0.74	High	17
12. Deciding what to read closely	3.33	1.30	Moderate	19
15. Using text features (e.g., tables, figures)	3.92	1.09	High	6
17. Using context clues	3.23	1.10	Moderate	22
20. Using typographical aids (e.g., italics)	3.72	1.15	High	15
21. Analyzing and evaluating what is read	2.77	0.99	Moderate	28
23. Checking my understanding	3.64	0.84	High	16
24. Predicting or guessing text meaning	3.69	0.99	High	10
27. Confirming predictions	3.55	0.92	High	14
Total	**3.41**	**1.01**	**Moderate**	**3**
Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSRS)				
7. Reading slowly and carefully	3.68	0.74	High	11
9. Trying to stay focused on reading	4.25	0.79	High	2
11. Adjusting the reading speed	3.67	1.05	High	12
14. Paying closer attention to reading	4.18	0.85	High	3
16. Pausing and thinking about reading	3.46	1.04	Moderate	6
19. Visualizing information read	3.48	1.06	Moderate	15
25. Rereading for better understanding	3.69	0.99	High	10
28. Guessing meaning of unknown words	3.96	0.85	High	5
Total	**3.80**	**0.92**	**High**	**1**

Table 4. 2 (Cont.)

Strategy	Surveyed Students (N = 36)			
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank
Support Reading Strategies (SRS)				
2. Taking notes while reading	3.25	0.79	Moderate	23
5. Reading aloud when text becomes hard	3.20	1.24	Moderate	27
10. Underlining information in the text	4.46	0.86	High	1
13. Using reference materials (e.g., dictionary)	3.12	1.23	Moderate	25
18. Paraphrasing for better understanding	3.90	0.92	High	7
22. Going back and forth in text	3.70	0.97	High	9
26. Asking myself questions	2.67	1.13	Moderate	30
29. Translating from English into Thai	3.33	1.30	Moderate	5
30. Thinking in both English and Thai	3.37	0.68	Moderate	19
Total	**3.45**	**1.01**	**Moderate**	**2**

As revealed in the table above, the findings revealed that problem solving reading strategies at the high level with the mean of 3.80 the students employed the support reading strategies and global reading strategies were used at the moderate levels with the mean of 3.45, and 3.41 respectively.

As for subcategories of self-reported strategies, the most frequently reported strategy was no. 10 "Underlining information in the text" ($\overline{X}$=4.46, S.D.=0.86), followed by strategies no. 9 "Trying to stay focused on reading" ($\overline{X}$=4.25, S.D. = 0.79), and no. 14 "Paying closer attention to reading" ($\overline{X}$ = 4.18, S.D. = 0.85), respectively. The strategy with the lowest mean score was no. 26 "Asking myself questions" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.67, S.D. = 1.13), followed by no. 3 "Using prior knowledge" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.70, S.D.= 1.33) and no. 21 "Analyzing and evaluating what is read" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.77, S.D. = 0.99), respectively.

4.2 Research Question Two: What difficulties do third year students majors in Business English encounter when reading English business texts?

This section presents frequencies of difficulties do third year students majors in Business English encounter when reading English business texts. The finding found that difficulties of third year students majors in Business English as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3   Frequencies of difficulties in reading English business texts.

Problems of the students when reading English business texts	Frequency	Percent
Vocabulary Problems	3	37.5
Grammatical Structure Problems	3	37.5
problems related to the organization of the passage and to the length of the text	2	25
Total	**8**	**100**

As shown in Table 4.3. it shows the grand total of frequencies were 8 (100%) in difficulties of third year students majors in Business English encounter when reading English business texts. There are three problems, namely, vocabulary problems, grammatical structure problems and problems related to organization of the passage and to the length of the text, respectively. In terms of the difficulties of third year students majors in Business English found the most difficulty were vocabulary problems (f=3,37.5%) and grammatical structure problems (f=3,37.5%) followed by

problems related to the organization of the passage and to the length of the text (f=2,25%), respectively.

The following section reports the results of the data. Data gathered from semi-structured interviews that learner knowledge has a crucial part to read the context of business texts. Therefore, the current section aims to shed light on the issue of learners' knowledge reading on metacognative strategies use.

Case studies of learners, as the major part of the main study, start from this question. Three data sources prioritized for analysis in relation to the case studies are individual semi-structured interviews. Research question is based mainly upon the data from semi-structured interviews (SSI) with the eight case study students, four HRPSs and four LRPSs about their perceived strategy use for the English business texts. The eight case study students were selected from their TOEIC Test scores. They came from Business English major: Anna, Sarah, Taylor and Jasmine were HRPSs and Stella, Molly, Camilla, and Jacob were LRPSs.

In each case, the research first sets out to introduce the student through the biographical profile (chiefly based on the students' interview data), and then the research examines in depth the research evidence about learner knowledge underlying their perceived strategy use. Furthermore, to facilitate the linkage between the strategy items on the MSIBRCS and those conspicuously observed in the strategy numbers which appeared on the MSIBRCS were also mentioned when discussing the use of each particular strategy in the following section.

4.2.1 High Reading Proficiency Students (HRPSs)

In this study, there are four case-study participants involved with this session. The following part is to present the HRPS group in terms of metacognitive reading strategies used for reading business English texts.

4.2.1.1 Case Study One: Anna

Anna was a 21 years old student, she started learning English. She was the only young of the secondary school. Her father was a farmer from Buriram and her mother was an original Buriram girl. Like every undergraduate student, Anna had to make the choice between Business English major and English Education major. She chose Business English major without hesitation. Anna's interest about business might be in some degree related to her imaginary learning or practice of English. Indeed, she was apt to initiate "self-amused" methods for English learning at home, such as listening to English songs and singing along, listening to music on a CD player while doing homework, and reading aloud English words or texts as she moved around.

Interestingly, at university, Anna was a friendly, hardworking student, but sometimes seemed to be detached to seek solitude. She was active in studies but too preoccupied with her own ways of learning, she seemed to have many ideas in mind and know well how to learn and how to select what to learn from what was taught in class. In the English classes, Anna was always serious about assignments, tried to make what she did the best, even though she was not so often seen to volunteer to answer questions or make classroom presentations.

In class, she enjoyed role play performance with her partner and other classmates even though role-play activities were rare to be set for the senior. She was

keen on some hands-on strategies such as note-taking, making error-notebooks, and

using a variety of marking symbols. Anna reported that her books were full of

marking symbols. Anna recalled this habitual classroom experience as follows:

> While the teacher was lecturing, I was casually drawing something.
> When reviewing the lesson some time later, I usually couldn't
> remember what the teacher taught in class. But, I could manage to
> recollect what the teacher said. In my senior studies, I no longer make
> such drawings. (Self report, April 20, 2013).

During reading English business texts, to foster the use of strategy No. 14,

Anna decided to read the comprehension questions first, explaining, "Reading the

questions helps me focus later on the text much more precisely. I know what to

ignore and what to read closely, especially when reading a long passage." In addition,

trying to come up with answers for the comprehension questions such as the meanings

of the unknown word, she demonstrated her competent skills at locating information

in business text.

In this case, she did not only use context to determine the word meaning in

Thai but also referred to a synonym in English which she has already known in order

to comprehend the text.

As illustrated above, when facing unfamiliar words or expressions, Anna

usually depended on context clues. The researcher then asked her to elaborate which

strategy she used to deal with word difficulty, and she ranked the following strategies

in order of her frequency of use: context clues, and dictionary search. She articulated

her perspective,

> I usually start with context clues because they help me read faster and
> easier without stopping to look up every new word in a dictionary. I use a
> dictionary only if it is impossible to guess from the context. Unfortunately,
> I sometimes cannot find certain words in a dictionary.
> (Interview, April 20, 2013).

Later, when she was a bit confused attempting to find an answer, she relied on strategy No. 22 "Going back and forth in text" in order to find relationships among ideas in it.

Even though Anna was a HRPS, she sometimes struggled with understanding complex ideas presented in the text. To alleviate the situation, two problem solving strategies, No. 14 "Paying closer attention to reading" and No. 25 "Rereading for better understanding", were used as she indicated, "The answer should be in this paragraph, but it seems complicated. Let me take some time to read what it says here more carefully". She further commented,

> This paragraph is a bit difficult to read and I still can't find the answer. So let me read it one more time (Interview, April 20, 2013).

Based on the self-report, Anna read this article as one of her class assignments. Reading on her own at home, she first reported printing out a hard copy of the article. She reasoned,

> I usually prefer to print out the text, especially when I read business texts in my class because I really need to jot down some important things and underline keywords or main ideas. It helps me better understand the text I read (Interview, April 20, 2013).

However, in certain cases, she was obliged to employ strategy No. 13 "Using reference materials" (i.e., dictionary) due to a dearth of context clues provided. To illustrate, Anna pointed out, "The concluding sentence in this article says,

> There's a little bit of hyperbole going on here". I think the word "hyperbole" is sort of important. Without enough context, I decided to look it up in my dictionary (Self-report, April 20, 2013).

Anna discussed how she used strategy No. 21 "Analyzing and evaluating what is read". She accounted, "The information presented should be trustworthy because the article contains reliable research references" (Interview, April 20, 2013).

To sum up, Anna was one of the HRPSs who had developed practical skills in using metacognitive reading strategies to rapidly locate information in reading business texts. She also preferred to make educated guesses about the meanings of unknown words by using context clues. However, in certain cases where she was provided with insufficient clues, she resorted to a dictionary. One thing that made Anna differ from several other participants was that she liked to print out a hard copy of what she read, particularly when she read class assignments. It was advantageous for her to underline main ideas and take useful notes while reading business English texts.

4.2.1.2 Case Study Two: Sarah

Sarah was 22 years old. She was the eldest among the two children in a farming family. Sarah was a pleasant, hardworking student, who had many friends both at university and Secondnary School. In class, she had frequent eye-contact with the teacher and her facial expressions might tell the teacher whether or not she understood what had been taught. Every moment in class, she kept concentrating on what the teacher were saying, doing, and showing great respect for the teacher.

Sarah preferred group learning style most. From what she reported in focus group and semi-structured interviews, her group major style preference evolved out of two types of learning experiences: participating in classroom group activities and cooperating with a small group of friends in the dormitory after school. She was not only active in responding to the teacher's questions but also enthusiastic in organizing and participating in group activities in English classes.

While undertaking metacognitive reading strategy tasks, Sarah adopted a unique approach to reading comprehension. Instead of reading the questions to locate where required information is, Sarah decided to complete the task in the opposite direction. She reasoned,

> I'd rather read the whole text before I read and respond to the comprehension questions (interview, April 20, 2013).

As revealed in her explanation, Sarah expected to gain a thorough understanding, rather than a gist of the text that she read per se. Sarah spent most of the time decoding what unknown words meant in order to achieve a thorough and insightful comprehension of the text, which was associated with strategy No. 13 "Using reference materials". Her distinguishable reading behavior was exhibited in the following instances:

> I've seen the word "specific" before and I think I know the meaning.
> Anyway, let me look it up in dictionary just to make sure.
> (Interview, April 20, 2013).

Not only did Sarah consult the dictionary frequently to deal with words whose meanings she was unsure of, but she also chose to take advantage of context clues available to handle word problems at times (Strategy No. 28 "Guessing meaning of unknown words").

According to her self-report of metacognitive reading strategies, she used some other useful strategies. First of all, strategy No. 11 "Adjusting reading speed" was mentioned as she commented, "I am interested in the news itself although I know it is difficult to understand the language". In order to tackle the text difficulty she encountered, Sarah further added,

Since this text is hard, I read much more slowly. Adjusting my reading speed is very important when I start to make sense of the article (Interview, April 20, 2013).

To sum up, in contrast to other participants, Sarah adopted a distinctive approach to reading comprehension whereby she preferred to read the whole text for detailed information, rather than merely give responses to comprehension questions. When she had vocabulary difficulty, Sarah chose to consult the dictionary frequently although she sometimes could use enough context clues provided to determine the meanings of unknown words. She tended to focus her particular attention to every detail of a brief text whereas she only skimmed through a long text and skipped several unfamiliar words and expressions.

4.2.1.3 Case Study Three: Taylor

Taylor was 21 years old. She was in the countryside. She used to be one of the most excellent students when she was a countryside high school. She was considered one of the most promising students, who were expected to be able to enter one of the city key schools.

Taylor proceeded to read the comprehension questions before returning to read the whole text very attentively. Taylor frequently employed strategies No. 13 "Using reference materials" and strategies No. 28 "Guessing meaning of unknown words" to sort out her vocabulary difficulty. Taylor's implementation of these strategies manifested itself in the following quotes:

> I don't know what dispute refers to. *"In the order best serve you and to enable us to file a dispute on your behalf."* This sentence gives no explanation of the term. So, I will consult dictionary first to see what it is short for. That's too bad. I need to ask my teacher, and I think I can know the meaning

I am searching for the meanings of "dispute" from the dictionary because this paragraph does not give me much context to guess their meanings (Interview, April 20, 2013).

As revealed above, it was evident that Taylor attempted to depend on context clues first to derive the meaning of unknown words. Once she failed to make use of them or the clues given were not sufficient, she resorted to using reference materials.

In summary, Taylor was another high proficient reader who liked to use a wide range of pre-reading strategies to predict what she was about to read as well as to make a decision on how to best approach the text. With a high level of English proficiency, Taylor expected to understand the text in detail; therefore, she focused on word meanings and ideas presented. In so doing, she relied on either context clues or outside resources such as a dictionary, talking dictionary and cell phone. Moreover, Taylor demonstrated how she sought material on the same topic in Thai, which was one of the strategies less often observed among the participants, to complement the information on a particular topic as well as to facilitate her understanding of the English business text she read.

4.2.1.4 Case Study Four: Jasmine

Jasmine was 21 years old. She had been studying English in tutoring centers for 3 years, and considered her overall English and reading proficiency levels as good. During the interview, she appeared to be a very proficient and confident English reader, and she rated her English reading proficiency as excellent as compared with those of her classmates. For entertainment purposes, she sometimes played online games, used social media, watched movie and downloaded music in English versions.

At the beginning of the first session, having read all comprehension questions, Jasmine decided to read the first paragraph only. While interview so, she explained,

I am reading this paragraph only because I think the main idea of the whole text should be embedded in it (Interview, April 20, 2013).

Once she got the gist of the text, she reviewed the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization (Strategy No. 8) and paid particular attention to several phrases in bold type (Strategy No. 20) as she thought that reading these phrases could save much time. She accounted,

> I understood what the text is talking about. So I am trying to figure out some important details contained by looking at these phrases in bold type. This really helps because I don't need to read the whole thing in order to get the essential ideas (Interview, April 20, 2013).

During the second session, Jasmine selected the same strategies; however, due to some differences in terms of organization of the text, only reading the first paragraph was not very helpful for her to get the main idea of the text. She pointed out,

> I tried to read the first paragraph as I usually do. But I think it doesn't tell me important things here in this paragraph; it only serves as an introduction to the topic. I just have to read more
> (Interview, April 20, 2013)

Based on the excerpt above, several strategies that Jasmine used to comprehend the text could be identified: using typographical aids (Strategy No. 20), using tables, figures, and pictures (Strategy No. 15), and deciding what to read closely and what to ignore (Strategy No. 12).

To sum up, Jasmine was a very proficient reader. She chose to read all comprehension questions before using English business reading strategies to guess the main idea of the whole text. Throughout the interviews, Jasmine tended to use several strategies related to the organization of the texts much more often the other common strategies, including those dealing with word difficulty. However, when faced with

unknown words, she activated her own background knowledge and used context clues to help determine the meanings. Another sophisticated strategy, distinguishing fact from opinion in online texts, was clearly observed. Like several other informants, Jasmine adjusted her reading speed as well as techniques according to the differing level of reading text and the familiarity with the topic.

4.2.2 Low Reading Proficiency Students (LRPSs)

Generally, there are four case-study participants involved in this session. The following part is to present the LRPS group in terms of metacognitive reading strategies used for reading business English texts, respectively.

4.2.2.1 Case Study One: Stella

Stella was a 20 year student. She liked English a lot when she could understand the vocabulary, but as the vocabulary size requirements increased, she did not like it as much as she used to. However, she still liked English because she enjoyed English-learning games. Unfortunately, as time went by and the content became harder, the teacher used fewer games in class.

Before she actually started to read,(Strategy No. 3) "Using prior knowledge" was observed as she skimmed the text from overall content by looking at the title, and they then continued to read the passage slowly to get the main ideas.

After predicting what the passage was about, Stella looked at the first sentence of each paragraph to understand the overall key information of the (business reading) passage. Then she slowly continued to read.

> Firstly, I try to know what the scope of a passage is and what it is about
> by roughly reading it. Then I continue to read the text at hand slowly... I
> think it is hard for me to think about the information of the passage and
> tring to follow its information slowly is enough to understand it.
> (Interview, April 20,2013)

In the past, Stella found it difficult to remember words learnt before. After the session on keeping vocabulary records, she realized the need to record and revise what she had learnt. However, in the second interview, she downplayed the importance of revision, claiming that vocabulary notebooks, which just strengthened memory, were not too useful. This showed she missed the whole point of the metacognitive strategy.

To sum up, Stella hardly used any strategies to predict what the author was discussing in the passage. It was difficult for her to predict the content of a business text. Therefore, she simply read the English business texts and tried to comprehend the information slowly.

4.2.2.2 Case Study Two: Molly

Molly was 21 year student. She was a friendly and easy-going student. Molly spent approximately two to three hours reading business each day materials. From time to time, Molly had to read news in English for class assignments although she preferred up-to-date news in Thai.

During interview, her explanation reflected the use of Strategies No. 13 "Using reference materials" and No. 28 "guessing meaning of unknown words". The manner in which these common strategies were used was, however, found to be in reverse direction to many other participants. As evidenced in the data, Molly chose to consult a dictionary immediately after she found an unknown word or expression. Unable to find words in her dictionary, Molly resorted to making use of context provided in the text, the strategy which was much preferred by several other readers.

> I always use the dictionary when I cannot understand or guess the
> meanings of unknown words. Actually, I think that dictionary is very

important for me because when I see the unknown words I cannot
understand the whole texts if I skip those words.
(Interview, April 20, 2013)

To sum up, Molly was a less proficient reader who experienced difficulties

with vocabulary in the texts. To help alleviate the problem, Molly consulted her

English-Thai dictionary, it provided literal translations. As indicated earlier, the

manner in which word-attack strategies were used was in reverse direction to several

other informants.

4.2.2.3 Case Study Three: Camilla

Camilla was 21year student. With regard to her reading use behavior, Camilla

rated herself as having low skills in using the technique to locate and access

information on a wide range of topics. Each day, she spent about one hour in reading

business English for class assignments.

Camilla is interesting to guess meaning from context, many participants

preferred to read only the sentences that came before and after the sentence where the

word was embedded. In contrast, while the word she found was in the middle of the

paragraph, Camilla decided to read the whole paragraph in order to learn the meaning

of the word as she explained below:

I tried to guess the meaning of unknown word by reading what comes
before and after. When I have a problem, I will use the context around
the unknown words to help and then I will guessed the meaning of
them.
(Interview, April 20, 2013)

To sum up, Camilla, like other LRPSs, experienced major vocabulary

difficulties throughout the interview. However, in her case, her feeling of

considerable anxiety was expressed as she was unaware of not only the meanings of

unknown words in the texts but also those of words used in some comprehension questions. Camilla sometimes skipped certain difficult words or sections and decided to answer the questions using her background knowledge.

4.2.2.4 Case Study Four: Jacob

Jacob was a 21 year student. Jacob spent about one or two hours a day reading class materials in business English. He also had an opportunity to use English, and was not the only student who enjoyed the recitation strategy (learning by heart a text or parts of a text through repetitions).

During interview, his explanation reflected the use of Strategies No. 13 "Using reference materials." As evidenced in the data, Jacob chose to consult a dictionary immediately after he found an unknown word and he said that "this was the easiest way for me to find the meaning of words correctly". Therefore, when he encountered unknown words, he immediately checked their meaning in the dictionary, as illustrated by the example of Jacob, he said:

> I mostly open the dictionary. When I see the unknown words , I cannot understand the text without skipping them, I look up in dictionary immediately. The dictionary is very important for reading because there are many unfamiliar and difficult words
> (Interview, April 20, 2013)

The excerpt above indicates that, to deal with vocabulary difficulty, Jacob preferred to use reference materials. (Strategy No. 13).

To sum up, similar to the cases of other LRPSs, Jacob's difficulty with business English reading comprehension was largely attributed to his narrow vocabulary repertoire. When he dealt with word problems, he deciding to consult outside resources (e.g., dictionary, electronic dictionary and cell phone).

The previous section reported on the eight selected students' actual use of strategies when undertaking reading comprehension tasks for business English texts. The qualitative data were collected from the following sources: MSIBRC questionnaires and reading interviews. In addition, it was found that the high English reading proficiency students (HRPSs) used 10 metacognitive strategies - "paying closer attention to reading" (Strategy No. 14), "Rereading for better to understanding" (Strategy No.25), "Using reference materials (e.g., dictionary)" (Strategy No.13), "Analyzing and evaluating what is read"(Strategy No.21), " Guessing the meaning of unknown words"(Strategy No.28), "Adjust reading speed"(Strategy No.11), " Nothing length and organization"(Strategy No. 8), "Using typographical aids (e.g., italics)"(Strategy No. 20), "Using text features (e.g., tables, figures)"(Strategy No. 15), and "Deciding what to read closely"(Strategy No.12). Opposed to them, the Low English reading proficiency students (LRPSs) used few metacognitive strategies to help them with their reading. Additional finding showed that there were various reading difficulties that students struggled with in their reading – "Using prior knowledge" (Strategy No.3), "Using reference materials (e.g., dictionary)" (Strategy No. 13), and " Guessing the meaning of unknown words" (Strategy No.28).

The following part discusses the overall picture of the perceived three broad frequently used strategies employed by HRPSs and the LRPSs participating in this study. Insights gained from the findings contribute to our better understanding of how the students selected metacognitive strategies to foster their metacognitve reading for business. In the Table 4.3 below, the GRS, PSRS, and SRS subsections are accompanied. Table 4.3 shows the results:

4.3 Research Question Three: How differently do the third year students majoring in Business English with high and low English reading proficiency use metacognitive strategies?

The purpose of the research question three was to gain an understanding of the differences which existed between the actual use of strategies among high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs). The combined methods, namely quantitative and qualitative methods from multiple sources which allowed triangulation were used to answer this research questions. The quantitative data came from the MSIBRCS, which measured the students' perceived use of metacognitive strategies when they read business English texts.

Table 4.4

Differences in Reading Strategy between HRPSs and LRPSs

Strategy	HRPSs (N=21)				LRPSs (N=15)			
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank
Global Reading Strategies (GRS)								
1. Setting purpose for reading	3.17	0.71	Moderate	23	3.15	1.07	Moderate	23
3. Using prior knowledge	3.33	0.84	Moderate	20	3.17	0.71	Moderate	22
4. Previewing text before reading	2.75	0.92	Moderate	29	2.79	1.07	Moderate	28
6. Checking how text content fits purpose	2.90	0.90	Moderate	28	3.11	1.06	Moderate	24
8. Noting length and organization	3.75	0.94	High	12	3.46	1.19	Moderate	11
12. Deciding what to read closely	3.54	0.81	High	16	3.56	1.04	High	10
15. Using text features (e.g., tables, figures)	3.82	1.01	High	11	2.92	1.25	Moderate	26
17. Using context clues	4.10	0.81	High	6	3.67	0.99	High	7
20. Using typographical aids (e.g., italics)	4.02	1.09	High	8	3.39	1.14	Moderate	13
21. Analyzing and evaluating what is read	2.94	0.87	Moderate	25	2.80	1.07	Moderate	27
23. Checking my understanding	3.34	1.05	Moderate	19	3.46	0.86	Moderate	11
24. Predicting or guessing text meaning	3.28	0.89	Moderate	22	3.38	0.77	Moderate	15
27. Confirming predictions	3.46	1.88	Moderate	17	3.31	0.99	Moderate	19
Total	**3.42**	**0.98**	**Moderate**	**3**	**3.24**	**0.76**	**Moderate**	**2**

Table 4.4(Cont.)

Strategy	HRPSs (N=21)				LRPSs (N=15)			
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Meaning	Rank
Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSRS)								
7. Reading slowly and carefully	3.72	0.67	High	14	4.04	0.84	High	3
9. Trying to stay focused on reading	4.38	0.76	High	4	4.11	0.82	High	2
11. Adjusting reading speed	3.95	0.83	High	9	3.35	1.18	Moderate	17
14. Paying closer attention to reading	4.43	0.56	High	3	3.91	1.03	High	4
16. Pausing and thinking about reading	4.10	0.81	High	6	3.67	0.99	High	7
19. Visualizing information read	2.89	0.90	Moderate	27	3.57	1.06	High	9
25. Rereading for better understanding	4.44	0.76	High	2	4.41	0.77	High	1
28. Guessing meaning of unknown words	4.11	0.69	High	5	3.78	0.92	High	5
Total	4.00	0.75	High	1	3.69	0.95	High	1
Support Reading Strategies (SRS)								
2. Taking notes while reading	2.94	0.87	Moderate	25	3.02	1.16	Moderate	25
5. Reading aloud when text becomes hard	3.03	1.35	Moderate	24	2.60	1.10	Moderate	29
10. Underlining information in text	4.61	0.61	High	1	3.30	1.06	Moderate	20
13. Using reference materials	3.75	0.98	High	12	3.32	1.00	Moderate	18
18. Paraphrasing for better understanding	3.33	1.08	Moderate	20	3.37	1.14	Moderate	16
22. Going back and forth in text	3.84	0.82	High	10	3.25	0.79	Moderate	21
26. Asking myself questions	2.61	1.10	Moderate	30	2.45	0.85	Moderate	30
29. Translating from English into Thai	3.35	1.18	Moderate	18	3.78	1.19	High	5
30. Thinking in both English and Thai	3.72	0.67	High	14	3.39	1.16	Moderate	13
Total	3.46	0.96	Moderate	2	3.16	1.05	Moderate	3

As revealed in the Table 4.4 above, the HRPSs and LRPSs used problem solving reading strategies at the high level ($\overline{X}$=4.00, S.D.=0.75) and ($\overline{X}$=3.69, S.D.=0.95). Support strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.46, S.D.=0.96), and global strategies($\overline{X}$=3.42, S.D.=0.98),were used at the moderate level. While LRPSs used Global strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.24, S.D.=0.76), and support strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.16, S.D.=1.05) at the moderate level.

As for subcategories of self-reported strategy used by HRPSs, the most frequently reported strategy was no. 10 "Underlining information in text" ($\overline{X}$=4.61, S.D.=0.61). This strategy with the highest mean score was followed by strategies no. 25 "Rereading for better understanding" ($\overline{X}$=4.44, S.D. = 0.76), and no. 14 "Paying closer attention to reading" ($\overline{X}$= 4.43, S.D. = 0.56). The strategy with the lowest mean score was no. 26 "Asking myself questions" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.61, S.D. = 1.10), followed

by no. 4 "Previewing text before reading" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.75, S.D.= 0.92) and no. 6

"Checking how text content fits purpose" ($\overline{X}$ = 2.90, S.D. = 0.90), respectively.

For LRPSs, the most frequently used strategies with the highest mean scores

was no. 25 "Rereading for better understanding" ($\overline{X}$ =4.41, S.D.=0.77), followed by

strategies No. 9 "Trying to stay focused on reading" ($\overline{X}$ =4.11, S.D.= 0.82), and No. 7

"Reading slowly and carefully" ($\overline{X}$ =4.04, S.D.=0.84). The strategy with the lowest

mean score was no. 26 "Asking myself questions" ($\overline{X}$ =2.45, S.D.=0.85), followed by

No. 5 "Reading aloud when text becomes hard " ($\overline{X}$ =2.60, S.D.=1.10) and No. 4

"Previewing text from reading" ($\overline{X}$ =2.79, S.D.=1.07), respectively.

In summary, the HRPSs and LRPSs showed the information as to the

perceived uses of strategies that the HRPSs tended to employ a wide range of

metacognitive reading strategies when reading business English texts more frequently

than the LRPSs. However, this difference between the two groups of students'

frequency of strategy use invites further investigation into whether or not the students

in each group manipulate the selected strategies in different ways. In order to reflect

more profoundly upon the students' use of strategies when undertaking business

English reading tasks, a detailed qualitative analysis of the very aspect based on

multiple sources of data is provided in the subsequent section.

As mentioned earlier, the quantitative data were partly reported in Research

Question One. The main research findings presented focused primarily on the data

from all surveyed students. Interestingly, how the strategies reported to be used by

students from the HRPSs and LRPSs were found to be different from each other was

also deemed worthy of investigation. Table 4.4 begins discussing this aspect by

discussing differences in reported strategy use by HRPSs and LRPSs in the study.

Moreover, in order to determine a reading proficiency level difference in the use of

individual reading strategies, an independent samples *t*-test for each reading strategy

was performed. The significant difference was set at the level of .05 for this study.

Table 4.5

Differences in Reported Reading Strategy Used between HRPSs and LRPSs

Strategy	HRPSs (N=21)		LRPSs (N=15)		t (N=36)	p- value
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	$\overline{X}$	S.D.		
Global Reading Strategies (GRS)						
1. Setting purpose for reading	3.17	0.71	3.15	1.07	1.92	0.06
3. Using prior knowledge	3.33	0.84	3.17	0.71	2.50	0.01*
4. Previewing text before reading	2.75	0.92	2.79	1.07	1.82	0.07
6. Checking how text content fits purpose	2.90	0.90	3.11	1.06	1.87	0.06
8. Noting length and organization	3.75	0.94	3.46	1.19	1.46	0.15
12. Deciding what to read closely	3.54	0.81	3.56	1.04	0.08	0.93
15. Using text features (e.g., tables, figures)	3.82	1.01	2.92	1.25	1.07	0.29
17. Using context clues	4.10	0.81	3.67	0.99	2.57	0.01*
20. Using typographical aids (e.g., italics)	4.02	1.09	3.39	1.14	3.02	0.01*
21. Analyzing and evaluating what is read	2.94	0.87	2.80	1.07	0.23	0.82
23. Checking my understanding	3.34	1.05	3.46	0.86	2.21	0.03*
24. Predicting or guessing text meaning	3.28	0.89	3.38	0.77	0.78	0.44
27. Confirming predictions	3.46	1.88	3.31	0.99	0.25	0.81
Total	3.42	0.98	3.24	0.76	0.43	0.01*
Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSRS)						
7. Reading slowly and carefully	3.72	0.67	4.04	0.82	1.63	0.11
9. Trying to stay focused on reading	4.38	0.76	4.11	0.82	1.81	0.07
11. Adjusting reading speed	3.95	0.83	3.35	1.18	3.18	0.01*
14. Paying closer attention to reading	4.43	0.56	3.91	1.03	3.40	0.01*
16. Pausing and thinking about reading	4.10	0.81	3.67	0.99	0.88	0.38
19. Visualizing information read	2.89	0.90	3.57	1.06	0.91	0.37
25. Rereading for better understanding	4.44	0.76	4.41	0.77	0.25	0.81
28. Guessing meaning of unknown words	4.11	0.69	3.78	0.92	2.24	0.03*
Total	4.00	0.75	3.69	0.42	0.43	0.01*
Support Reading Strategies (SRS)						
2. Taking notes while reading	2.94	0.87	3.02	1.16	0.24	0.81
5. Reading aloud when text becomes hard	3.03	1.35	2.61	1.19	1.76	0.08
10. Underlining information in text	4.61	0.61	3.30	1.06	1.95	0.05*
13. Using reference materials (e.g., dictionary)	3.75	0.98	4.28	1.00	2.84	0.01*
18. Paraphrasing for better understanding	3.33	1.08	3.37	1.14	1.33	0.19
22. Going back and forth in text	3.84	0.82	3.54	1.09	1.67	0.10
26. Asking myself questions	2.61	1.10	2.74	1.17	0.63	0.53
29. Translating from English into Thai	3.35	1.18	3.78	1.19	3.67	0.01*
30. Thinking in both English and Thai	3.72	0.67	3.39	1.16	1.35	0.18
Total	3.46	0.96	3.30	1.38	0.17	0.01*

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
**. The mean difference is significant at the .01 level.

In order to determine a reported reading strategy difference in the use of each reading strategy, an independent samples *t*-test for each metacognitive reading strategy was performed, and the results are summarized in Table 4.5. The results revealed that there were statistically no significant differences in all of the three subsections reported to be used by the HRPSs and LRPSs. As far as individual strategies are concerned, out of all thirty metacognitive reading strategies, the participants showed no significant difference in the use of ten reading strategies between the groups of HRPSs and LRPSs. The HRPSs reported using eight of the ten reading strategies more frequently than the LRPSs did. However, the only two reading strategies that the LRPSs reported using more frequently than the HRPSs were "using reference materials (e.g., dictionary)" and "Translating from English into Thai". This result will be discussed in detail in the Chapter Five.

4.5 Summary of the Chapter

In summary, few findings of this study reached statistical significance. The results of each research question are described the third years students majoring in business English report using on the MSIBRCS when reading English business texts; the selected students' actual use of strategies differences between the use of strategies among HRPSs and LRPSs.

The chapter has reported other results obtained from the quantitative analysis of MSIBRCS questionnaire on students' attitudes toward metacognitive awareness of business reading English texts together with the qualitative analysis of individual interviews about metacognitive strategies. The findings show similar results to those of the reading tests - that is, students held a positive attitude toward metacognitive

awareness. In addition to these findings, the interview responses displayed, to some extent, the personality of the students and their preferences for reading, indicating that students prefer to read in class due to lack of responsibility, autonomy and time management. The other is from the reading fluency of the four HRPS groups compared with the other four LRPS groups. The findings reveal that metacognitive reading strategy shows positive results in developing reading comprehension and particularly in reading fluency notwithstanding. Some possible reasons for these results will be discussed next in Chapter Five.