CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This chapter concludes and discusses the findings of the study reported in chapter four with reference to the research questions presented in chapter one. First, the researcher presents the summary of the study, followed by the discussions of the findings of the present study. Then, the pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research are described.

5.1 Summary of the Main Findings

In this chapter, the participants' uses of metacognitive strategies while they read English business texts are discussed. The total number of participants were 36 third – year Business English major of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Buriram Rajabhat University. The data for the study were derived from multiple sources, namely the MARSIS, TOEIC reading proficiency test scores, and semi-structured interviews. In the interview, open – ended questions were used as guidelines for each participant to investigate her and his reading strategies. The data from the questionnaire, TOEIC reading test scores, and interviews are consistency. There were three main objectives in this study. The first objective was to investigate what metacognitive strategies the third year students majoring in business English use in their reading business texts and how they use them. Secondly, the research was to investigate the difficulties these students encountered when reading business texts. Finally, the research was to investigate the differences between the use of

metacognitive strategies of the students with high English reading proficiency (HRPSs) and these of the students with low English reading proficiency (LRPSs).

The summary of the major findings were explained and resulted as follows:

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

The average score of the overall use of metacognitive reading strategies employed by 36 business English students was at moderate level. Observationally, fourteen strategies were reported as high usage, and sixteen strategies were reported as moderate usage. There were not any strategies employed as low usage.

Thirty strategy items which fall into three categories of metacognitive reading strategies were listed in the order of mean of the strategy use score reported by the participants. The findings revealed that global reading strategies and support reading strategies were at moderate level of usage, while problem solving reading strategies were at the high level of usage. The ranking from the highest to the lowest mean scores of the metacognitive reading strategies used by university students were problem solving reading strategies the most, followed by support reading strategies, and global reading strategies the least, respectively.

To discusses the overall picture of the perceived three broad frequently used strategies employed by high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs) participating in this study, the results revealed that the HRPSs used problem solving reading strategies the most, followed by support strategies the second most, and global strategies the least, respectively. However, the

LRPSs reported that they used problem solving reading strategies the most, followed by global strategies, and support strategies, respectively.

5.1.2 Research Question Two: What difficulty do the third year students majoring in Business English encounter when reading English business texts?

The participants in this study indicated various difficulties in their business English texts, in this present study gathered data from semi – interview and indicated that vocabulary problems (f = 3,37.5%) and grammatical structure (f = 3,37.5 %) were their biggest problems and followed by problems related to the organization of the passage and to the length of the text (f=2,25%) , while they faced with these problems

They had use metacognitive to help them when they read business English texts. Overall, based on the qualitative data from these multiple sources, three of the most frequently used strategies among the students in this groups could be observed. Within the Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSRS), these include No. 9 "Trying to stay focused on reading", No. 14 "Paying closer attention to reading ", and No. 28 "Guessing meaning of unknown words respectively. The most frequently observed strategies in the Support Reading Strategies (SRS) include No. 10 "Underline information in text", No. 7 "Paraphrasing for better understanding", and No. 22 "Going back and forth in text", respectively. With regard to the Gobal Reading Strategies (GRS), these strategies include No. 6 "Checking how text content fits purpose", No. 15 "Using text features (e.g., table, figures)", and No. 24 "Predicting or guessing text meaning", respectively.

Overall, the HRPSs' and the LRPSs' methods of employing metacognitive awareness of reading strategies differed from each other in terms of both frequency and quality of use.

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

This research question highlighted the differences which existed between HRPSs and LRPSs based on multiple sources of data. In conclusion, it was also found that there were statistically significant differences in all of the three subsections reported to be used by HRPSs and LRPSs. Additionally, HRPSs not only used metacognitive strategy with higher frequency, as revealed on the MARSIS, but they were also observed using it more purposefully than LRPSs. As revealed above, the students' decision as to what to read closely and what to ignore depended to a large extent on their understanding of the text. In this study, the participants from HRPS group made such decisions based on the importance of each part or section in the text; whereas, LRPS group did so when they were unaware of the gist of each section mainly due to their vocabulary difficulty. The LRPSs expressed a preference to depend on outside sources of information, which corresponds with using reference materials. As for the types of dictionary, both groups of students reported using English-Thai dictionaries most frequently as they provide translation equivalents that alleviate the complexity of words during the reading process.

In summary, high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs) used English to Thai dictionaries to translating from English into Thai, consulting the dictionary with word difficulty encountered during reading business texts as discussed earlier.

5.2 Discussion of the Findings

This researcher discusses the finding of the study reported in chapter four with reference to the research questions presented in chapter one. The present study examined what metacognitive reading strategies the surveyed students reported using in reading business texts, the difficulties these students encountered when reading business texts, and the different between the use of metacognitive strategies of the students with high English reading proficiency (HRPSs) and the students with low English reading proficiency (LRPSs).

5.2.1 Metacognitvie Reading Strategies the Students Use in Reading Business Texts

This result is understandable by recognizing features of the Problem Solving strategies as Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002:4) described them as follows: "problem solving strategies are the actions and procedures that readers use while working directly with the text. These are localized, focused techniques…". Direct and localized Problem Solving Strategies, for example "paying to closer attention to reading", "trying to stay focused", "guessing meaning of unknown word", and "pausing and thinking about reading", do not seem to demand many resources from readers to be implemented. The readers just need to decide if they use those strategies when they encounter comprehension problems during interaction with business texts.

Interestingly, the data obtained indicate that the participants in this study employed a wide variety of strategies while they were reading business texts in order to plan, control, and remediate their reading comprehension. However, the information as to the perceived use of strategies among the high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs) further suggests that

the former group's use tended to be greater in terms of number of strategies and frequency of use than the latter group. The findings of the current study are consistent with those of previous studies which conclude that second or foreign language learners use metacognitive strategies to foster their academic reading process (Anderson. 2003; O'Malley & Chamot. 1990; Pressley & Afflerbach. 1995). An interesting finding in the data is that the participants in both high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency (LRPSs) reported using the problem solving strategies the most. Some examples of these strategies include visualizing information read, guessing word meaning, trying to stay focused on reading, reading slowly and carefully, and skipping difficult words and sections. This specific result is in line with other research studies investigating reading in the metacognitive awareness context (Alexander & Jetton. 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach. 1995; Sheorey & Mokhtari. 2001) which indicated that non-native readers employed support strategies significantly more than native readers. Therefore, it is arguable that university students use problem solving strategies the most because they process English text materials as if they were solving problems in general. In the present investigation, it was also found that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores in all of the three subcategories (i.e., global, problem solving, and support strategies) as reported on the MSIBRCS by the HRPSs and LRPSs.

The average score of overall use of the metacognitive reading strategies was 3.49 on the 5-point Likert scale. According to established strategy usage criteria as described previously, this indicates that university students show "moderate" usage of the metacognitive reading strategies when they read business texts in English.

In terms of frequency of reading strategy use, this result was similar to previous studies conducted in EFL learning environments as in Korea (Lee. 2007) and in other Asian countries (Al-Nujaidi. 2003; Wu. 2005). Lee (2007) investigated reading strategy use in reading general English texts among 72 Korean EFL college students and reported moderate usage of reading strategies ($\overline{X} = 2.92$ for one group; $\overline{X} = 3.01$ for the other group, on 5-point Likert scale). Wu (2005) investigated the use of reading strategies among 204 Taiwanese EFL college students and reported moderate usage of the reading strategies ($\overline{X} = 3.08$, on 5 point Likert scale). Wu used the SORS to measure reading strategy use as in this study. While Al-Nujaidi (2003) modified the SORS for his own purpose and Lee (2007) developed her own measure for her own purpose. If the difference in measures is not accounted for, Lee (2007) found a much more frequent use of the reading strategies by Korean college students compared to the results of other studies. One possible explanation for this result is that current trends in universities in Korea, where authentic English textbooks are popular in a class and academic reading comprehension ability is considered very important for academic success, might make the Korean college students use reading strategies actively when they read authentic expository/technical texts in English.

With regard to each category of the reading strategies, the most frequently used category of the reading strategies was Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSRS) ($\overline{X} = 3.80$, S.D. = 0.92), followed by Support Reading Strategies (SRS) ($\overline{X} = 3.45$, S.D. = 1.01) and Global Reading Strategies (GRS) ($\overline{X} = 3.41$, S.D.= 1.09). The participants in this study showed a greater use of the Problem Solving strategies.

5.2.2 The Difficulties Students Encountered when Reading Business Texts.

The finding in this study are consistent with the research findings from Chumpavan (2000), who states that vocabulary and grammatical structure problems were main obstacles met by second language students in their readings. A lot of unknown words make much more difficult for students cannot understand academic texts with a lot of. Similarly, the participants in this study had difficulties when they faced a lot of unknown words. Most of them indicated various difficulties in their English business reading texts, but the majority reported that unknown words and grammatical structure problems were their biggest problems. They had to use various metacognitive strategies to help them guess the meaning of new words such as underlining information in the text, trying to stay focused on reading, paying attention on reading, recalling their background knowledge, or consulting the dictionary to recheck and clarify the accuracy of their guessing. Especially, when they read business texts or technical texts, it was difficult for them to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.

5.2.3 The Difference between High English Reading Proficiency (HRPSs) and Low English Reading Proficiency (LRPSs).

The results based on multiple sources of data in this study indicated that the high reading proficiency students (HRPSs) and low reading proficiency students (LRPSs) employed each metacognitive strategy were different from each other in terms of both frequency and quality of use. Specifically, as evidenced from the MSIBRCS data, the HRPSs showed higher metacognitive English reading strategies usage than the LRPSs. Additionally, the qualitative data revealed that the

latter group generally struggled with vocabulary, reading skills and using strategies. The former group, on the other hand, was able to monitor their cognitive processes better. Not only were they aware of which strategies to use and how to use them, but they also tended to be good at regulating the use of such strategies while reading. This difference between the two groups was echoed in previous research studies (Alexander & Jetton. 2000; Pressley. 2000; Piyanukool. 2001) which established that awareness and use of reading strategies are associated with and contribute to superior reading comprehension and thereby successful learning.

Apart from the aforementioned aspect, the students' selection of metacognitive strategies during reading business texts varied according to their reading proficiency. In order to comprehend English business reading materials, the less skilled readers tended to make use of simple strategies such as using reference materials, translating from English into Thai, and skipping difficult words and sections. Contrasting with this group, the skilled readers were more capable of utilizing sophisticated metacognitive strategies which include evaluating what is read, distinguishing fact from opinion, and paraphrasing for better understanding. Additionally, similar to Graves, Juel, and Graves (2004), the present study demonstrated that the proficient readers purposefully varied their metacognitive awareness of English reading strategies in order to comprehend the text at hand and eventually solve their reading problems.

It should also be noted that the differences in terms of their preferred strategy use were attributable to their reading proficiency, attitude toward the text, motivation for reading, and out-of-class reading practice. In other words, the HRPSs were more able to comprehend the English reading business text than the LRPSs because they

possessed a higher level of reading ability, developed a positive attitude toward what they read, maintained their reading motivation, and practiced reading outside the classroom regularly.

Another aspect that is worthy of further discussion is related to the translation strategy. As pointed out earlier, translation was the only strategy, among the 35 items on the MSIBRCS, which the LRPSs reported using more frequently than the HRPSs. Moreover, during the think-aloud sessions and independent reading tasks, this strategy was more frequently observed among the former group than the latter group. The participants in the LRPS group relied on spontaneous translation when they did not understand English business texts.

As outlined in the methodology section, the semi- interview sessions in which each participant read business texts with the presence of the researcher were conducted in Thai, the researcher's and students' first language. As a result, it seemed difficult, if not impossible, for students to avoid using this translation strategy while undertaking the tasks. However, to make certain that this strict condition did not necessitate the selection of this strategy, the researcher explicitly asked each of the students during either the semi- interview session to clarify how often they used this strategy as well as how they made use of it while reading in English. The interview data collaborate the finding that the LRPSs preferred to translate the text and think about the content in their native language, which eventually allowed them to better understand the information in the target language.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

From the findings of this study suggest a number of pedagogical implications, especially in EFL settings. As O'Malley and Chamot (1990) asserted that metacognitive strategies are responsible for regulating other strategies, teaching students how to use these strategies becomes a prime consideration in the reading classroom. This study can be seen that metacognitive reading strategies are helpful to improve reading comprehension of third -year Business English majors at Buriram Rajabhat University effectively. Therefore, teacher should facilitate their understanding of English business texts which are as follows:

5.3.1. Teachers need to incorporate strategy awareness training before engaging students in reading business texts. The study showed that students used of various effective metacognitive strategies. Therefore, when students are faced with unfamiliar words, teacher should suggest them look around the words and help them predict meanings before looking up the definitions of the words in the dictionary or teachers should introduce a few strategies at a time. They can teach how to scan and guess the gist of a text. In a reading class, teachers should explain and discuss with students the value of strategies. It is deemed important that teachers explicitly explain why the strategy should be learned and used and teachers should create a classroom environment that encourages social interactions related to reading.

5.3.2. Teachers should pay special attention to selecting texts that address students' interests and their English proficiency. In this study, students, regardless of their language proficiency, used their schema or background knowledge frequently when reading English business texts. Thus, teachers should begin with some

metacognitive reading strategies that are easy for students to implement in order to inspire their confidence and build a greater sense of achievement.

5.3.3. This study indicated that the MARSIS was created as useful for providing valuable information about the students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) assert that this type of information assists students in raising their awareness of reading strategies, enhancing their understanding of the reading process. In addition, teachers can benefit from this information as they help their students to become good readers

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research

In order to gain a better insight into using metacognitive strategies to improve business reading comprehension, the following may serve as guidelines for future researches.

5.4.1 This study was conducted with 36 third year students studying at Buriram Rajabhat University. In further studies, a larger number of participants should be asked to participate to ascertain the reliability of the present studies, such as, the students who studied in Business Reading Courses at the northeastern university of Thailand.

5.4.2 Students majoring in other fields, such as Accountancy, Financier, and Mass Communication should be asked to participate in further studies to see if the results are comparable to the ones concluded with students majoring in English.

5.4.3. Since Metacognitive strategies are important for students' reading learnings, in further studies, the use of metacognitives strategies in other English language skills, such as listening, speaking and writing, should be investigated,

to confirm that these skills are enhanced the same way as reading English business texts in this study.

In conclusion, the researcher believes that the present study can help the instructors develop their teaching business texts. Also, it is my hope that the present study has made a small but significant contribution to research in the fields of genre analysis and business reading texts.