Models of Metacognitive Reading Strategies Awareness of Liberal Arts Students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang

Pattaraporn Thampradit

Senior Lecturer, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang (KMITL), Thailand
Email: tpattaraporn@yahoo.com

Abstract

Reading is one of the most essential skills for everyone. It is a very efficient, and powerful tool for anyone who seeks for dominant knowledge in every aspect. Regardless of educational levels or study fields, students apply this tool to search for either primary, or advanced knowledge and technologies to strive for their educational success. However, to achieve optimal success in any tertiary educational discipline: Arts or Science, students need to engage in utilize reading strategies efficiently and effectively. This study, therefore, aimed to (1) explore models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts students and (2) compare the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness between students with different reading ability levels. The sample were 113 KMITL Liberal Arts fourth year English program students, but, at last, the overall sample only 108 students who returned the completed questionnaire. The instrument was a questionnaire, having the framework of MARSI-R (the inventory of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory-Revised), which consisted of three main components: Global Reading Strategies (GRS), Problem-Solving Strategies (PSS), and Support Reading Strategies or SRS (Mokhtari, Reichard & Dimitrov, 2013). Descriptive statistics was applied for analyzing this data. The finding revealed that metacognitive reading strategies awareness models of KMITL Liberal Arts students were at high level ($\bar{X} = 3.89$). Surprisingly, for GRS, item 3 (Checking to see if content of the text fits the purpose of reading), the model was only at mid level ($\bar{X} = 3.41$). Additionally, when comparing students with different reading abilities, it was found that metacognitive reading strategies awareness models of both high and mid reading ability students were at high level ($\bar{X} = 4.05$, and $\bar{X} = 3.71$ respectively). Interestingly, the models of both high and mid reading ability students for GRS, item 3, was still at mid level ($\bar{X} = 3.48$, and $\bar{X} = 3.36$ respectively). Moreover, various items of PSS and SRS that students with different reading ability levels had different awareness levels were discussed. Finally, recommendations were suggested.

Keywords: Metacognitive Reading Strategies Awareness, MARSI-R, KMITL Liberal Arts students

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Education in Thailand, especially at the tertiary level, reading has long been an essential tool for Thai EFL students to gain worldwide knowledge. Students, regardless of their fields of study, or institutions, have been offered English reading courses as either compulsory or elective courses. These courses were mainly

focused on teaching and supporting university students to comprehend the texts and be able to apply various appropriate reading strategies suitable for each reading goal. However, it was found that the English proficiency level of Thai university students was still unsatisfied (Saengpakdeejit, 2014; Sawangsamutchai & Rattanavich, 2016; Chutichaiwirath & Sitthitikul, 2017). Previous study indicated that most Thai students lacked metacognitive reading strategies awareness and were unable to utilize metacognitive reading strategies when dealing with academic texts (Chutichaiwirath & Sitthitikul, 2017). Accordingly, Thai university students need to increase their metacognitive reading strategies awareness and learn to apply these strategies more effectively.

Additionally, several studies had emphasized the important roles of metacognitive reading strategy awareness in EFL settings (Tavakoli, 2014; Saricoban & Behjoo, 2017). They indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between EFL students' metacognitive reading strategies awareness and their reading achievement. They also pointed the need of EFL university students to develop the use of reading strategies to improve their academic reading ability Accordingly, the results of this study would be like a mirror to endorse metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts English program students and lead them to learn how to utilize these strategies more efficiently and effectively.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.

1. What were the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts students?
2. Are there any different metacognitive reading strategies awareness models of KMITL Liberal Arts students with different English reading ability levels?

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To explore the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts students, majoring in English.
2. To compare the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness between

KMITL Liberal Arts students with different reading ability levels.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Population
The population were 113 KMITL Liberal Arts students. All had already studied four compulsory reading courses. They were the fourth-year English program students during the 2021 academic year.

Sample
All 113 population was selected as the sample of this study. All were voluntary. However, there were five returned questionnaires that were uncompleted answer. Thus, the overall sample, at last, were 108 KMITL Liberal Arts, English program students. For different English reading ability levels, it was found that of all 108 students, there were 35 high English reading ability level, 73 mid English reading ability level; however, none were at low English reading ability level.

Instrument
To assess the students' models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness, the questionnaire was designated. It consisted of two parts: students' demographic data and a 15-item-questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale. All 15 items in the questionnaire were derived from the framework of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory-Revised (MARSI-R). The MARSI-R (Mokhtari, Reichard, and Dimitrov, 2013) consisted of three main components: Global Reading Strategies (GRS), Problem-Solving Strategies (PSS), and Support Reading Strategies (SRS). Each components had five items. This questionnaire, with the reliability of 0.90 (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient), was distributed through all 113 students.

V. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE
Data collection was conducted during 2021 academic year. All sample were informed the purposes of this study before the questionnaires were distributed. Then, they were asked to read each statement indicated the level of awareness

in each reading strategies. They were allowed to complete all items in the questionnaires within 15 minutes.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics: arithmetic mean was utilized for examining the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts students and used to evaluate if there were any different metacognitive reading strategies awareness models between students' different English reading ability levels.

Criteria for interpreting mean scores

Based on the MARSI-R (Mokhtari, Reichard, and Dimitrov, 2013), the criteria for interpreting mean scores were as follows:

Table 1: *Criteria for Interpreting Mean Scores*

Mean Scores	Awareness Level
3.5 or higher	high
2.5-3.49	mid
2.49 or Lower	low

VII. RESULTS

Research question 1:

What were the models of metacognitive reading strategies awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts students?

Table 2: *Models of Metacognitive Reading Strategies Awareness of KMITL Liberal Arts Students*

Components	Reading strategies	Mean	Awareness Level
GRS item1	Having purpose when reading	3.59	high
GRS item 2	Previewing the text to see what it is about before reading	3.95	high
GRS item 3	Checking to see if the content of the text fits the purpose of reading	*3.41*	*mid*
GRS item 4	Using typographical aids, e.g., bold face and italics to pick out key information	3.99	high
GRS item 5	Critically analyzing and evaluating the information read	3.68	high
Total	**Global Reading Strategies (GRS)**	**3.72**	**high**
PSS item 1	Getting back on track when getting sidetracked or distracted	3.62	high
PSS item 2	Adjusting reading pace or speed based on what is reading	3.66	high
PSS item 3	Stopping from time to time to think about what is reading	3.72	high
PSS item 4	Re-reading to make sure of comprehending what is reading	4.26	high
PSS item 5	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases	4.32	high
Total	**Problem-Solving Strategies (PSS)**	**3.92**	**high**
SRS item 1	Taking notes while reading	3.71	high
SRS item 2	Reading aloud to help comprehending what is reading	3.55	high
SRS item 3	Discussing the reading with others to check understanding.	4.02	high
SRS item 4	Underlining or circling important information in the text	4.59	high
SRS item 5	Using reference materials such as dictionaries to support reading	4.21	high
Total	**Support Reading Strategies (SRS)**	**4.02**	**high**
Total	**All 15 reading strategies (GRS, PSS, and SRS)**	**3.89**	**high**

Table 2 revealed that students' overall metacognitive reading strategies awareness model was at high level ($\bar{X} = 3.89$). Moreover, considering the total 5 items of each three components of reading strategies: GRS, PSS and SRS, it was found that KMITL Liberal Arts fourth year English program students also had the awareness at high level ($\bar{X} = 3.72, 3.92,$ and 4.02 respectively). Interestingly, there was only one reading strategy: Checking to see if the content of the text fits the purpose of reading (GRS, item3) that the students had the awareness model at mid level ($\bar{X} = 3.41$).

Are there any different metacognitive reading strategies awareness models of KMITL Liberal Arts students with different English reading ability levels?

Research question 2:

Table 3: *Comparing Models of Metacognitive Reading Strategies Awareness between Students with Different Reading Ability Levels*

Components	Reading Strategies	High Reading Ability Level (n = 35)		Mid Reading Ability Level (n = 73)	
		Mean	Awareness Levels	Mean	Awareness Level
GRS item 1	Having purpose when reading	3.68	high	3.51	high
GRS item 2	Previewing the text to see what it is about before reading	3.89	high	3.65	high
GRS item 3	Checking to see if the content of the text fits the purpose of reading	*3.48*	*mid*	*3.36*	*mid*
GRS item 4	Using typographical aids, e.g., bold face and italics to pick out key information	4.00	high	3.85	high
GRS item 5	Critically analyzing and evaluating the information read	4.55	high	3.59	high
All Global Reading Strategies (GRS)		**3.92**	**high**	**3.59**	**high**
PSS item 1	Getting back on track when getting sidetracked or distracted	**3.93**	**high**	**3.45**	**mid**
PSS item 2	Adjusting reading pace or speed based on what is reading	**3.87**	**high**	**3.49**	**mid**
PSS item 3	Stopping from time to time to think about what is reading	**3.77**	**high**	**3.44**	**mid**
PSS item 4	Re-reading to make sure of comprehending what is reading	4.59	high	4.16	high
PSS item 5	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases	4.41	high	4.15	high
All Problem-Solving Strategies (PSS)		**4.11**	**high**	**3.74**	**high**
SRS item 1	Taking notes while reading	**3.95**	**high**	**3.49**	**mid**
SRS item 2	Reading aloud to help comprehending what is reading	**3.62**	**high**	**3.48**	**mid**
SRS item 3	Discussing the reading with others to check understanding.	4.18	high	3.75	high
SRS item 4	Underlining or circling important information in the text	4.62	high	4.10	high
SRS item 5	Using reference materials such as dictionaries to support reading	4.24	high	4.22	high
All Support Reading Strategies (SRS)		**4.12**	**high**	**3.81**	**high**
Total		**4.05**	**high**	**3.71**	**high**

Table 3 indicated that the metacognitive reading strategies awareness models of KMITL Liberal Arts English program students, having different English reading ability levels, i.e., high and mid, were at high level ($\bar{X}$ = 4.05, and 3.71 respectively). Additionally, it was found that the students with different English reading

ability levels: high and mid, also had the awareness models of each three components: GRS, PSS and SRS, at high level (for GRS, $\bar{X}$ = 3.92, 3.59; for PSS , $\bar{X}$ = 4.11, 3.74; and for SRS, $\bar{X}$ = 4.12, 3.81 respectively).

Interestingly, the study also revealed that there was only one reading strategy in the GRS:

Checking to see if the content of the text fits the purpose of reading (GRS, item3) that both the students with high and mid reading ability levels had the awareness model at the mid level ($\overline{X}$ = 3.48, 3.36 respectively).

However, when considering PSS components, the students' awareness models between high and mid reading ability levels were different in item1: Getting back on track when getting sidetracked or distracted; item 2: Adjusting reading pace or speed based on what is reading; and item 3: Stopping from time to time to think about what is reading. That is, while the high reading ability students had the awareness model at high level, the mid reading ability students only had the awareness model at mid level (for item 1, $\overline{X}$ = 3.93, 3.45; for item 2, $\overline{X}$ = 3.87, 3.49; and for item 3, $\overline{X}$ = 3.77, 3.44 respectively). Similarly, considering SRS components, it was found that while the high reading ability students had the awareness model at high level in items 1: Taking notes while reading; and item 2: Reading aloud to help comprehending what is reading, the mid reading ability students only had the awareness model at mid level (for item 1, $\overline{X}$ = 3.95, 3.49; and for item 2, $\overline{X}$ = 3.62, 3.48 respectively).

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study were consistent with various previous relevant studies which showed that EFL students tended to perceive PSS at high level when dealing with academic texts (Chutichaiwirath & Sitthitikul, 2017; Saricoban & Behjoo, 2017; Shikano, 2014; Simpson, 2018). However, when considering the mean scores, it was found that students' highest mean score was in SRS whereas those in the previous studies were in PSS. This might be because during Covid-19 epidemic, students had to studied online, SRS might be much more basic for them to use for comprehending their texts. Thus, the students coped their metacognitive reading strategies with SRS much more often than with the PSS.

Additionally, when considering mean scores, students with high reading ability level tended to outperform in Global Reading Strategies and Problem-Solving Strategies than those with mid

reading ability level. In addition, students with mid reading ability level outperformed more in Support Reading Strategies. This was reasonable because the mid reading ability level students used their online experience for relying much more on functional and practicable strategies to overcome texts. Such strategies include looking up dictionaries, marking the texts, and circling important information.

IX. RECOMMENDATION

1. The findings of this study should be beneficial for any EFL teacher who aimed to develop students' when comprehending texts. They also could be used as a mirror to endorse metacognitive reading strategies awareness of their students. By supporting students to learn how to utilize these strategies more efficiently and effectively, they should be more successful either in their study and their future lifelong learning.

2. For further research, the big data, including all KMITL students, with different academic disciplines and years of study should be performed to get results that could be generalized for any scholar interested in these relevant aspects.

X. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Chutichaiwirath, K., & Sitthitikul, P. (2017). The metacognitive awareness of reading strategies in Thai EFL learners. Journal of Nusantara Studies, 2(2), 1-14. doi:10.24200/jonus.vol2iss 2pp1-14

2. Kocaman, O., & Beskardes, S. (2016). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use by English language teaching

students in Turkish context: Sakarya university sample. Sakarya University Journal of Education, 6(2), 254-269. doi:10.19126/suje.61107

3. Mokhtari, K., Dimitrov, D. M., & Reichard, C. A. (2018). Revising the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies inventory (MARSI) and testing for factorial invariance. Education Faculty Publications and Presentations, 8(2), 219-246 doi:10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.3

4. Phaipimai, J., & Meesri, R. (2015). Differences in metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of the third-year undergrad students among English major and non-English major students. Online Journal of Education (OJED), 10(1), 344-357. Retrieved from http://tci-thaijo.org/index.php/OJED/ article/download/40499/33424/

5. Saengpakdeejit, R. (2014). Thai third-year undergraduate students' frequent use of reading strategies with a focus on reading proficiency and gender. Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 35(1), 103-112. Retrieved from http://kasetsartjournal.ku.ac.th/kuj _files/2014/A1403260951441406.pdf

6. Sawangsamutchai, Y., & Rattanavich, S. (2016). A comparison of seventh grade Thai students' reading comprehension and motivation to read English through applied Instruction based on the Genre-Based Approach and the Teacher's Manual. English Language Teaching, 9(4), 54-63. doi:10.5539/elt.v9n4p54

7. Saricoban, A., & Behjoo, B. M. (2017). Metacognitive awareness of Turkish EFL learners on reading strategies. Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 21(1), 159-172. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/

8. Shikano, M. (2014). A quantitative survey on metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use in English by Japanese university students. International Education Centre Journal, 14, 11-24. Retrieved from http://office.nanzan-u.ac.jp/ncia/about-cia/item/pdf_14/kenkyu_02.pdf

9. Simpson, J. (2018). Perception of EFL learners' use of reading strategies: A case study. Veridian E-Journal, International (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts), 11(4), 730-744. Retrieved from http://tci-thaijo.org/index.php/abc/article/download/ 53946/44779/

10. Tavakoli, H. (2014). The effectiveness of metacognitive strategy awareness in reading comprehension: The case of Iranian university EFL students. The Reading Matrix, 14(2), 314-336. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/files/11-24o5q41u.pdf

11. Thongwichit, N. (2018). Metacognitive reading strategies with southern Thai university students. Suranaree Journal of Social Science, 12(1), 1-16. Retrieved from http://tci-thaijo.org/index.php/sjss/article/view/1281 76