

# **CHAPTER V**

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

## **Chapter 5**

### **Conclusion and Suggestion**

This chapter presents the conclusion of this research and suggestions. The first part is the conclusion, followed by suggestions.

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

Conclusively, the research subjects of this present study utilize all the three types of metacognitive reading strategies, which are Global, Problem-Solving, and Support Reading Strategies. The research findings revealed that there were variations in the usage of the strategies. The students were reported using Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB) the most, followed by Global Reading Strategies (GLOB), and Support Reading Strategies (SUPP).

The high usage of Problem Solving Strategies indicates that students apply both cognitive and metacognitive strategies deliberately when comprehending the reading problems. In fact, based on research results, students who utilized most Problem-Solving Strategies and Global Reading Strategies were successful than learners who utilized less the two strategies. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001 as cited from Rastakhiz & Safari, 2014) stated that problem solving strategies are deliberate, advanced techniques readers take when comprehending problems.

Moreover, successful readers use more strategic skills to understand meaning in a text and solving problems during reading. Particularly, these students tend to

overcome difficulties in reading by employing metacognitive strategies such as guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases, re-reading the text to find relationship between ideas, and thinking what they have known already about the topic before reading. They rarely read aloud to help them understand what they read and taking notes while reading.

The prime preference for problem solving (PROB), followed by global strategies (GLOB), and support strategies (SUP), as shown in this research, is consistent with previous studies that examined Hungarian university students' reading strategies by means of MARSII to (Monos, 2005), study of Sri Lankan university students' reading strategies (Dhanapala, 2010), and study of metacognitive reading strategies by native speakers of Arabic (Alsheikh and Mokhtari, 2011).

On the contrary, the findings of this research was against the study conducted by Rastahkiz & Safari (2014) and study by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001), who found that most use of metacognitive reading strategies was Support Reading Strategies, followed by Problem-Solving Strategies, and Global Reading Strategies.

The mean of reading comprehension of the research subjects is 58. Based on the scores obtained, almost over half of the students are proficient while one fourth of the rest needs more improvement in their reading. This concludes that the reading comprehension of the research subjects is low, and still needs to be improved and developed.

Based on the findings of this research, it was found that metacognitive reading strategies were discovered to have a positive correlation with reading

comprehension. In response to the first research question, which addresses the correlation between Global Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension, the finding of this research found that the correlation was positive and moderate at 0.66 at  $p < 0.01$  (2 tailed) respectively.

In response to the second research question, which addresses the correlation between Problem-Solving Strategies and Reading Comprehension, the finding of this research found that the correlation coefficient was 0.72 at  $p < 0.01$  (2 tailed). This result indicates that there is a positive and strong correlation between the strategy and reading comprehension respectively.

On the third research question, which addresses the correlation between Support Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension, the current study found that the correlation was a positive and weak at 0.26,  $p < .001$  (2 tailed). In this research, the correlation between overall metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension was also measured. The result of Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.79.

## **5.2 Suggestions**

The research findings of this research have shown that there is a positive correlation between metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension. Employing metacognitive reading strategies might improve learners' understanding of meaning and comprehending reading texts. As seen from the overall mean of students' metacognitive reading strategies, there were some students who were still

not fully utilizing metacognitive reading strategies, especially GLOB and SUPP strategies.

Students' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies, from reading globally to solving problem and seeking for support needs to be raised for it can help them become skillful readers and strategic thinkers. The strategies should be taught explicitly and systematically on an ongoing basis. One example of GLOB strategies is activating students' prior knowledge before reading should be discussed to help them prepare what's coming. Thinking aloud is one of the technique teachers can employ to invite students' responses of what they already know from the text. Students share their experiences and thought either by saying it out loud or using graphic organizers, such as a mind map, a flow chart, or a KWL chart. Other examples of GLOB strategies are skimming and making prediction.

Problem Solving Strategies help students read accurately and with understanding. One of the reading challenges that EFL students stumble upon is decoding meaning. Teachers should remind students that it is not necessary to know every meaning of words in the reading. What is important is to comprehend the main idea and message in the text. Some PROB strategies that students can use to comprehend better are reading in meaningful chunk, adjusting reading rate, and re-reading text.

Besides GLOB and PROB strategies, teachers could also maximize students' understanding in reading by familiarizing them with Support Reading Strategies. Teachers can teach students to circle specific information to help

them find important dates, names, facts easily. Making annotations in the margin of the reading text might also help students to locate and remember information easily. Students applying SUPP strategies are more sharp-wittedness and comprehension than those who do not apply.

One of the significant findings emerging from this study is that successful readers are those who have high awareness of metacognitive reading strategies, meanwhile less successful readers are those who have low awareness of metacognitive reading strategies. Therefore, it seems apt that EFL teachers raise students' awareness of the wide range of metacognitive reading strategies that are available for them. Students should realize that using metacognitive reading strategies will help them in planning, monitoring, and evaluating their comprehension.

The empirical findings in this research provide English teachers, curriculum planners, and instructors with validated information on metacognitive reading strategies used by university students. Since this research has found that prime preference of metacognitive reading strategies used is PROB strategies, followed by GLOB and SUPP strategies, it is apt for teachers to raise students' awareness of GLOB and SUPP strategies.

In addition, it is also expected that teachers' awareness of the needs of the students, particularly in comprehending academic reading text, is also increased. This study has shown that there were some students who still had low scores on reading comprehension test. Giving more practices on reading comprehension and

applying metacognitive reading strategies are two of practical, effective solutions to help students deal with academic reading texts.

Research on metacognitive reading strategies is useful in order to gain more understanding on students' reading comprehension or skill. Over the years, researches on correlation between metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension have been carried out, and the results are reportedly consistent or inconsistent with other studies. This inconsistency leads us to assume that students' reading skill are different from one another, and thus, it is necessary to explore what students' metacognitive reading strategies are in order to help them to be successful learners.

All in all, this research has not escaped from its weaknesses. The main weakness of this research is the small number of subjects that participate. This research also offers no further depth analysis of students' preferences of strategies used. It would be better if future study would examine a large, randomly selected subjects. Moreover, to have a more systematic study on metacognitive reading strategies, future researchers might expand the research into different perspectives, such as classroom action research on metacognitive reading strategies, longitudinal study on metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension, and the differences of metacognitive reading strategies use employed by native speakers and EFL students.

# **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Alsheikh, N. O. & Mokhtari, K. (2010). An Examination of the Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by Native Speakers of Arabic When Reading in English and Arabic. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 151-160.
- Anderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Astan, C. (2014). *The Correlation between Vocabulary Size and the Reading Comprehension of the English Education Department Students*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from WIMA repository.
- Block, E. (1986). The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language Readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 463-494.
- Chang, C. & Liu, H. (2013). Learning Strategy Use and Language Learning Motivation of Taiwanese EFL University Students, *10(2)*, 196-209.
- Chen, K. & Chen, S. (2015). The Use of EFL Reading Strategies among High School Students in Taiwan. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 15(2), 156-166.
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Dev, P. C. (1997). Intrinsic Motivation and Academic Achievement: What Does Their Relationship Imply for the Classroom Teacher? *Remedial and Special Education*, 18(1), 10-27.
- Dhanapala, K. V. (2010). Sri Lankan University Students' Metacognitive Awareness of L2 Reading Strategies. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation* 16(1), 65-82.
- Evans, B. (2007). Student Attitudes, Conceptions, and Achievement in Introductory Undergraduate College Statistics. *The Mathematics Educator*, 2(17).
- Fogarty, R. (1994). *How to teach for metacognition*. Palatine, IL: IRI/Skylight Publishing.
- Fountas, I.C. & Pinnell, G.S. (2000). *Guiding Readers and Writers (Grades 3-6) Teaching Comprehension, Genre, and Content Literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fourdini, H., Radjab, D., Refnaldi. (2014). The Correlation between Students' Language Learning Strategies in Reading & Their Reading Comprehension

- at the Second Year of English Department of the State University of Padang. *JELT*, 2(2), 103-110.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Graesser, A. C., Person, N. K., & Hu, X. (2002). Improving comprehension through discourse processing. In D. F. Halpern & M. D. Hakel (Eds.), *Applying the science of learning to university teaching and beyond* (pp. 33-44). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Gremmo, M. J. (1985). Learning A Language or Learning to Read. Riley (ed). *Discourse and Learning*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hoang, N. M. (2016). *The Relationship between Reading Strategy Use and Reading Proficiency of Vietnamese Students in the UK* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from British Council database.
- Hussein, B. A. (2012). Analysis of the Real Situation of Teaching Reading Comprehension to First Year Students at the Department of English Language and Literature at Al-Zaytoonah Private University of Jordan. *Asian Social Science*. 8(4), 237-251.
- Istanto, W. (2013). *The Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension of the English Department Students*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from WIMA repository.
- Iftanti, E. (2012). A Survey of the English Reading Habit of EFL Students in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2), 149-164.
- Lepper, R. M. (1988). Motivational Considerations in the Study of Instruction. *Cognition and Instruction*, 5(4), 289-309.
- Mohamad, A. (1999). What do we test when we test reading comprehension? *Journal of Teaching English as Second Language*, 5(12). Retrieved from [iteslj.org/Techniques/Mohamad-TestingReading.html](http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Mohamad-TestingReading.html)
- Mokhtari, K., & Shoerey, R. (2002) Measuring ESL Students' Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-10. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu>. (Accessed February 2017)
- Monos, K. (2005). A Study of the English Reading Strategies of Hungarian

- University Students with Implications for Reading Instruction in an Academic Context. *Malaysian Journal of ELT*, 1(1).
- Olshavsky, J. E. (1977). Reading as Problem Solving: An Investigation of Strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 4, 654-674.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Walker, C. (1987). Some applications of cognitive theory in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9(3), 54-67.
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). *Language Learning Strategies What Teacher Should Know*. United States of America: A Division of Wadsworth, Inc.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W.J. (1991). *A Manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)*, Report Number NCRIPAL-91-B-004. Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 122).
- Rastakhiz, M. & Safari, M. R. (2014). The Relationship between Global Reading Strategies and Support Reading Strategies on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension Ability. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 4(4), 491-503.
- Rraku, V. (2013). Reading Strategies on The Improvement of The Reading Skills of Students. *Social and Natural Science of Journal*, 7(2), (1-4).
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, L. E. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "Good Language Learner" Can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What Can We Learn from the Good Language Learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 304-318.
- Van den Broek, P., & Espin, C. A. (2012). Connecting cognitive theory and assessment: Measuring individual differences in reading comprehension. *School Psychology Review*, 41(3), 315-325.
- Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice-Hall International.

Zare, P. & Othman, M. (2013). The Relationship between Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategy Use among Malaysian ESL Learners. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(13), 187-193.