

An Investigation of Academic Reading Strategies among Thai Economics Students

Prathomwat Suraprajit

Faculty of Management Sciences
Kasetsart University Sriracha Campus

Abstract

Reading is one of the most important skills for language learners. Therefore, the reading strategies play a vital role for comprehending their reading tasks. The present study then investigated the reading strategies employed by Thai university students towards academic reading. The questionnaire, which based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, 1990), and semi-structure interview were conducted for collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. The collected data then were analysed by using the descriptive statistics. Classified by category, the findings from the questionnaire indicated that affective strategies was rated at the most used strategy, whereas social strategies was reported the least use. Moreover, grouped by strategy, the highest used strategies was cognitive strategies, whereas social strategies was at the least level. In addition, the results from interviewing stated that scanning (cognitive strategies) was the most employed strategy, whereas reading a passage only one time with no focus was the least used. Moreover, summarizing (cognitive strategies) was the most useful strategy reported by the participants, while reading slowly with no focus was the useless technique for most of them. A further study should explore the relationship between the use of reading strategies and the perception towards the useful strategies.

Keywords: Cognitive strategies, Affective strategies, Social strategies, Metacognitive strategies

1. Introduction

Over the last decades, reading is a fundamental skill that plays a vital role in English learning worldwide. Among various kinds of fields that English is necessary, academic reading is marked to be the core for learning an updated information together with gaining access to the alternative explanation and interpretation (Yukselir, 2014). Semtin & Maniam (2015) added that the English reading ability is important for various fields including academic purpose. Therefore, reading effectively and efficiently is the vital ability for successful life (Nordin et al., 2013). In the educational context, the ability to read well is a crucial asset for students, as they have attained a certain level of academic achievement. Carrell (1989) as cited in Yukselir (2014) informed that reading might be the most vital skill in academic context because most students learn English or acquire information through reading. Moreover, reading skill could help in dealing with some difficulties, being a doorway to knowledge and acquiring knowledge in such fields (Songsingchai, 2010; Magogwe, 2013; and Shehadeh, 2015).

Used as a medium language for many professions worldwide, English is the first foreign language that most of the Thai students learn in school. That is because it is widely declared as one of the most used language for both business and academic purposes. However, several studies reported that Thai university students who were expecting to join various kinds of businesses after graduation still face difficulties with reading academic English texts. Paksasuk (2013) stated that there are many points that Thai students should consider for making their reading better such as their inability to find main idea, inadequate vocabulary, and other reading comprehension problems. It also stated that reading comprehension becomes a major problem of Thai learners because of lacking of English reading skills (Wannathong, 2016). According to the stated problems, one of the reasons why they faced difficulties or could not gain 100% comprehension when they read in academic reading is lacking of the knowledge of reading strategies. In the other word, Thai learners are unfamiliar with employing reading strategies that might support them to a deeper or clearer comprehension (Songsingchai, 2010).

The present study then explored the reading strategies employed by the Thai university students while reading the academic texts. The benefits of the present study are that the students could realize the importance and benefit of the reading strategies. In addition, the results could encourage the teachers in developing their teaching in reading strategies or course books relating to academic reading. According to the above statement, there are some research questions as follows:

- What are the frequency use of reading strategies among Thai university students while reading academic texts?
- What useful and useless reading strategies do Thai university students consider when they read an academic text?

1.1 Theoretical background

The framework of the present study was adapted from the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) designed by Oxford (1990). SILL is about cognitive, meta-cognitive, social, and affective strategies that the learners employed when they learned the language. Considering deeper in each strategy, firstly, cognitive strategies is useful for dealing with the target language correctly. The strategies under this type are skimming, using other clues, reasoning deductively, summarizing, scanning, analysing, expressions, elaborating, using imagery, guessing the meaning of new words from context, highlighting/underling, rereading, taking notes (predict/infer), translating, and resourcing. Secondly, metacognitive strategies is employed to support learners by thinking about what has been known about the topic, identifying a purpose for reading, paying attention, and self-evaluating. Thirdly, social strategies is about involving with learners such as cooperating with others, and asking for clarification or verification. Finally, affective strategies discusses on using progressive relaxation, deep breathing or meditative and discussing feelings with someone else.

1.2 Literature review

There are many previous studies around the world, which used the framework of SILL (Oxford, 1990) to investigate the language learning strategies and there found some interesting results. In Korea, Park (1997) measured the relationship between language learning strategies and L2 proficiency. The findings showed that the participants used meta-cognitive strategies the most, whereas affective strategies were frequently conducted the least. Then, in Palestine, Khalil (2005) who assessed language-learning strategies employed by Palestinian EFL students found that the participants employed the cognitive strategies at the medium level with affective strategies at the least level of use. Next, in China, the findings from Nisbet et al. (2005) who investigated the language learning strategies and English proficiency of Chinese University students showed that the most employed strategies is metacognitive whereas the least used is social strategies. Yu & Wang (2009) then explored the language learning strategies use in the context of EFL curriculum and pedagogy reform in China. The results showed that cognitive strategies was employed at the high level, whereas the social strategies and affective strategies were reported at the least level of usage. In Philippines, Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006) worked on the language learning strategies used by ESL students with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds focusing on differences in strategy use across gender and nationality. The study showed the students preferred to use meta-cognitive strategies the most, whereas they showed the least use of affective and memory strategies. In Taiwan, Tsan (2008) explored the language learning strategies used by undergraduate students at National Taiwan Normal University. The findings showed that meta-cognitive strategy was the most effective and affective strategy was the least effective strategy. In Iran, Alireza & Abdullah (2010) explored the language learning strategies and styles among Iranian engineering and political science graduate students. The findings showed that among the engineering students, cognitive strategies was reported as the high level of use, whereas social strategies were the least use. In Turkey, Incecay (2013) studied the metacognitive online reading strategies in Turkish EFL students. The findings showed that the students reported a wide range of metacognitive strategies when reading online academic texts by employing reference material (i.e. online dictionaries), scrolling through the text, rereading for better understanding, guessing what the context is about and paying closer attention to reading as the most frequently used strategies, respectively. Del Angel & Gallardo (2014) then investigated the language learning strategies among the students in Mexico. The findings showed that cognitive strategies was reported as the high level of use, whereas social strategies were the least use. In Vietnam, Hung & Ngan (2015) worked on the reading strategies used in reading academic texts by 1st and 3rd year students majoring in English. The results showed that the 1st year students frequently used those strategies of skimming, scanning, translating, highlighting, relevant-thinking, whereas the 3rd year participants preferred using analysing, elaborating, purpose-identifying, and other strategies. In Saudi Arabia, Alhaysony (2017) measured the language learning strategies used by Saudi EFL students. The findings showed that cognitive strategies was used the most, whereas affective strategies were employed the least. In addition, there are some scholars worked on this field in Hong Kong. Firstly, the findings from Bremmer (1999) who determined the language learning strategies used by Hong Kong students showed that compensation and metacognitive strategies were the most used, whereas affective and memory strategies were the least used. Then, Peacock & Ho (2003) worked on the use of student language learning strategies and then the findings revealed that the older students were strong in affective and social strategies whereas cognitive strategies were widely used. Leung (2011) later investigated the language learning strategies of Hong Kong learners. The results showed that cognitive strategies was employed at the medium level whereas social strategies were used the least. In Thailand, Songsiangchai (2010) explored the reading strategies used among the science students and English major students. The results showed that on the printed academic materials, the participants used cognitive and metacognitive strategies at the medium level where metacognitive strategies was the most used for the high proficient science students, whereas cognitive strategies was the most employed by the English major participants.

Then, Waelatech & Paramal (2014) investigated the English learning strategies among Thai university students the questionnaire and in-depth interview as instruments. The results showed that most Thai students adopted cognitive strategy in learning ranging from repeating to analysing expression to summarizing.

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants

The participants of the present study were 140 Thai students who were studying at the faculty of Economics, Kasetsart University Sriracha Campus. All of them had passed Fundamental English III before they enrolled Technical English course. They are 45 males (32.1%) 93 females (66.4%), and 2 LGBT (1.4%). They are 67 sophomores (47.9%), 33 juniors (23.6%), 38 seniors (27.1%), and 2 super seniors (1.4%). Their ages are 19 to 22 years old and their L1 is Thai. They all have to take Technical English course, which is a compulsory course for the economic students. The course focuses on academic reading.

2.2 Instruments

The research instruments employed in the present study were questionnaire and interviewing.

2.2.1 Questionnaire

Oxford & Berry-Stock (1995) stated that the reason for researchers' frequent use of learner self-report is that it is often difficult for them to employ standard observational method. Then, adapted from Oxford (1990), the questionnaire used in the present study mainly based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). It was for detecting the English reading strategies in academic reading. A questionnaire presented to the participants in order to search out the reading strategies they employed. As shown in table 1, it consists of 26 chosen statements equivalent to 22 specific reading strategies under the four categories including cognitive strategies (14 items), meta-cognitive strategies (4 items), social strategies (2 items), affective strategies (2 items), and 4 additional items that are not involved in SILL. The 4 additional items (items no. 23-26) were additionally put into the present questionnaire because of the significant findings from the pilot study in both questionnaire and interview. Therefore, the researcher realized that the stated additional items should also consider exploring among the participants because it might provide the new interesting strategies employed by the Thai readers. Then, each statement was followed by a 5-point Likert scale of frequently use that are 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=sometimes, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree. The questionnaire was then translated into Thai version for easier comprehending. Focusing on reliability of SILL, Anderson (2005) stated that SILL was the most widely employed for L2 strategy research. That is because it has a great advantage on reliability and validity. That is also true with the report of Oxford (1996) showing its reliabilities for the ESL / EFL SILL range from .86 to .91 when the participants feedback to the questionnaire in their second language (English) which is the same result of what Mohammadi & Alizadeh (2014) found in investigating the reliability and validity of SILL among Iranian University Students.

Table 1. presents the categories of reading strategies which were mainly classified as cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, social strategies, affective strategies, and other strategies.

Table 1. Categories of Reading Strategies

Category	Statement	Item
Cognitive	I first skim the text, then go back and read carefully.	1
	I use other clues, e.g. titles/headings, introduction, transition for better understanding.	2
	I try to infer what is said, but not clearly stated in the text.	3
	I stop to periodically summarize what I've already read to make sure it make sense.	4
	I read quickly to get specific piece of information that I want.	5
	I try to analyse the sentences after reading.	6
	I try to elaborate new information with known information in mind.	7
	I try to picture or visualize information to help me remember what I read	8
	When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases in context.	9
	I underline/ highlight information in the text to help me remember it better.	10
	When the text becomes difficult, I reread it to increase my understanding.	11
	I take notes of what I've read.	12
	When reading, I translate from English (L2) into Thai (L1).	13
	I use reference materials e.g. dictionaries to understand the text better.	14
Metacognitive	Before I read, I think about what I have already known about the topic.	15
	I have a purpose in mind when I read.	16
	When reading, I try to stay focused on text and skip unimportant parts.	17
Social	After I read, I check if my guesses about text are right or wrong	18
	I work with my classmates to solve reading problems.	19
Affective	I ask my teacher to explain something that is not clear or does not make sense to me.	20
	I try to relax whenever I feel anxious about reading text.	21
Others	I talk to my classmates about my attitudes and feelings relating academic reading texts.	22
	When I read, I'll give priority to the main idea.	23
	When I read, I'll give priority to the supporting ideas.	24
	When I read, I'll give priority to the core parts of each sentences.	25
	When I read, I'll clarify the facts and opinions.	26

2.2.2 Interview

Interview, whether formal or not, provides personalized information on many types of strategies that would not be available through observation, but they take considerable time from the teacher and the students (Oxford & Berry-Stock, 1995). In order to gain the qualitative data about the reading strategies that the samples employed when they read academic texts, the interviewing was proceeded for this stage. Conducted in Thai, the L1 of all participants, the interviewing was approximately 20-30 minutes per each participant. There are four main interviewed questions as follows:

- What reading strategies do you usually use when you read the academic texts?
- What reading strategies do you hardly use when you read the academic texts?
- In your opinion, what are the useful reading strategies when you read the academic texts?
- In your opinion, what are the useless reading strategies when you read the academic texts?

2.3 Data collection and analysis

2.3.1 Questionnaire

All participants were firstly informed the instruction of the present survey including the objectives and benefits of the study. Moreover, the participants were informed that 1) their rates would not effect on their final grades, 2) they needed not to write their name down on the survey, and 3) they should inform the truth because their responses would be greatly benefited for developing the course. Then, they were asked to complete the survey carefully and honestly in the classroom. Each participant spent 20 – 30 minutes for finishing the survey. The data then was analysed under the descriptive analysis.

2.3.2 Interview

All participants were asked to have an interview with the researcher who acted as the interviewer for 20-30 minutes based on the availability of each participant. The interview started with the small talks, and then went down to the business. The interview was conducted in the teacher's room. The data was then analysed under the descriptive analysis.

3. Results

According to the levels of reading strategies used based on 5-point Likert scale, the mean scores 3.5 to 5.0 referred to the high use, 2.5 to 3.4 were defined as medium use, and average scores of 1.0 to 2.4 were as the low use.

Table 2. Summary of Mean Scores of Strategy Category from questionnaire

Category	Mean Score	SD	Level of Use	Item no.
1. Cognitive	3.47	1.05	Medium	1-14
2. Metacognitive	3.05	1.01	Medium	15-18
3. Social	2.75	1.12	Medium	19-20
4. Affective	3.55	1.15	High	21-22
5. Others	3.05	0.97	Medium	23-26

Classified by category, table 2 presents the summary of strategy used with the level of usage. The finding showed that the level of usage is from medium to high frequency with the mean score of affective strategies as 3.55, cognitive strategies as 3.47, metacognitive as 3.05, and social strategies as 2.75, respectively. In the other word, it indicated that the highest use went to affective strategies, whereas the lowest was for social strategies.

Table 3. Summary of the highest use of reading strategies from questionnaire

Strategy	Category	Mean	SD
1. "I use reference material such as dictionaries to understand the text better." (resourcing)	Cognitive	4.29	0.94
2. "I underline/highlight information in the text to help me remember it better." (highlighting)	Cognitive	3.97	1.20
3. "I read quickly to get specific piece of information that I want." (scanning)	Cognitive	3.95	1.08
4. "I try to relax whenever I feel anxious about reading text." (anxiety-relaxing)	Affective	3.91	1.02
5. "I first skim the text, then go back and read carefully." (skimming)	Cognitive	3.66	1.02

Table 3 summarizes the highest use of each reading strategies employed by the Thai university students. The popular strategies among the participants are resourcing, highlighting, scanning, anxiety-relaxing, and skimming accordingly. And the most use strategy is "resourcing" with the mean score as 4.29.

Table 4. Summary of the lowest use of reading strategies from questionnaire

Strategy	Category	Mean	SD
1. "I ask my teacher to paraphrase/explain something is not clear to me." (assistant-seeking)	Social	2.15	1.01
2. "When reading, I clarify facts & opinions." (finding facts&opinions)	Other	2.49	1.05
3. "When reading, I try to stay focused on text and skip unimportant parts." (attention-paying)	Metacognitive	2.87	0.92
4. "I take notes of what I've read." (note-taking)	Cognitive	2.87	1.19
5. "After I read, I check if my guess about text are right or wrong."(self-evaluating)	Metacognitive	2.92	1.08

Table 4 concludes the lowest use of reading strategies employed by the Thai university students. The participants use "assistant-seeking", "finding facts & opinions", "attention-paying", "note-taking", and "self-evaluating" as the least strategies. Among the five stated strategies, "assistant-seeking" is the least strategy that the participant employed with the mean score as 2.15.

Table 5. Frequency of the most and least strategies used by the participants from interviewing

No.	Most Strategy Used (No. of students)	Least Strategy Used (No. of students)
1	Scanning (61)	Reading only one time with no focus (31)
2	Skimming (22)	Reading every single word (15)
3	Note-taking (20)	Reading aloud (9)
4	Summarizing (18)	Skimming (8)
5	Using dictionary (14)	Summarizing / Memorizing (6)

Table 5 shows the data from interviewing all participants for their most and least frequently used of reading strategies. The top five that they prefer the most are scanning, skimming, note-taking, summarizing, and using dictionary respectively. And, the five strategies that they prefer the least are reading only one time with no focus, reading every single word, reading aloud, skimming and summarizing respectively.

Table 6. Frequency of the useful and useless strategies thought by the participants from interviewing

No.	Useful Strategy (No. of students)	Useless Strategy (No. of students)
1	Summarizing after reading (32)	Reading slowly with no focus (29)
2	Finding the main idea (18)	Reading together with doing other activities (11)
3	Being a tutor for friends (16)	Scanning (9)
4	Scanning (14)	Skimming(6)/ Reading all words(6)/ Memorizing (6)
5	Reading more frequently (13)	Looking for facts & opinions (5)

Table 6 presents the data from interviewing all participants for their opinion towards the useful and useless strategies. The five strategies that they thought useful are reading together with summarizing, finding the main idea, being a tutor for friends, scanning, and reading more frequently, respectively. And, the five strategies that they thought useless are reading slowly with no focus, reading together with doing other activities, scanning, skimming/reading all words/reading together with memorizing, and looking for facts & opinions, respectively.

4. Discussion

4.1 What are the most and least reading strategies that the Thai students employed regarding their perception via questionnaire?

Regarding the category of SILL (Oxford, 1990), the present results were consistent with those found in Chu et al. (2012), Rao (2006) and Peacock & Ho (2003) that the most highly used category was the affective strategies. Claimed by Oxford (1993), some of the best learners use affective strategies to control their emotional state, to keep themselves motivated on task, and to get help when they need it. This may imply that this strategy plays important role for learner's mind in dealing with some difficulties when they read. Moreover, the affective strategies can encourage the learners to focus on their emotion, motivated and have a positive attitude in learning a language. That is very crucial because positive emotions and attitudes can make language learning far more effective and enjoyable (Oxford, 1990). In addition, the students who used affective strategies know better how to effectively regulate their emotions and tend to intentionally seek out opportunities to interact with target-language users communicatively in order to enhance their proficiency of the language (Stern, 1983). In contrast, the findings of the present study are absolutely different from many previous studies (Park, 1997; Bremmer, 1999; Mochizuki, 1999; Khalil, 2005; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2008; Tsan, 2008; Yu & Wang, 2009; Russell, 2010; Geramia & Baighlou, 2011; Grossmann, 2011; Tech & Yusoff, 2013; Del Angel & Gallardo, 2014; and Alhaysony, 2017) which found that affective strategies was used the least among EFL/ESL students. It means that the students unlikely do take control over affective strategies. They may also realize that negative feelings can stunt language-learning progress (Oxford, 1990). For this matter, the classroom should have a positive atmosphere for learning. In addition, the teachers then should create a positive feeling in class.

Moreover, classified by strategy, the top three of the most used strategies are resourcing, highlighting, and scanning which are under cognitive strategies. The findings are consistent with those found in, Yu & Wang (2009), Alireza & Abdullah (2010), Songsiengchai (2010), Chu et al. (2012), Castillo & Espeleta (2013), Anne (2014), Hungyo (2015), Semtin & Maniam (2015), Alhaysony (2017), and Riazi (2017) that cognitive strategies were the most used by the students in learning or dealing with some difficulties of second language. And, Oxford (1990) also agreed that cognitive strategies were reported by many studies as the most favorite tactic among L2 learners.

In addition, grouped by both category and strategy, the findings showed that social strategies were the least used strategy. The results consistent with the works of Park (1997), Peacock & Ho (2003), Nisbet et al. (2005), Rao (2006), Yu & Wang (2009), Alireza & Abdullah (2010), Leung (2011), Afdaleni (2013), Teh et al. (2013), and Alhaysony (2017). However, social strategies facilitate interaction with others in the context of learning languages and related cultures (Oxford, 1990). The results implied that the present participants did not realize or were afraid in using English as a tool to communicate with people. They did not know that social strategies are very important in learning language because language is used in communication among people. As Bremmer (1999) stated that Asian students likely to use social strategies that entail asking questions or asking for verification, the Asian culture still look attitude of asking questions while learning or speaking is still going on as disturbance, impolite, and disrespectful towards the speaker. Less social strategies use reflected that the students tended to be more independent and showed less desire to consult their problems with their peers (Alireza & Abdullah, 2010).

4.2 What are the most and least reading strategies that the Thai students employed regarding their feedback from the interview?

The most used strategy that participants (61 students) informed via interview is scanning which is consistent with those found in Zhang (2008), Hung & Ngan (2015), and Sultana (2016). The reasons for choosing scanning as the best way for helping comprehend the text are that it is easy, saves time and fast. There are some previous studies discussed on the popularity of scanning strategies. Shan-Shan (2013) stated that scanning supported the reading in interacting with the contents of the text. Fatmawati (2014) also agreed that scanning supported the students to get specific information, main idea, and details of a text faster together with being so effective to improve the reading comprehension. Next, skimming (22 students) is the second most used. The reasons are various. For example, the students could understand the main points. It saves time. In addition, they can get the whole picture of the story. Then, it comes up with note-taking (20 students). The reasons for choosing this strategy are that it helps the students to get a deeper understanding. They can remember the important parts of the reading material. They can remember the story better when they take note. Moreover, the students also informed that summarizing (18 students) is another good strategy for better understanding, reviewing, and remembering the reading passage that is consistent with the findings of Waelatech & Paramal (2014). Lastly, using dictionary to find the meaning of the difficult words (14 students) is another way to help the participants finding the meaning of those difficult words or unfamiliar vocabularies so that they can gain more understanding about the passage.

However, the participants (31 students) report reading a passage for one time as the least used strategy. That is because they think that if they read the passage only one time, they cannot fully understand the passage and they may even forget what they read. Another reason is that they must not remember what they read. Another least used strategy is reading every word (15 students). The major reason is that it wastes time in case that the participants have a limited time in reading such as taking an exam or quizzes. Then, reading aloud (9 students) is informed because the students stated that this strategy may interrupt themselves or the others so that they cannot concentrate on their task. Moreover, skimming (8 students) is another least used strategy. The reasons are that they cannot fully understand the text. Finally, summarizing (6 students) and memorizing (6 students) are other least used strategies. The participants stated that it wastes time to summarize. Sometimes, they cannot catch the story so that they might do a wrong summary. Moreover, it is not good to memorize because they cannot fully understand the passage. In the other word, it is just memorizing, not understanding.

4.3 What reading strategies do Thai students think they are useful or useless when they read the academic texts?

The most used strategy that participants (32 students) informed via interview is summarizing. The reasons for choosing summarizing as the most useful way for helping comprehend the text are that it helps to cross check their understanding through the text, supports for better memorizing, is good for reviewing and a better understanding the text. Next, finding the main idea (18 students) is the second strategy that they think it is useful. The reasons are various. For example, the students could guess the whole story from the main idea and they can faster understand the reading passage. Then, it comes up with being a tutor for friends (16 students). The reasons for choosing this strategy are that it helps the students to review the text.

They can exchange knowledge about the reading passage with their friends. Moreover, the students also informed that scanning (14 students) is another good strategy for saving time, getting the answers faster. Lastly, reading more frequently (13 students) is another way that students think is useful that is consistent with the previous study (Incecay, 2013). They think that the more repeat, the better understanding.

However, the participants (29 students) inform reading slowly with no focus as the useless strategy. That is because they think that it wastes time and they must not understand completely. In addition, eleven participants agree that reading together with doing other activities is another useless strategy. The main reason is that they did not have a concentration. Then, nine students mention scanning useless strategy because the students state that this strategy may cause mistake if they did not read carefully and completely. Moreover, skimming, reading all words, and memorizing (reported by six students) are other useless strategies. The main reasons are that they cannot fully understand the text and it wastes time. Finally, looking for facts and opinions (5 students) is another useless strategy. The participants state that it is difficult for them to clarify facts and opinions.

5. Conclusions

The present study used SILL of Oxford (1990) to investigate the reading strategies among Thai university students. The results revealed that the participants used affective strategies category the most, whereas social strategies was rated at the least used. Classified by strategy, a cognitive strategy was used the most, whereas social strategy still was the least employed. Interview data also informed that cognitive strategies (scanning) was the most employed strategy, whereas reading a passage for only one time with no focus was the least used strategy. Moreover, students think that summarizing was the most useful strategy, but reading slowly with no focus was thought to be the least useful strategy. The findings from the present study would encourage Thai students to realize on their reading strategies and their importance when they read the academic texts. Then, it also helps those teachers to organize their lesson plans that related to reading strategies together with developing the curriculum. However, this study did not investigate the relationship between the results from the questionnaire and those found from interviewing. Therefore, the further studies should investigate the stated issue.

Acknowledgements

I would like to give a very high thank you to the Faculty of Management Sciences, Kasetsart University Sriracha Campus that supported this project. In addition, I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude and thanks to all participants for their valuable time, great responses and feedbacks. Finally, I would also like to express my gratitude to my beloved grandfather, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Udom Piriyasing, who is my inspiration and hero.

References

- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language Learning Strategies Use by Saudi EFL Students: The Effect of Duration of English Language Study and Gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1), 18-28.
- Alireza, S. & Abdullah, M.H. (2010). Language learning strategies and styles Iranian engineering and political science graduate students studying abroad. *Educational Research and Review*, 5(2), 35-45.
- Anderson, N.J. (2005). *L2 Strategy research*. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. pp. 757-772. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anne, R.S. (2014). The Use of Cognitive Reading Strategies to Enhance EFL Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Education (IJE)*, 2(1).
- Boonkongsaen, N. (2014). The effects of gender, reading anxiety and language learning experience on Thai science-oriented students' use of reading strategies. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, 10(1), 24-35. Retrieved September 15, 2017, from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com>
- Bremmer, S. (1999). Language Learning Strategies and Language Proficiency: Investigating the Relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4).
- Carrell, P.L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(2), 121-134.
- Castillo, M.C.D.A. & Espeleta, I.E.S. (2013). Strategies used by successful English learners in a Chilean University. *Matices en Lenguas Extranjeras*; Bogota, 7, 23-29.
- Chu, Y.W., Huang, B.S., Shih, M.P. & Tsai, C.H. (2012). A Look at EFL Technical Students' Use of learning Strategies in Taiwan. *World Journal of Education*, 2(3), 16-24. Retrieved on September 12, 2017, from www.sciedu.ca/wje
- Del Angel, M.C. & Gallardo, K.E. (2014). Language learning strategies and academic Success: A Mexican perspective. *Universitas Psychologica*, 13(2), 703-713.
- Fatmawati, Y. (2014). *The impact of using skimming and scanning strategies of descriptive text towards students' reading comprehension at grade eight of SMPN 22 Bandar Lampung*. The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL). Bandar Lampung University. Indonesia
- Gerami, M.H., & Baighlou, S.M.G. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1567-1576.
- Grossmann, D. (2011). *A study of cognitive styles and strategy use by successful and unsuccessful adult learners in Switzerland*. Thesis. M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL/TESL), the University of Birmingham.
- Hong-Nam, K. & Leavel, A.G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34, 399-415.
- Hung, D.M. & Ngan, P.T. (2015). Investigating Reading Strategies Used by EFL Students at Dong Thap University. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(4), 10-20. Retrieved October 1, 2017, from www.multidisciplinaryjournal.com
- Hungyo, E. (2015). A Study of the language learning strategies used by business students at Asia-Pacific International University, Thailand. *Catalyst*, 12(2), 85-93. Retrieved October 17, 2017, from <http://www.apiu.edu/download-individual-articles-pdf/a-study-of-the-language-learning-strategies-used-by-business-students-at-aiu/download>
- Inceca, G. Metacognitive Online Reading Strategies Applied by EFL Students. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 9(4), 390-407. Retrieved September 15, 2017, from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/63367>
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of Language Learning Strategies Used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108-118.
- Leung, Y. (2011). Language Learning Strategies of Hong Kong Putonghua Learners. *Education Research Journal*, 26(1), 17-40.
- Magogwe, J. M. (2013). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of University of Botswana English as Second Language students of different academic reading proficiencies. *Reading & Writing*, 4(1). doi:10.4102/rw.v4i1.29
- Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language Learning Strategies Used by Japanese University students. *RELC Journal*, 30(2), 101-113.

- Mohammadi, H. & Alizadeh, K. (2014). An Investigation of Reliability and Validity of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning among Iranian University Students. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*. 1(2), 53-63.
- Nisbet, D.L., Tindall, E.R. & Arroyo, A.A. (2005). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency of Chinese University Students. *Foreign Language Annals*. 38(1).
- Nordin, N. M., Rashid, S. M., Zubir, S. I., & Sadjirin, R. (2013). Differences in Reading Strategies: How ESL Learners Really Read. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 90, 468-477. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.116
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L. (1993). Research on second language learning strategies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 13, 175-187.
- Oxford, R.L. & Berry-Stock, J.A. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide the ESL/EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*. 23(1), 1-23.
- Oxford, R.L. (1996). Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning*. 7, 25-46.
- Paksasuk, V. (2013). Students' Perceptions on the Use of Reading Strategies, Reading Difficulties, and Factors Affecting Their Reading Performance: A Case Study of a Technical English Class. *Humanities Journal*, 20(2). Retrieved September 12, 2017, from <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/abc/article/viewFile/53946/44779>
- Park, G.P. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annual*. 30(2), 211-221.
- Peacock, M. & Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 13(2), 179-200.
- Ozek, Y. & Civelek, M. (2006). A Study on the Use of Cognitive Reading Strategies by ELT Students. *The Asian EFL Journal. Professional Teachers Articles*. Retrieved October 5, 2017, from http://asian-efl-journal.com/PTA_August_06_ozec%26civelek.pdf
- Rao, Z. (2006). Understanding Chinese Students' Use of Language Learning Strategies from Cultural and Educational Perspectives. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 27(6), 491-508.
- Riazi, A. (2007). Language Learning Strategy Use: Perceptions of Female Arab English Majors. *Foreign Language Annals*. 40(3), 433-441.
- Russell, A. (2010). *Assessment of Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) in Students Learning a Second Language*. Thesis. M.A of Science Degree. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.
- Saengpakdeejit, R. (2014). Thai Third-Year Undergraduate Student's Frequent Use of Reading Strategies with a Focus on Reading Proficiency and Gender. *Kasetsart Journal (Social Sciences)*. 35(1), 102-112. Retrieved September 15, 2017, from http://kasetsartjournal.ku.ac.th/kuj_files/2014/A1403260951441406.pdf
- Semtin, S.A. & Maniam, M. (2015). Reading Strategies among ESL Malaysian Secondary School Students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 4(2), 54-61 Retrieved October 4, 2017, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1091709>
- Shang, H.F. (2010). Reading Strategy Use, Self-Efficacy and EFL Reading Comprehension. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*. 12(2). Retrieved January 5, 2018, from www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/June-2010.pdf
- Shan-Shan, K. (2013). Exploring the Useful Reading Strategies among EFL College Students in Taiwan. *Chinese Studies*. 2(4), 193-196.
- Shehadeh, A. (2015). Reading Strategies Used by Palestinian College Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 6(4), 15-25. Retrieved August 18, 2017, from http://www.awej.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=804:adnan-shehadeh&catid=62&Itemid=167
- Songsingchai, T. (2010). *Reading Strategies Used by Thai EFL Students in Reading Online and Printed Academic Texts: A Case Study of Srinakharinwirot University*. Master's thesis. Retrieved September 12, 2017, from [http://thesis.swu.ac.th/swuthesis/Eng\(M.A.\)/Tarnraporn_S.pdf](http://thesis.swu.ac.th/swuthesis/Eng(M.A.)/Tarnraporn_S.pdf)
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sultana, N. (2016). *Assessing Reading Difficulties and Reading Strategies in the Context of Bangladesh: Tertiary Level*. Thesis. M.A of Arts in English. Dhaka: BRAC University.
- Teh, K.S.M., Yusoff, N.M.R.N. & Embi, M.A. (2013). Social and Affective Strategies Use among Arabic Language Students in Terengganu. *Journal of Islamic and Arabic Education*. 5(1), pp. 11-18.
- Tsan, S.C. (2008). Analysis of English Learning Strategies of Taiwanese Students at National Taiwan Normal University. *Educational Journal of Thailand*. 2(1), 84-94. Retrieved August 18, 2017, from http://digital_collect.lib.buu.ac.th/ojs/index.php/Education3/article/view/1628

- Waelatech, B. & Paramal, N.H. (2014) English Learning Strategies Employed by Thai Students: A Case Study at Prince Songkla University, Pattani Campus. *Proceeding. 9th International Academic Conference, Istanbul*, 912-925. Retrieved November 2, 2017, from <http://proceedings.iises.net/index.php?action=proceeding.IndexConference&id=1>
- Wannathong, N. (2016). Cognitive Reading Strategies and EFL Undergraduate Learners. *Sakon Nakhon Graduate Studies Journal. 61*(3), 93-100. Retrieved October 6, 2017, from <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/SNGSJ/article/view/59241>
- Yu, Y. & Wang, B. (2009). A Study of Language Learning Strategy Use in the Context of EFL Curriculum and Pedagogy Reform in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education. 24*(4), 457-468.
- Yukselir, C. (2014). An Investigation into the Reading Strategy Use of EFL Prep-class Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 158*, 6572. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.034
- Zhang, L.J. (2008). Constructivist Pedagogy in Strategic Reading Instruction: Exploring Pathways to Learner Development in the English as a Second Language (ESL) Classroom. *Instr Sci. 36*, 89-116.