

Received: 2020-03-31

Revised: 2020-12-21

Research Articles  
Accepted: 2020-12-22

การพัฒนาวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ และการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของผู้เรียนที่เรียน  
ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศที่มีความสามารถทางด้านภาษาแตกต่างกัน  
โดยการใช้กิจกรรมการอ่านแบบแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้  
Metacognitive Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension Achievement  
with Difference Proficiencies' EFL Learners through  
Reciprocal Reading Activities

วิมลพร ระเวงวัลย์<sup>1</sup>

Wimonphon Rawengwan

รัตนา ยาวิโลง<sup>2</sup>

Rattana Yawiloeng

Corresponding Author E-mail: kib-555@hotmail.com

### บทคัดย่อ

บทความวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) ศึกษาการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถทางด้านภาษาแตกต่างกันโดยการใช้กิจกรรมการอ่านแบบแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้ 2) ศึกษาผลสัมฤทธิ์ของการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจโดยการใช้กิจกรรมการอ่านแบบแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้ของผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถทางด้านภาษาแตกต่างกัน (เก่ง ปานกลาง อ่อน) ประชากรได้แก่นักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏนครสวรรค์ จำนวน 43 คน กลุ่มตัวอย่างได้แก่ ผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถทางด้านภาษาแตกต่างกันจำนวน 3 คน (เก่ง 1 ปานกลาง 1 อ่อน 1) โดยใช้วิธีการสุ่มแบบเจาะจง เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัยในครั้งนี้ ได้แก่ 1) แบบสำรวจพฤติกรรมการใช้กลวิธีการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ 2) ข้อสอบวัดผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจ Oxford Reading Comprehension Placement Test 2015 3) แบบทดสอบวัดผลสัมฤทธิ์ก่อนเรียนและหลังเรียน สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลได้แก่ ค่าเฉลี่ย, ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน, การทดสอบที และร้อยละ ผลการวิจัยพบว่า การใช้กิจกรรมการอ่านแบบแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้สามารถกระตุ้นกลวิธีการอ่าน ภาษาอังกฤษแบบต่าง ๆ เช่น การตั้งคำถาม, การทำนาย, การสรุปความ และการแปลความ ของผู้เรียนที่มีความสามารถทางด้านภาษาแตกต่างกัน และผู้เรียนมีผลสัมฤทธิ์ด้านการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจหลังเรียนสูงขึ้น

**คำสำคัญ:** กลวิธีการอ่านแบบอภิปัญญา, การอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจ, กิจกรรมการอ่านแบบแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้

### Abstract

The objectives of this study were 1) to investigate metacognitive strategies are used by the readers engaged in reciprocal reading activities 2) to investigate the achievement of reading comprehension based on reciprocal reading activities using metacognitive strategies for reading comprehension. The research population consisted of 43 first-year learners at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University. The sampling comprised of three different proficiency EFL learners (advanced, intermediate, novice) by purposive sampling. Data were collected by metacognitive reading strategies observation form, the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) and reading

<sup>1</sup> Doctoral Student in English, School of Liberal Arts, University of Phayao

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer in English, School of Liberal Arts, University of Phayao

comprehension pre-test and post-test. Mean, standard deviation, t-test and percentage were used as data analysis.

The results of this study showed that reciprocal reading activities could engage three different proficiency EFL learners; they used different metacognitive reading strategies to achieve reading comprehension (e.g., questioning, predicting, summarizing, and translation). All of them were more frequently used cognitive reading strategies than metacognitive reading strategies. Also, reciprocal reading activities could engage the reading comprehension achievement with different proficiency EFL learners. Discussion and findings are offered.

**Keywords:** Metacognitive Reading Strategies, Reading Comprehension, Reciprocal Reading Activities

## Introduction

It is well known that reading comprehension consists of a complex cognitive process, language competency, and metacognitive process. In reading class, if a teacher teaches reading strategies with their learners in the systematic ways and proper process of reading (pre-reading, during reading, and post-reading), the learners will consciously receive the meaning or comprehend the texts. Besides, the learners will use the various procedures in the reading process to promote the energetic competence and intentional reading (Ahmadi & Gilakjani, 2012; Arman, 2017; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). So, reading comprehension and reading strategies are relevant. Reading strategies mean the use of flexible and conscious procedures that readers apply in many types of text, they can identify the readers' perception about textual clues, sense of reading, and using problem-solving methods when they encounter with the reading comprehension problems. They can help learners to comprehend the text and support them to be the independent readers (Allen, 2003; Carrell, 1989 as cited in Ahmadi & Gilakjani, 2012). Flavell (1976) as cited in Jafari and Ketabi (2012) asserted that metacognition refers to the intellectual awareness and control of one's own learning. Besides, metacognitive strategies refer to the methods used to help learners understand the way they learn (thinking about thinking). The metacognitive reading strategies are influenced to the readers' higher comprehensible input (Chevalier, Parrila, Ritchie, & Deacon, 2017). Also, they can help the readers to academic success at the university level. Thus, the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in EFL reading activities will be considered as the teaching strategies to enhance reading comprehension ability with EFL learners.

However, EFL learners at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University have encountered with reading comprehension problems because they were taught by using grammar-translation and lecture-based strategies to practice reading comprehension skills. Thus, most learners are passive learners and they do not share their comprehension skills with others. Also, they lack reading strategies practiced to promote reading comprehension abilities. As a result, they are still inefficient readers in improving reading comprehension achievement. Therefore, EFL learners at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University require the metacognitive reading comprehension practiced in the English reading class. Reciprocal reading activities with four metacognitive reading strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, summarizing) are offered to solve reading comprehension problems with them. In this activity, the learners will have opportunities to share their opinion in small group work and they will activate the use of metacognitive reading strategies through four

metacognitive reading strategies practiced to be the comprehended readers and enhanced reading comprehension ability.

## Objectives

The objectives of this study were:

1. to investigate metacognitive reading strategies are used by the readers engaged in reciprocal reading activities.
2. to investigate the achievement of reading comprehension based on reciprocal reading activities using metacognitive reading strategies for reading comprehension.

## Methodology

### 1. Population and Sampling

The research population consisted of 43 EFL first-year learners at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University, who registered the course name English for Technology in the academic year 2019. After that, three different proficiency EFL learners (advanced, intermediate, novice) were selected by purposive sampling by using the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) by Word and Gramer (2015).

### 2. Research Instruments

2.1 The cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies observation form with their characteristics (Dahish, 2017; Oczkus,2018; Thampradit, 2006; Wirotanan,2002) were used as the research instruments to observe three different proficiency EFL learners.

2.2 The Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) by Word and Gramer (2015). 25 items were used to investigate the achievement of reading comprehension.

2.3 The reading comprehension pre-test and post-test (12 items per each unit) were from three units in the English for Technology textbook that was constructed by the researcher based on Bloom's Taxonomy model (Dagostino, Carifio, Bauer, Zhao, & Malaysia, 2014). All of them were given to the specialist to find out the item difficulty. Also, they were used to investigate the achievement of reading comprehension.

### 3. Data Collection and Data Analysis

#### 3.1 Data Collection

The table below shows the data collection with three different proficiency EFL learners by using reciprocal reading activities in small group work.

<b>Reciprocal Reading Activities with Different Proficiency EFL Learners</b>
<b>Week 1 (3 hours)</b>
The research introduced the objectives of the study and gave the schedule with all participants. They did the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) to classify the language learners' competency (advanced, intermediate, novice) into a small group work with 4 to 6 persons.
<b>Week 2-5 (12 hours) Unit 1 to 3</b>
Before the unit 1 to 3 began, all participants were trained the using of reciprocal reading activities (predicting, questioning, clarifying, summarizing). Then, they took turns using the

reciprocal reading activities in their small group work of 4 to 6 persons. Besides, the participants did the reading comprehension pre-test and post-test before and after each unit beginning.

Three different proficiency EFL learners were observed the metacognitive strategies using through reciprocal reading activities in a small group work. Besides, the data collection strategies were used observation form and audio recording.

#### Week 6 (3 hours)

All participants did the Oxford reading comprehension test (2015).

### 3.2 Data Analysis

Mixed-method (both qualitative and quantitative) were used to analyze the data. Qualitative data were analyzed by discourse analysis using metacognitive reading strategies observation form by (Dahish, 2017; Thampradit, 2006; Wirotanan, 2002) in term of the frequency of using metacognitive reading strategies in the reading process through reciprocal reading activities with different proficient EFL learners. Meanwhile, quantitative data were analyzed by using Oxford reading comprehension placement test 2015 and reading comprehension pre-test and post-test to answer the research question number two by the mean, standard deviation, t-test and percentage.

## Results

The results of the study will be presented by each objective.

1. To investigate metacognitive reading strategies are used by the readers engaged in reciprocal reading activities.

The table below shown the metacognitive reading strategies are used by three different proficiency EFL learners (advanced, intermediate, novice) in the reciprocal reading activities.

**Table 1** The metacognitive reading strategies are used by the advanced learner (AL1) through reciprocal reading activities in the reading process.

Units 1-3 Advanced Learner (AL1)	Reciprocal Reading Activities	(Meta)cognitive Reading Strategies Codes (C4) = Clarifying, (C12) = Grammar concentration, (C22) =Prediction (C23) =Questioning, (C24) =Re-reading, (C27) =Summarizing, (C29) =Translating, (C30) =Using dictionary, (C31) =Using tittle, (M17) =Supporting-reading strategies
1. Technology and Society	Pre-reading Predicting During-reading Questioning Clarifying Post-reading Summarizing	AL1: We had to <u>use a dictionary to find new vocabulary</u> . What did these words mean? (C30) AL1: <u>What</u> was marine engineering? (C23) AL1: Everyone found the meaning of the new vocabulary by <u>translated!</u> (C29) AL1: <u>What</u> were information technology and marine engineering? What did they do? (C23) AL1: <u>This sentence could be summarized</u> in the summarizing part; if it did not correct, we had to find the other one. (C27) AL1: <u>This idea could be written and summarized</u> in the last part. (Technologies were important to our society and they had both positive and negative effects. The engineers created technology.) (C27)
2. Studying technology	Pre-reading Predicting During-reading	AL1: <u>I did not get this word. What did this word mean?</u> Peer: It meant quality. (C4)

	Questioning Clarifying	AL1: We had to different <u>highlight</u> the sentences to make the questions. What was question number one? (M17) AL1: <u>What</u> was engineer high qualification? Hum... <u>How</u> did I ask the question? I wanted to change the question. <u>What</u> did this word mean? (C23) AL1: <u>I predicted that</u> what did the learner learn? (C22) AL1: I wished I asked a teacher. " <u>What</u> was "sandwich"?" (C23) AL1: I wanted to know the meaning of sandwich course. <u>What</u> did it mean? (AL1 asked a teacher.) (C23) AL1: (Re-read) ..... " <u>This was called part-time, day-release, and sandwich course.</u> " (C24)
	Post-reading Summarizing	AL1: ( <u>Highlighted</u> ) The keyword used to make the question. (M17) AL1: <u>Which</u> part could we use to make the summarizing? (C23)
3. Design	Pre-reading Predicting	AL1: <u>Predicting</u> (What did we learn?) Design! Gave the information: " <u>I thought I would learn design process because.....</u> " (C22) <u>Looked at the topic again!</u> I couldn't remember. "..... Because I found from the title..." We tried to write the new one. "I thought I would learn design process because <u>I found from the tittle</u> ". (C31) AL1: <u>Wrote in Thai</u> first! (C29)
	During-reading Questioning Clarifying	AL1: <u>I underlined the information</u> to make the question one. (M17) AL1: Third question was " <u>What</u> was the purpose of designer?" (C23) AL1: <u>What</u> was the first stage of the design process to make the model? (question number four) (C23) AL1: <u>Could we changed the question</u> "What was the beginning of making model." I never used " <u>What was the beginning.....?</u> " Peer: You had to use this idea. AL1: " <u>What was the first step to make the model?</u> " We could make the <u>question.</u> <u>Wrote this question and please remembered</u> " <u>What was the first step to make the model?</u> " (C12) * (Advanced learner changed the structure of question word.) AL1: <u>What</u> was "realization"? (C23)
	Post-reading Summarizing	-

The frequency of metacognitive reading strategies was used by advanced learner (AL1) unit 1 to unit 3. They could be illustrated that cognitive reading strategies were most used by the advanced learner nine times of questioning (C23) 40.9%, twice of predicting (C22) 9%, summarizing (C27) 9% and translating (C29) 9%, once of clarifying (C4) 4.5%, using dictionary (C30) 4.5%, grammar concentration (C12) 4.5%, re-reading (C24) 4.5%, and using title (C31) 4.5%. Also, reciprocal reading activities could activate the metacognitive reading strategies to the advance learner thrice of supporting-reading strategies (M17) 13.6% such as highlight or underline the keywords.

**Table 2** The metacognitive reading strategies are used by the intermediated learner (IL1) through reciprocal reading activities in the reading process.

Units 1-3 Intimidated Learner (IL1)	Reciprocal Reading Activities	(Meta)cognitive Reading Strategies Codes (C11) = Finding the main Idea, (C22) = Prediction, C23) = Questioning, (C24) = Re-reading, (C27) = Summarizing,
---	-------------------------------------	--

		(C29) = Translating, (C30) = Using dictionary, (C31) = Using title, (M13) = Vocabulary listing, (M14) = Working with classmate, (M17) = Supporting-reading strategies
1. Technology and Society	<p>Pre-reading Predicting</p> <p>During-reading Questioning Clarifying</p> <p>Post-reading Summarizing</p>	<p>IL1: Using google <u>translation!</u> (C29)</p> <p>IL1: I thought we learned about “Technology and Society” I <u>looked at from the title.</u> (C22)</p> <p>IL1: “<u>The main idea was</u> “the purpose of technology”. It was very important in society. (C11)</p> <p>IL1: <u>What</u> was the purpose of technology? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: You could <u>open the dictionary!</u> It meant sad or disappointing. (C30)</p> <p>-</p>
2. Studying Technology	<p>Pre-reading Predicting</p> <p>During-reading Questioning Clarifying</p>	<p>IL1: It was ok. I had to <u>translate it!</u> (C29)</p> <p>IL1: “<u>Studying Technology</u>” was the topic for today. (C31)</p> <p>IL1: Questioning! We <u>looked at the detail or main idea</u> of the studying then we made the question. (C11)</p> <p>IL1: We had to <u>guess from the topic (title)</u> and the context. What did we write on the sheet? (C31)</p> <p>IL1: This was the supporting detail. We had to guess the topic then gave the supporting detail. What did we do?</p> <p>IL1: Also, we could compare between <u>technical, technologists, and engineer.</u> What were they different? (M13)</p> <p>IL1: I would start with .... <u>I thought....</u> (Waite a moment....) I didn’t know. What did we write? We had explained. (C22)</p> <p>IL1: <u>It was another topic.</u> It was not working. It was only for studying because I saw the word “university”. (C31)</p> <p>IL1: Hum.... <u>It was about studying.... when the learners graduated from this course then they could do work under this field. (engineering)</u> (C27)</p> <p>IL1: Also, “<u>What</u> did the qualifications do they got after they completed the course?” (C23)</p> <p>IL1: I didn’t write (predicting) <u>I thought I would learn about.....</u> (C22)</p> <p>IL1: <u>What</u> did we give the reasons after “because.....”? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: “<u>I thought I learned about</u> the qualification of studying and when the students finished the course, they could do....” (C22)</p> <p>IL1: <u>We could use “because” to support the predicting.</u> (C22)</p> <p>IL1: <u>What</u> did we make the questions? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: So, we could make the question “<u>How many</u> years did the technologist train?” (C23)</p> <p>IL1: Also, <u>what</u> did they have to learn? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: <u>Who</u> is he (Alex)? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: What... OK. We asked “<u>Who</u> was Alex and <u>What</u> did he do?” (C23)</p> <p>IL1: <u>Didn’t forget underline the sentence?</u> <u>This way could help ours to remember.</u> (M17)</p> <p>IL1: <u>What</u> was the last question? (C23)</p> <p>IL1: Ok. The last question was “<u>What</u> did the students do after they finished the course? (career) (C23)</p> <p>IL1: <u>The main idea was an important part,</u> but this part was finding the difficult vocabulary. We had to find the meaning of “HND” because we didn’t know what did it mean at first? (C11)</p>

	Post-reading Summarizing	-
3. Design	Pre-reading Predicting During-reading Questioning Clarifying  Post-reading Summarizing	IL1: <u>What</u> reason did we give? (C23) IL1: <u>Look at the title!</u> (C31) IL1: We could <u>underline the words that we didn't know.</u> (determined together) (M17) IL1: Consistently, “manufacture” this word was ok. We could give the reason; <u>we got the meaning of this word by asking a friend.</u> (M14) IL1: Also, <u>re-read the text</u> and didn't emphasize the meaning of all sentences. We focused only the difficult word. (C24) IL1: Actually, <u>this paragraph was a description.</u> (C11) IL1: <u>Could we make a question like this?</u> “Did the designer test the product before selling?” (C23) IL1: <u>What</u> was the last question? (C23)

The frequency of metacognitive reading strategies were used by intermediate learner (IL1) unit 1 to unit 3. They could be illustrated cognitive reading strategies were most used by the intermediate learner thirteen times of questioning (C23) 38.2 %, five times of predicting (C22) 14.1%, four times of finding the main idea (C11) 11.7% and using the title (C31) 11.7%, twice of translating (C29) 5.8%, once of using a dictionary (C31) 2.9%, summarizing (C27) 2.9% and re-reading (C24) 2.9%. In addition, reciprocal reading activities could activate the metacognitive reading strategies to the intermediate learner once of vocabulary listing (M13) 2.9%, supporting-reading strategies (M17) 2.9% and working with classmates (M14) 2.9%.

**Table 3** The metacognitive reading strategies are used by the novice learner (NL1) through reciprocal reading activities in the reading process.

Units 1-3 Novice Learner (NL1)	Reciprocal Reading Activities	(Meta)cognitive Reading Strategies Codes (C4) = Clarifying, (C11) = Finding the main Idea, (C14) = Identify keywords and phrases, (C16) = Looking for main idea, (C22) = Prediction, (C23) = Questioning, (C24) = Re-reading, (C27) = Summarizing, (C29) = Translating, (C30) = Using dictionary, (C31) = Using the title, (M14) = Working with classmate
1. Technology and Society	Pre-reading Predicting  During-reading Questioning Clarifying	NL1: I did not understand the main idea. <u>Could I use Thai language?</u> (C29) NL1: <u>This wasn't the main idea</u> and what was the main idea? <u>Could you tell me?</u> (NL1 asked her peer)? (M14) NL1: Ok. <u>I wrote the main idea.</u> <u>What</u> was it? (Technology and Society) (C11+C23) NL1: “I thought I would .....” Peer: There weren't any pictures, so you had to write ..... “ <u>I thought I would learn about technology and society because I read from the topic.</u> ” (C22) NL1: <u>What</u> did it mean? “I think I would .....” (C23) NL1: The main idea was very important. We could ask “ <u>What</u> was the main idea?” (C23) NL1: If you said that this story was about engineering. <u>How</u> did I write? (C23)

	<p>Post-reading Summarizing</p>	<p>NL1: <u>What</u> was the next question? (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> were they (old technology) developed from? (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> was next? Did this technology have the effects? (C23)  NL1: <u>The last paragraph was important</u> “The problem for technology was how to increase the positive effects on society and reduce the negative effects.”  Peer: It was important. The last paragraph was “The problem for technology was how to increase the positive effects on society and reduce the negative effects.”  NL1: ..... <u>because technology was important for society.</u> (C14)  NL1: <u>Could I ask the question</u> that “<u>What</u> was old technology developed new technology?” (From radio wave to mobile phone) (C23)  NL1: Yes, that was an example. <u>How</u> could do I write it? (C23)  NL1: <u>What's</u> next? ..... coal and oil. <u>Why</u> engineers created these (coal and oil)? (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> was this story about? (C23)  NL1: <u>I would ask</u> “<u>What</u> was this story about?” (C23)  NL1: The question was easy, but we had to <u>read the main idea again.</u> (C24)  NL1: <u>What</u> did I write? (C23)  NL1: <u>Could I write the first question</u> was from the first paragraph and the second line. I took it from there. (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> was the title? (C23)  NL1: And <u>what</u> was the problem? (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> was the negative effect of developing? (C23)  NL1: <u>Which</u> sentence was it? (C23)  NL1: I wanted to make question using this sentence but I didn't know <u>how did I write.</u> (M14)  Peer: <u>What did you say?</u>  NL1: I wanted to make question using this sentence.....  Peer: <u>The technology had both positive and negative effects. We could ask the question “Did technology have only positive effect? Answered no, it didn't. It had negative effect too. It was very easy.</u>  NL1: <u>Yes!</u>  NL1: <u>Where</u> was it? (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> was it? (C23)  NL1: (focused on the questions) “<u>What</u> did we ask about daily technology?” (C23)  NL1: <u>What</u> were main ideas 1 2 3 or 4? (C23)  NL1: (asked the teacher) <u>What</u> was this? (C23)  NL1: <u>Could I write in Thai?</u> (C29)  NL1: <u>Why</u> this word was difficult? (C23)  NL1: (talked about clarifying) <u>What</u> was “different”?  (NL1 talked to her peer to get the meaning of the vocabulary (tag-tarng in English) (C23)  Peer: “different”  NL1: <u>What</u> did this word mean? (C23)  NL1: <u>Could you read this word.....?</u> (M14)  Peer: <u>e-quip-ment</u></p>
--	-------------------------------------	---



2. Studying Technology	<p><b>Pre-reading</b> Predicting</p> <p><b>During-reading</b> Questioning Clarifying</p> <p><b>Post-reading</b> Summarizing</p>	<p>NL1: <u>From the title</u>. it was about “studying and technology”. (C31)</p> <p>NL1: How did a person who wanted to be an engineer do? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>It was the main idea</u>. It was an example of engineering. <u>What</u> did the engineer do? (C11+C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did we do? Everyone <u>opened the online dictionary!</u> (C23+C30)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> was the most difficult? Hum.....(C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>Could I ask a question number three?</u> (C23)</p> <p>NL1: “certification “<u>Opened the dictionary</u>. (C30)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did it read? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: I couldn’t remember. <u>Could you explain?</u> “The difference between a technician, a technology and an engineer, they passed and progressed from these routes: .....”) (C23)</p>
3. Design	<p><b>Pre-reading</b> Predicting</p> <p><b>During-reading</b> Questioning Clarifying</p> <p><b>Post-reading</b> Summarizing</p>	<p>NL1: This one consisted of the important and <u>what</u> did this word mean?</p> <p>I asked you every day but I still forgot. (C23)</p> <p>NL1: Also, <u>it was the main idea</u>. <u>There were the stages to do</u>. (C11)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did this part talk about? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: Asked teacher, teacher! <u>What</u> did this phrase mean? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>How</u> did we write it to have many stages? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: It was about design. <u>Why</u> was it about design? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>The main idea was the second one</u>, “the design process”. I was sure!</p> <p>(Please, asked me <u>how</u> I wrote in English?) (C16+C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> was this? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> these phrases pronounced? “the definition of design” (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>To sum up</u>, this topic was about the definition and meaning of the design process. (C27)</p> <p>NL1: Ok. I could do it. “<u>What</u> was the heart of design, or what was the heart of technology?” <u>Could you translate it for me?</u> (C23+M14)</p> <p>NL1: <u>Could I ask</u> “How many design processes were there?”? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> was the heart of technology? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: Hum..... so we could ask “<u>Where</u> was the first or second stage of the design process?” (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>How</u> did I write the answer of “Where did the design process begin?” (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>Which</u> word was the same meaning of “composing”? (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did this say? It was .....(C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did I summarize? I didn’t understand. <u>Could you translate this sentence for me?</u> (C23+M14)</p> <p>Peer: <u>The design process would be ended when the product met all of the requirements or the designer could solve the problem</u>.</p> <p>NL1: OK! I could ask “<u>When</u> was the end of product?” (C23)</p> <p>NL1: <u>What</u> did this word mean? “durability” <u>It was very difficult words</u>.</p> <p>Peer: “durability” or “heard wearing” (C4)</p> <p>NL1: (<u>opened the online dictionary</u>) .... Listened! Listened! I didn’t know. (<u>What</u> did it pronounce?) (C30+C23)</p> <p>NL1: “<u>the stages of the design process</u>” and <u>there were eight</u>.</p> <p>Teacher! <u>You could say that “I thought I would lean the design process because I saw there were eight stages of the design process”</u>. (C27)</p>

		<p><b>NL1: “Where did the design process begin?” (C23)</b></p> <p><b>Teacher:</b> Hum.... “Where” meant you asked about places? Please changed this question into “What did the design process begin?” Or “What stage did the design process start?” Then, clarifying.....</p>
--	--	--

The frequency of metacognitive reading strategies were used by the novice learner (NL1) unit 1 to unit 3. They could be illustrated cognitive reading strategies were most used by her fifty-two times of questioning (C23) 71.2%, thrice of finding the main idea (C11) 4.1% and using a dictionary (C30) 4.1%, twice of summarizing (C27) 2.7% and translating (29) 2.7%, once of prediction (C22)1.3%, identifying keywords and phrases (C14) 1.3%, re-reading (C24) 1.3%, using title (C31) 1.3%, looking for main ideas (C16) 1.3% and clarifying (C4) 1.3%. Besides, reciprocal reading activities could activate the metacognitive reading strategies to the novice learner five times of working with classmates (M14)6.8%.

2. To investigate the achievement of reading comprehension based on reciprocal reading activities using metacognitive strategies for reading comprehension.

The table below are illustrated the mean score of the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2105) and the percentage of pre-test and post-test scores (units 1 to 3) before and after using reciprocal reading activities intervention with different EFL proficiency learners (advanced, intermediate, novice).

**Table 4** The Mean Score and the Percentage of the Oxford Reading Comprehension Placement Test (2105) of Three Deferent Proficiency EFL Learners Pre-test and Post-test

Different Proficiency Learners	Oxford Reading Comprehension Placement test (2015)			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Mean	Percentage	Mean	Percentage
1. Advanced Learner (AL1)	15	60%	12	48%
2. Intermediate Learners (IL1)	12	48%	15	60%
3. Novice Learners (NL1)	6	24%	16	64%

According to the mean score of pre-test and post-test (the Oxford reading comprehension placement test), the mean score of the post-test of advanced learner (AL1) is (12). It is lower than the mean score of the pre-test. Conversely, the mean score of pre-test and post-test of intermediate learner (IL1), the mean score of the post-test is (15). It is higher than the mean score of the pre-test (12). Similarly, with the mean score of pre-test and post-test, the mean score of the post-test of novice learner (NL1) is (16). It is higher than the mean score of the pre-test (6). It has surprisingly.

**Table 5** Paired Simple T-test for the Equality of Mean for Three Different Proficiency EFL Learners Pre-test and Post-test

Different ProficiencyLearners	Reading Comprehension Pre-test and Post-test Unit 1 to 3					
	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Mean	S.D.	Percentage	Mean	S.D.	Percentage

1. Advanced Learner (AL1)	2.33	1.15	19.41 %	2.66	1.52	22.16 %
2. Intermediated Learners (IL1)	5.33	1.15	44.41 %	7	1	58.33 %
3. Novice Learners (NL1)	3.33	0.57	27.75 %	4	1	33.33 %

The mean score,

the standard deviation and the percentage of pre-test and post-test with the different proficiency EFL learners (advanced, intermediate, novice) illustrate the significant differences before and after using reciprocal reading activities intervention with all of them. There are as follows; the mean score of the post-test of an advanced learner is (2.66). It is higher than the mean score of the pre-test (2.33). The mean score of the post-test of an intermediate learner is (7). It is higher than the mean score of the pre-test (5.33). Besides, the mean score of the post-test of a novice learner is (4). It is higher than the mean score of the pre-test (3.33).

## Discussion

Both quantitative and qualitative data will be discussed. The result from the metacognitive reading strategies observation form explains that reciprocal reading activities can activate three different proficiency EFL learners to use metacognitive reading strategies. Also, the achievement of reading comprehension of three different proficiency EFL learners are improved based on reciprocal reading activities.

Surprisingly, the novice learner (NL1) frequency uses metacognitive reading strategies (73 times) to comprehend the reading articles from unit 1 to 3. Questioning is the most favorite cognitive reading strategy for this novice learner (52 times) 71.2%. In addition, the reciprocal reading activities can engage the novice learner uses many cognitive reading strategies (11 types) as follows; questioning, finding the main idea, using a dictionary, summarizing, translating, prediction, identifying keywords and phrase, re-reading, using title, looking for main ideas, and clarifying. Also, the novice learner uses a type of metacognitive reading strategy that is working with classmate for reading comprehension (Palinscar & Brown, 1984 as cited in Ahmadi & Gilakjani, 2012).

In the same way, the intermediate learner (IL1) uses metacognitive reading strategies (34 times) through reciprocal reading activities. Questioning is the most frequently cognitive reading strategy used by the intermediate learner (IL1) 38.2%. The finding of this study reveals that “questioning” was used to encouraged EFL learners to discuss with their peers (Prastyo & Rodli, 2017). The reciprocal reading activities can activate the intermediate learner (IL1) to use (9 types) of cognitive reading strategies; questioning, predicting, finding main idea, using title, translating, using dictionary, summarizing, re-reading and it can activate the using of metacognitive reading strategies (2 types); supporting strategies (e.g., highlight the important part) and working with classmate with the intermediate learner (IL1) for reading comprehension.

In this research study, the advanced learner (AL1) is the least using of metacognitive reading strategies (9 types) engaging in the reciprocal reading activities. Questioning is the most frequently cognitive is used by the advanced learner (AL1) 40.9%. This finding is similar with Pilten (2016) that the learners needed to make active questions on the content of the writing. Also, reciprocal reading activities can activate the advanced learner (AL1) using of many cognitive reading strategies (e.g., questioning, predicting, summarizing, translating, clarifying, using a dictionary, grammar concentration, re-reading and using title). Supporting-reading strategies is an only type of metacognitive reading is used by the advanced learner (AL1).

Also, the quantitative data are from the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) by Word and Gramer (2015) and the reading comprehension pre-test and post-test. They use to support the achievement of reading comprehension based on reciprocal reading activities using metacognitive strategies for enhancing reading comprehension. The results are as follows.

According to the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) by Word and Gramer (2015), the mean score of post-test of the advanced learner (AL1) is (12). It is lower than the mean score of the pre-test (15). Meanwhile, the mean score of post-test of intermediate learner (IL1) is (15). It is higher than the mean score of pre-test (12). In the same way, the mean score of post-test of the novice learner (NL1) is (16). It is higher than the mean score of pre-test (6). In this cause, only the mean score of post-test of advance learner (AL1) is lower than the mean score of post-test. However, the mean score of post-test (unit 1 to 3) of three different proficiency EFL learners are higher than the mean score of pre-test. It can be summarized that reciprocal reading activities can enhance the using of metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension achievement with different proficiency EFL learners at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University.

### Suggestion

1. The follow up using reciprocal reading activities with the different proficiency EFL learners could be investigated the other language skills.

2. The researcher notices that from the four metacognitive reading strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, summarizing), three different proficiency EFL learners are good at using questioning, clarifying, predicting, summarizing) in order. All of them are not good at summarizing, so the next research should investigate the other activities to support reciprocal reading activities in the post-reading (summarizing part).

3. From the Oxford reading comprehension placement test (2015) by Word and Gramer (2015), the next research should investigate the sustainability of using reciprocal reading activities with different proficiency EFL learners (classifying male and female) in another class of reading comprehension skills.

### References

- Ahmadi, M. R., & Gilakjani, A.P. (2012). Reciprocal Teaching Strategies and Their Impacts on English Reading Comprehension. *Theory and Practice in language studies*, 2(10), 20-53.
- Arman, R. F. S. (2017). *Factors that Influence Students' Motivation in Learning Reading Comprehension in English Language Education*. Department of University Muhammadiyah Malang. Thesis of Doctoral dissertation, University of Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Chevalier, T. M., Parrila, R., Ritchie, K. C., & Deacon, S. H. (2017). The Role of Metacognitive Reading Strategies, Metacognitive Study and Learning Strategies, and Behavioral Study and Learning Strategies in Predicting Academic Success in Students with and without a History of Reading Difficulties. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 50(1), 34-48.
- Dagostino, L., Carifio, J., Bauer, J., Zhao, Q. & Malaysia, S. (2014). Assessment of a Reading Comprehension Instrument as It Relates to Cognitive Abilities as Defined by Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. *Current Issues in Education*, 17(1), 1-15.
- Dahish, J. M. (2017). ESL Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Their Reading Strategies. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 6(2), 92-111.

- Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension Skill and the Strategies for Improvement. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(5), 180.
- Jafari, D., & Ketabi, S. (2012). Metacognitive Strategies and Reading Comprehension Enhancement in Iranian Intermediate EFL Setting. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 4(3), 1-14.
- Thampradit, P. (2006). *A Study of Reading Strategies Used by Thai University Engineering Students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang. A study of reading strategies used by Thai university engineering students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang*. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Retrieved January, 11 2018, from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/a4ca16fa9eb2ca5e5ab668d2d4bafbbf/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Oczkus, L. D. (2018). *Reciprocal Teaching at Work: Powerful Strategies and Lessons for Improving Reading Comprehension* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Prastyo, M., and Rodli, H. (2017). Applying Reciprocal Teaching Method in Teaching Reading. *Linguistics and Literature*, 1(2), 112-122.
- Pilten, G. (2016). The Evaluation of Effectiveness of Reciprocal Teaching Strategies on Comperhension of Expository Texts. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(10), 232-247.
- Wirotnan, J. (2002). *Reading Strategies of University EFL Thai Readers in Reading Thai and English Expository Texts*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).
- Word, C. S. & Gramer, M.F. (2015). *Q: Skills for Success 3 Reading and Writing*. Retrieved February, 5 2018, from <https://iq.ouponlinepractice.com/lms/book?bookid=rw3>