

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the results of the current study, obtained from the questionnaire distributed to 219 participants who were divided into two groups according to their reading ability levels. The results include the reading strategies that all participants used when they read English texts, and the comparison of reading strategies used by the two groups: the higher reading ability group and the lower reading ability group.

Reading Strategies Used by All Participants

The data retrieved from the questionnaire were counted for frequency of usage and calculated for percentage and mean scores. Table 4 shows the percentage of the participants who used the three strategies: global reading, problem-solving, and support strategies.

With regards to global reading strategies, 13.4% of the participants reported that they always used these strategies; 35.2% usually used them; 33.8% used them sometimes; 13% used them occasionally, and 3% said they never used them. There were 1.6% of the participants did not response to global strategies. The mean score of global strategies used by all participants was 3.4, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage based on the guideline suggested by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002).

Table 4

The Degree of Reading Strategies Usage by All Participants (N = 219)

Reading Strategies	0 (not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean	Degree of usage
GLOB	1.6%	3%	13%	33.8%	35.2%	13.4%	3.4	medium
PROB	1.5%	2.9%	16.6%	34%	32%	13%	3.3	medium
SUP	1.6%	7.6%	18.4%	35.3%	27.9%	9.2%	3.1	medium
Total							3.3	medium

Regarding the problem solving strategies, 13% of the participants always used these strategies; 32% usually used them; 34% used them sometimes; 16.6% used them occasionally, and 2.9% never used them. There were 1.5% of the participants did not response to problem solving strategies. The mean score of problem solving strategies used by all participants was 3.3, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage, based on the guideline suggested by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002).

With regards to the support strategies, 9.2% of the participants always used these strategies; 27.9% usually used them; 35.3% used them sometimes; 18.4% used them occasionally, and 7.6% never used them. There were 1.6% of the participants did not response to support strategies. The mean score of support strategies used by all participants was 3.1, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage, based on the guideline suggested by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002).

In sum, the participants moderately used global reading, problem-solving, and support strategies. The average mean score of these strategies usage by all participants was 3.3, which could be interpreted as a medium

degree of strategies usage (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002) as well. This indicates that the participants used all three reading strategies at a medium degree when they read EFL texts.

The next section reports the percentages of the higher reading ability participants and the lower proficiency participants who used each of the three types of reading strategies.

Higher Ability Readers' Usage of Reading Strategies

The percentage of the higher reading ability participants who used the three reading strategies is illustrated in Table 5. With regards to the global reading strategies, 15.5% of the higher reading ability participants reported that they always used these reading strategies; 36.4% usually used them; 33.5% used them sometimes; 10.6% used them occasionally, and 2.8% said they never used them. There were 1.2% of the participants did not response to support strategies. The mean score of global reading strategies used by the higher reading ability participants was 3.5, which could be interpreted as a high degree of usage, based on the guideline suggested by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002).

Table 5

The Degree of Reading Strategies Usage by the Higher Reading Ability Group

Reading Strategies	0 (not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean	Degree of usage
GLOB	1.2%	2.8%	10.6%	33.5%	36.4%	15.5%	3.5	high
PROB	0.9%	2.3%	13.6%	35.5%	31.9%	15.8%	3.4	medium
SUP	1.1%	7.6%	17.5%	32.7%	29.8%	11.3%	3.2	medium
Total							3.4	medium

Regarding the problem solving strategies, 15.8% of the higher reading proficiency participants always used these strategies; 31.9% usually used them; 35.5% used them sometimes; 13.6% used them occasionally, and 2.3% never used them. There were 0.9% of the participants did not response to support strategies. The mean score of problem solving strategies used by the higher reading ability participants was 3.4, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage.

With regards to the support strategies, 11.3% of the higher reading proficiency participants always used these strategies; 29.8% usually used them; 32.7% used them sometimes; 17.5% used them occasionally, and 7.6% never used them. There were 1.1% of the participants did not response to support strategies. The mean score of support strategies used by the higher reading ability participants was 3.2, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage.

In sum, the higher reading ability participants moderately used problem solving and support strategies at a medium degree, whereas global reading strategies were used at a high degree of usage. The average mean

score of these strategies used by the higher reading ability participants was 3.4, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of strategies usage. This indicates that the higher reading ability participants used all three reading strategies at a medium degree when they read EFL texts.

Lower Ability Readers' Usage of Reading Strategies

The percentage of using the three reading strategies among the lower reading ability participants is illustrated in Table 6. With regards to the global reading strategies, 11.3% of the lower reading ability participants reported that they always used these strategies; 34.1% usually used them; 34% used them sometimes; 15.5% used them occasionally, and 3% said they never used them. There were 2.1% of the participants did not response to global reading strategies. The mean score of global reading strategies used by the lower reading ability participants was 3.3, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage.

Table 6

The Degree of Reading Strategies Usage by the Lower Reading Ability Group

Reading Strategies	0 (not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean	Degree of usage
GLOB	2.1%	3%	15.5%	34%	34.1%	11.3%	3.3	medium
PROB	2.3%	3.4%	19.6%	32.7%	32.1%	9.9%	3.2	medium
SUP	2.2%	7.5%	19.4%	37.8%	25.9%	7.2%	3.0	medium
Total							3.2	medium

Regarding problem solving strategies, 9.9% of the lower reading proficiency participants always used these strategies; 32.1% usually used them; 32.7% used them sometimes; 19.6% used them occasionally, and 3.4% never used them. There were 2.3% of the participants did not response to problem solving strategies. The mean score of problem solving strategies used by the lower reading ability participants was 3.2, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage.

With regards to the support strategies, 7.2% of the lower reading proficiency participants always used these strategies; 25.9% usually used them; 37.8% used them sometimes; 19.4% used them occasionally, and 7.5% never used them. There were 2.2% of the participants did not response to support strategies. The mean score of support strategies used by the lower reading ability participants was 3.0, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of usage.

In sum, the lower reading ability participants moderately used global reading, problem solving, and support strategies at the same degree. The average mean score of their usage of these strategies was 3.2, which could be interpreted as a medium degree of strategies usage. This indicates that the lower reading ability participants used all three reading strategies at the same degree (medium) when they read EFL texts.

In conclusion, the participants from both higher and lower reading ability groups used problem solving and support strategies at the same degree of usage (medium), while global reading strategies were used at the different degree. The higher ability readers used global reading strategies at a high degree, while the lower ability readers used it at a medium degree. The

average mean scores of usage of the three strategies by both higher and lower reading ability readers were 3.4 and 3.2, respectively, which indicates that averagely there was no difference between the higher and the lower reading ability readers regarding their usage of reading strategies.

A Comparison of Strategies Usage between the Higher and the Lower Ability Readers

This section reports the participants' usage of the sub-strategies in each group. Additionally, it compares the usage of sub-strategies in each category between the higher and the lower reading ability participants. The mean score of each item was calculated and interpreted as its degree of usage.

Global Reading Strategies

Table 7 shows the 13 global reading strategies that were used by the higher ability participants, ranged from high to low degree of usage. Averagely, the higher reading ability participants used global reading strategies at a high degree ($M=3.5$) as shown in Table 5. However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the higher reading ability participants, it is found that they used seven sub-strategies at a high degree and six sub-

Table 7

The Higher Ability Participants' Usage of Global Reading Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean Score	Degree of Usage
25	Rereading text when it becomes difficult	0.9%	0.9%	3.6%	23.6%	46.5%	24.5%	3.9	high
10	Underlining or circling information in the text	0%	2.7%	5.5%	23.6%	41.8%	26.4%	3.8	high
29	Translating from L2 to L1	0.9%	0.9%	7.3%	28.2%	39.1%	23.6%	3.7	high
19	Trying to picture or visualize information	0.9%	0%	5.5%	30.9%	42.7%	20%	3.7	high
7	Reading slowly and carefully	0.9%	3.6%	11.8%	21.9%	39.1%	22.7%	3.6	high
14	Paying closer attention to text when it becomes difficult	0.9%	3.6%	6.4%	37.3%	38.2%	13.6%	3.5	high
23	Checking understanding when come across new information	0%	1.8%	9.1%	40.9%	38.2%	10%	3.5	high
22	Finding relationship among ideas in the text by going back and forth	0.9%	1.8%	9.1%	42.7%	32.7%	12.8%	3.4	medium
26	Self-questioning	0.9%	1.8%	9%	41.9%	40%	6.4%	3.4	medium
3	Activating prior knowledge	1.8%	1.8%	14.5%	35.5%	36.4%	10%	3.3	medium
4	Taking an overall view of the text	0.9%	5.5%	17.3%	28.2%	34.5%	13.6%	3.3	medium
1	Setting purpose for reading	4.5%	2.7%	19.1%	35.5%	26.4%	11.8%	3.1	medium
17	Using context clues	3.6%	9%	19.1%	45.5%	17.3%	5.5%	2.8	medium
Total								3.5	high

Table 8

The Lower Ability Participants' Usage of Global Reading Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean Score	Degree of Usage
25	Rereading text when it becomes difficult	1.8%	4.6%	9.2%	13.8%	43.1%	27.5%	3.7	high
10	Underlining or circling information in the text	1.8%	3.6%	6.5%	27.5%	37.7%	22.9%	3.6	high
29	Translating from L2 to L1	1.8%	0.9%	10.1%	24.9%	44%	18.3%	3.6	high
19	Trying to picture or visualize information	1.8%	3.6%	11.9%	23.9%	45%	13.8%	3.5	high
7	Reading slowly and carefully	1.8%	0.9%	12.8%	31.2%	40.5%	12.8%	3.5	high
14	Paying closer attention to text when it becomes difficult	1.8%	0.9%	17.5%	36.7%	33%	10.1%	3.3	medium
23	Checking understanding when come across new information	1.8%	3.6%	11%	43.2%	31.2%	9.2%	3.3	medium
22	Finding relationship among ideas in the text by going back and forth	1.8%	0.9%	14.7%	42.2%	33%	7.4%	3.3	medium
27	Self-questioning	1.8%	5.5%	12.8%	37.6%	33%	9.3%	3.2	medium
3	Activating prior knowledge	0.9%	2.8%	19.3%	38.5%	33.9%	4.6%	3.2	medium
4	Taking an overall view of the text	2.8%	1.8%	21.1%	34.8%	34.9%	4.6%	3.2	medium
1	Setting purpose for reading	5.5%	0.9%	28.4%	43.2%	16.5%	5.5%	2.8	medium
17	Using context clues	1.8%	9.2%	25.7%	45%	17.4%	0.9%	2.7	medium
Total								3.3	medium

strategies at a medium degree. The seven sub-strategies that the higher reading ability participants used at a high degree were rereading text when it becomes difficult, underlining or circling information in the text, translating from L2 to L1, trying to picture or visualize information, reading slowly and carefully, paying closer attention to text when it becomes difficult, and checking understanding when come across new information. Furthermore, there were six sub-strategies that the higher reading ability participants used at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were finding relationship among ideas in the text, self-questioning, activating prior knowledge, taking an overall view of the text, setting purpose for reading, and using context clues.

Similarly, Table 8 shows the 13 global reading strategies that were used by the lower reading ability participants, ranged from high to low degree of usage. Averagely, the lower reading ability participants used global reading strategies at a medium degree ($M= 3.3$) as shown in Table 6.

However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the lower reading ability participants, it is found that they used five sub-strategies at a high degree and eight sub-strategies at a medium degree. The five sub-strategies that the lower reading ability participants used at a high degree were translating from L2 to L1, underlining or circling information in the text, rereading text when it becomes difficult, reading slowly and carefully, and trying to picture or visualize information. Furthermore, there were eight sub-strategies that the lower reading ability participants used at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were self-questioning, finding relationship among ideas in the text, checking understanding when come across new information,

paying closer attention to text when it becomes difficult, activating prior knowledge, taking an overall view of the text, setting purpose for reading, and using context clues.

The higher reading ability participants and the lower reading ability participants averagely used the global reading strategies at the different degree of usage. The higher ability readers used global reading strategies at a high degree, while the lower ability readers used it at a medium degree. The higher ability readers used seven sub-strategies at a high degree of usage and the other six sub-strategies at a medium degree. The lower ability readers used five sub-strategies at a high and eight sub-strategies at a medium degree.

Considering the use of each sub-strategy, there were five sub-strategies that both higher and lower ability used at the same degree. These sub-strategies were rereading text when it becomes difficult, underlining or circling information in the text, translating from L2 to L1, trying to picture or visualize information, and reading slowly and carefully at a high degree of usage. The participants from higher and lower ability groups used finding relationship among ideas in the text by going back and forth, self-questioning, activating prior knowledge, taking an overall view of the text, setting purpose for reading, and using context clues at a medium degree. Some of these sub-strategies were used to store new information and others were used to retrieve it from memory. They were also the most popular strategies among learners (Oxford, 1990).

However, two sub-strategies were used differently by the higher and the lower ability participants. The higher reading ability participants paid

closer attention to text when it becomes difficult and checking understanding when come across new information at a high degree of usage (M=3.5 and 3.5), while the lower reading ability participants used these strategies at a medium degree (M=3.2 and 3.3). These sub-strategies provided readers an effective way to plan and arrange their language. However, unsuccessful readers have problem in realistically monitoring their error and they fail to adequately evaluate progress (Oxford, 1990). This finding supported what Paris and Mayers (1981) state that the higher ability readers were able to monitor comprehension of difficult formation by paying closer attention to what they read and check understanding, whereas the lower ability readers were not. Clearly, the higher ability readers were more able to acknowledge the importance of the reading materials than the lower ability readers were.

Problem Solving Strategies

Table 9 shows the eight problem solving strategies that were used by the higher reading proficiency participants, ranging from high to low degree of usage. Averagely, the higher reading ability participants used problem solving strategies at a medium degree (M=3.4) as shown in Table 5. However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the higher reading ability participants, it is found that they used four sub-strategies at a high degree and the other four sub-strategies at a medium degree. The four sub-strategies that they used at a high degree were using reference materials, paraphrasing, checking whether the guesses about text are right or wrong, and reviewing the text

before reading. Furthermore, there were four sub-strategies that the higher reading ability participants used at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were critically analyzing and evaluating information in the text, adjusting reading speed according to text, thinking about information in both L1 and L2, and stopping from time to time and thinking about text.

Similarly, Table 10 shows the eight problem solving strategies that were used by the lower reading ability participants, ranging from high to low degree

PAYAP UNIVERSITY

Table 9

The Higher Ability Participants' Usage of Problem-Solving Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasional ly)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean Score	Degree of Usage
13	Using reference materials (e.g., a dictionary)	0%	2.7%	10%	20%	26.4%	40.9%	3.9	high
18	Paraphrasing	0%	2.7%	9%	32.8%	40%	15.5%	3.6	high
27	Checking whether the guesses about text are right or wrong	0.9%	0%	12.7%	29.2%	44.5%	12.7%	3.5	high
8	Reviewing the text before reading	0.9%	0.9%	14.5%	31.9%	34.5%	17.3%	3.5	high
21	Critically analyzing and evaluating information in text	0.9%	2.7%	18.2%	48.2%	21.8%	8.2%	3.4	medium
11	Adjusting reading speed according to text	0.9%	2.7%	12.7%	41.9%	30.9%	10.9%	3.3	medium
30	Thinking about information in both L1 and L2	2.7%	1.8%	17.3%	40.9%	22.8%	14.5%	3.2	medium
16	Stopping from time to time and thinking about text	0.9%	4.5%	14.5%	39.1%	34.5%	6.5%	3.2	medium
Total								3.4	medium

Table 10

The Lower Ability Participants' Usage of Problem-Solving Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Missing)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean Score	Degree of Usage
13	Using reference materials (e.g., a dictionary)	3.7%	1.8%	11.9%	25.7%	33%	23.9%	3.5	high
8	Reviewing the text before reading	2.8%	2.8%	12.8%	22%	47.7%	11.9%	3.4	medium
18	Paraphrasing	1.8%	0.9%	18.4%	32.1%	35.8%	11%	3.3	medium
27	Checking whether the guesses about text are right or wrong	1.8%	2.8%	19.3%	33%	32.1%	11%	3.2	medium
16	Stopping from time to time and thinking about text	2.8%	3.7%	21.1%	31.1%	35.8%	5.5%	3.1	medium
11	Adjusting reading speed according to text	1.8%	4.6%	21.1%	38.5%	29.4%	4.6%	3.0	medium
30	Thinking about information in both L1 and L2	1.8%	7.3%	25.7%	35.8%	20.2%	9.2%	2.9	medium
21	Critically analyzing and evaluating information in text	1.8%	3.7%	25.7%	43.1%	22.9%	2.8%	2.9	medium
Total								3.2	medium

of usage. Averagely, the lower reading proficiency participants used problem-solving strategies at a medium degree ($M=3.2$) as shown in Table 6. However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the lower reading ability participants, it is found that they used one sub-strategy at a high degree and the other seven sub-strategies at a medium degree.

One sub-strategy that the lower reading ability participants used at a high degree was using reference materials. Furthermore, there were seven sub-strategies that the lower reading ability participants used at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were reviewing the text before reading, paraphrasing, checking whether the guesses about the text are right or wrong, stopping from time to time and thinking about the text, adjusting reading speed according to text, thinking about information in both L1 and L2, and critically analyzing and evaluating information in the text.

In comparison the higher reading ability participants and the lower reading ability participants averagely used problem solving strategies at the same degree of usage (medium), when considering the sub-strategies usage, there were some differences (see Table 9 and Table 10). The higher ability readers used four sub-strategies at a high degree of usage and four sub-strategies at a medium degree, while the lower ability readers used one sub-strategy at a high degree of usage and seven sub-strategies at a medium degree.

The higher and the lower ability participants used five strategies at the same degree of usage. They used using reference materials at a high degree of usage. One possible explanation is that this sub-strategy was the most

popular strategies among readers (Oxford, 1990). Another explanation is that EFL readers have limited vocabulary knowledge, which is a critical factor in L2 reading comprehension and leads to skill development in L2 learning process (Macaro, 2006). The lower ability readers were more concern about vocabulary than the higher ability group did. Some lower ability readers mentioned that they looked at meanings for new words or phrases when confronted with difficulties at word level.

In addition, participants from higher and lower ability groups used critically analyzing and evaluating information in the text, adjusting reading speed according to text, thinking about information in both L1 and L2, and stopping from time to time and thinking about text at a medium degree. These sub-strategies concern logical analysis and reasoning as applied to various target language skills as well as to understand the meaning of a new expression or to create a new expression. However, the participants' L2 competency may not develop to the level that they can use high order thinking skills. Moreover, they may not realize how essential these strategies were, which could be one of the causes (Oxford, 1990).

Three sub-strategies were used at different degrees by the higher and the lower ability participants. The higher reading ability participants used paraphrasing, checking whether the guesses about text are right or wrong, and reviewing the text before reading at a high degree of usage, while the lower reading proficiency participants used them at a medium degree. Concerning paraphrasing, Majid (1984) explained that the higher ability readers preferred to use their own words more than the lower ability readers, and they were

better in selecting relevant details from the passage. The higher ability readers had higher reading proficiency level and they had less problems understanding L2 texts so they were better in using strategies that require higher thinking skills, for instance, paraphrasing, checking the guesses and texts, and reviewing the text before reading. The lower ability readers had lower reading proficiency so they had difficulties to understand L2 language and strategies usage (Yang, 2002).

In addition, the higher ability readers backed up their understanding by checking their guesses while reading; however, the lower ability readers did not (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995). One explanation is that the higher ability readers were more selectively attentive and able to proceed generally from front to back of texts while reading than the lower ability readers were.

The finding also showed that the higher ability participants intentionally kept spiraling back to what has already been learned at the same time that they are learning new information by reviewing the text before reading, whereas the lower ability participants did not. One explanation is that the higher ability readers were more able to recognize and relate the relevance of the content to their previous knowledge and experience, while the lower ability readers were not (Majid, 1984).

Support Strategies

Table 11 shows the nine support strategies that were used by the higher reading ability participants, ranging from high to low degree of usage.

Averagely, the higher reading ability participants used support strategies at a medium degree ($M=3.2$) as shown in Table 5. However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the higher reading ability participants, it is found that they used two sub-strategies at a high degree and seven sub-strategies at a medium degree. The two sub-strategies that the higher reading ability participants used at a high degree were trying to guess about the content of text and trying to get back on track when losing concentration. Furthermore, there were seven sub-strategies that the higher reading ability participants used at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases, using typological features, deciding what to read closely and what to ignore, reading aloud, fitting content of the text and reading purpose, taking note while reading, and using tables, figures, and pictures in text.

Table 11

The Higher Ability Participants' Usage of Support Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean score	Degree of Usage
24	Trying to guess about the content of text	0.9%	0%	6.4%	30%	39.1%	23.6%	3.8	high
9	Trying to get back on track when losing concentration	0.9%	0.9%	9.1%	29.1%	37.3%	22.7%	3.7	high
28	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases	0.9%	3.6%	14.5%	30.9%	37.3%	12.8%	3.4	medium
20	Using typographical features	1.8%	6.4%	13.6%	31.9%	34.5%	11.8%	3.3	medium
12	Deciding what to read closely and what to ignore	0.9%	10.9%	13.6%	30%	39.1%	5.5%	3.1	medium
5	Reading aloud	1.8%	12.7%	16.4%	29.1%	30%	10%	3.0	medium
6	Fitting content of the text and reading purpose	0.9%	5.5%	20.9%	44.5%	21.8%	6.4%	3.0	medium
2	Taking note while reading	0.9%	11.8%	29.1%	33.7%	20%	4.5%	2.7	medium
15	Using tables, figures, and pictures in text	0.9%	16.4%	33.6%	35.6%	9%	4.5%	2.5	medium
Total								3.2	medium

Table 12

The Lower Ability Participants' Usage of Support Strategies

Items	Sub-strategies	0 (Not response)	1 (Never)	2 (Occasionally)	3 (Sometimes)	4 (Usually)	5 (Always)	Mean Score	Degree of Usage
24	Trying to guess about the content of text	1.8%	0.9%	6.4%	28.5%	43.1%	19.3%	3.7	high
9	Trying to get back on track when losing concentration	1.8%	1.8%	14.7%	35.8%	37.6%	8.3%	3.3	medium
28	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases	4.6%	1.8%	15.6%	36.7%	34%	7.3%	3.2	medium
20	Using typographical features	2.8%	9.1%	13.8%	33%	31.2%	10.1%	3.1	medium
12	Deciding what to read closely and what to ignore	3.7%	6.4%	15.6%	40.4%	29.3%	4.6%	3.0	medium
5	Reading aloud	0%	6.4%	19.3%	55%	15.6%	3.7%	2.9	medium
6	Fitting content of the text and reading purpose	1.8%	10.1%	26.6%	30.3%	24.8%	6.4%	2.9	medium
2	Taking note while reading	1.8%	13.8%	25.7%	44%	11.9%	2.8%	2.6	medium
15	Using tables, figures, and pictures in text	1.8%	17.4%	35.8%	36.7%	5.5%	2.8%	2.3	low
Total								3.0	medium

Similarly, Table 12 shows the nine support strategies that were used by the lower reading ability participants, ranging from high to low degree of usage. Averagely, the lower reading proficiency participants used support strategies at a medium degree ($M=3.0$) as shown in Table 6. However, when considering each sub-strategy used by the lower reading ability participants, it is found that they used only one sub-strategy at a high degree, seven sub-strategies at a medium degree, and one sub-strategy at a low degree. The lower reading ability participants tried to guess about the content of text at a high degree. Furthermore, they used seven sub-strategies at a medium degree. These sub-strategies were guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases, trying to get back on track when losing concentration, using typological features, deciding what to read and what to ignore, fitting content of the text and reading purpose, reading aloud, and taking note while reading. Only one sub-strategy, using tables, figures, and pictures in text, was used at a low degree by the lower reading ability participants.

Although both the higher reading ability participants and the lower reading ability participants averagely used the support strategies at the same degree of usage (medium) when considering the sub-strategies usage, there is some difference. The higher and the lower ability participants used seven sub-strategies at the same degree of usage. They used trying to guess about the content of text at a high degree. One possible explanation is that this sub-strategy brings a great deal of knowledge, expectation, assumptions, and a basic of understanding of the vocabulary which readers can relate to their experiences to help them comprehending texts (Goodman, 1967).

Furthermore, participants from both higher and lower proficiency groups

used guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases, using typological features, deciding what to read closely and what to ignore, reading aloud, fitting content of the text and reading purpose, and taking note while reading at a medium degree of usage. These sub-strategies allow readers to demonstrate their understanding tangibly and prepare for using language.

The higher and the lower ability participants used two sub-strategies differently. The higher reading ability participants used trying to get back on track when losing concentration at a high degree of usage, while the lower reading ability participants used it at a medium degree. The higher reading ability participants used tables, figures, and pictures in text at a medium degree, while the lower reading ability participants used it at a low degree. As for trying to get back on track when losing concentration, the higher ability readers were more aware of acknowledging the importance of the reading materials. The lower ability readers, on the other hand, were not aware of acknowledging the importance of the reading materials or evaluating their reading because of their limitation of the target knowledge (Majid, 1984). In addition, the higher reading ability participants claimed to be able to use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase understanding at a higher degree than the lower reading ability participants did. One explanation is that the higher ability readers were more aware of the importance of such technical aids in the text as different tables, figures, and pictures than the lower ability readers were. They were able to promote their personal growth and transfer skills from those technical aids as well as using them to gain more knowledge. The lower ability readers, however, may not recognize the relevance of the technical aids to their additional knowledge.

Additionally, the results from the interview attributed the support to what the findings reported above. The samples from both groups informed that sometimes they averagely used all three strategies when reading texts. However, when considering the sub-strategies usage, there were tendencies of strategies usage among the higher ability group than the lower ability group. Regarding global reading strategies, all samples from both groups said that they frequently reread texts when they wanted to increase their understanding, underlined information in texts, and translated from L2 to L1. This could be associated with time spent on reading and ability of word or sentence understanding of the participants. Non-proficient readers need to spend more time on reading and word definitions. They stop reading when confronted with difficulties at even word level whereas proficient readers less do (Majid, 1984). In addition, 80% of the participants from both groups claimed that they frequently used reference materials when reading texts and reviewing the text before reading. These strategies mentioned earlier were well known among readers (Oxford, 1990). Moreover, the samples from both groups said that they frequently used support strategies. All participants from both groups used guessing about the content. According to Majid (1984), readers who still have problem at word level cannot comprehend the meaning of texts. They skipped to what they can understand to help them comprehend the meaning of the whole texts. However, more than 60% of them mentioned that they had not heard about some strategies, including taking note and using tables, figures, and pictures in texts. This could be explained that readers still have both language problem and strategy usage's problem.

In conclusion, the participants from both higher and lower ability groups employed problem solving and support strategies at the same degree of usage, which was a medium degree. However, they used global reading strategies differently. The higher ability readers used global reading strategies at a high degree, while the lower ability readers used it at a medium degree. There was a tendency that the higher ability reader used more sub-strategies than the lower ability readers. However, when considering the average mean scores of these two groups, the results revealed that averagely the higher and lower ability readers used strategies at the same degree of usage (medium), which were 3.4 and 3.2. The fact that they averagely used problem solving and support strategies at the same degree of usage could be interpreted that their ability in determining what strategies they should use to enhance their reading were not good because of their language problems. Thus, they were not able to reach a certain level of comprehension texts at a college level. On the other hand, the fact that the higher ability readers averagely used global reading strategies higher than the lower ability did could be interpreted that the higher ability readers have better way of thinking of as generalized and intentional reading strategies aimed at setting the stage for the reading act than the lower ability readers do. Thus, the higher ability readers showed higher tendency of using global reading strategies than the lower ability readers did.

The next section discusses the conclusion of the result found in the current study.

Discussion

The result of this study revealed that the higher and lower ability readers used reading strategies at the same degree (medium). It is consistent with a previous study on reading strategies by Kaosombut (2004), which found that readers from different ability levels used strategies similarly. This may be because the higher and lower ability readers shared similar backgrounds when learning the English language. Both groups studied English as a foreign language in schools for at least eight years (Wirotanun, 2002). Sosothikul (1992, p.1) stated that many university students are “poor readers”. They read slowly and without realizing their purposes. Their reading background is poor and they are not able to understand the meaning of words and phrases in more advanced reading materials. Thus, when they read EFL texts they used similar strategies to help them comprehend what they read.

Another possible explanation was that the higher and lower ability readers were simply unaware of some reading strategies because they are not directly taught (Holloway, 1999; Saskatchewan Education, 1997; Sosothikul, 1992). In the interview, both higher and lower ability readers informed in the interview that when they read in L2, they tried to finish the text by reading every single word. They rarely checked their understanding or perform other strategies. Additionally, some of them repeated the same strategies because those were all they knew. Carrell (1985) stated that reading strategies can be taught to students because they enhance students’ comprehension and recall.

Students need to be explicitly taught various strategies in order to increase their reading comprehension.

When considering the results of each category of the three reading strategies, both higher and lower ability readers used problem solving and support strategies at a medium degree of usage. However, the two groups used global strategies at different degrees. The higher ability readers used global strategies at a high degree of usage, while the lower ability readers used it at a medium degree. This result supported parts of Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) who conducted a study assessing adolescent and adult readers' metacognitive awareness and perceived use of reading strategies while reading academic of school-related materials. In Mokhtari and Reichard's study, the results revealed that there were significantly different between highly skilled readers and less skilled readers when using strategies. The highly skilled readers had a significantly higher use of global and problem solving strategies than less skilled readers. In the current study, however, the difference is only in the use of global strategies.

The explanation of this outcome probably is the lower ability readers had problems with utilizing complex strategies that were beyond their understanding (Liontas, 1999). In contrast, the higher ability readers used complex strategies more frequently than did the lower ability readers because they knew when and how to apply strategies on a task (Carrell, 1989; Paris & Mayers, 1981). Lower ability readers did not engage in deliberate activities that required intentional thinking and flexible strategies (Paris & Jacobs, 1984). They did not think about the topic, look forward and backward in the

passage, and check their own understanding as they read as higher ability readers did.

Additionally, the mean score outcome of each category of reading strategies showed that there was a tendency that the higher ability readers used more strategies than did the lower ability readers, though it is noted that the differences lacked any significance (see Table 13).

Table 13

A Comparison of the Mean Scores of Strategies Usage

Strategies	Higher Ability Participants	Lower Ability Participants
	Mean Scores	Mean Scores
GLOB	3.5	3.3
PROB	3.4	3.2
SUP	3.2	3.0
Total	3.4	3.2

Table 13 compares the mean scores of the usage of reading strategies. In all categories, the higher ability readers' mean score of usage was higher than those of the lower ability readers (3.5:3.3; 3.4:3.2; 3.2:3.0). This is also true for the overall usage of reading strategies (3.4:3.2). This showed that the higher ability readers had a tendency to use reading strategies more frequently than the lower ability readers did.

This result supported the outcome of Paris and Mayers' study (1981) which found that there was a strong relationship between reading strategies used by the readers and their levels of proficiency. Besides, good readers

tended to use a wider range of strategies and used them more frequently than poor readers. This seemed to suggest that readers' ability and their usage of reading strategies interacted with each other. The higher ability readers seemed to be distinguished from the lower ability readers in their reported frequency of using the reading strategies. This frequency was reflected in their understanding of when, where and how they tended to use these strategies. The higher ability readers were not so much confined to their L2 linguistic boundaries as were the lower ability readers. Thus, the higher ability readers showed the tendency of better understanding what they read, while the lower ability readers struggled with text meaning because of linguistic boundaries and tendency of less strategies use (Barnet, 1988).

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter described the results of the analysis of the strategies usage of EFL college readers when reading an English text. The result of the study revealed that averagely the participants from higher and lower ability groups used global reading strategies at the different degree, while problem solving and support strategies were used at the same degree of usage. The reasons of the outcomes were also discussed.