

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS

The purposes of this study were: (1) to investigate the developing reading methods of Industrial Education students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang. (2) To determine if developing reading strategies differ among Thai university first year engineering students of differing English reading abilities. (3) To investigate if developing reading strategies differ among Thai university first year engineering students of differing gender: male and female. The samples were all 60 second year undergraduate Industrial Education Students in the field of Applied Arts, majoring in English and enrolling the course of "Reading2" during the first semester of 2015 academic year at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang (KMITL). The research instruments for this study consisted of a two-part questionnaire. The first part of the survey gathered students' individual demographic background while the second part consisted of the developing of reading methods questionnaire adapted from the classification of reading strategies given by O'Malley and Chamot (1990). The questionnaire consists of 14 statements which include either metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social or affective strategies.

Since this research was a descriptive research using the questionnaires. All data were analyzed through computer program to find all the results. To answer all the research questions: research question number one to research question number three, statistical procedures: arithmetic mean and standard deviation were employed. Then, the data were analyzed by comparing the values of arithmetic mean, and standard deviation of students' developing reading methods. The arithmetic mean also provided average levels of all the students' English developing reading methods.

Of all 60 second year undergraduate Industrial Education students in the field of Applied Arts, majoring in English and enrolling the course of “Reading2” during the first semester of 2015 academic year at King Mongkut’s Institute of Technology Ladkrabang (KMITL) were 16 male students (26.7%) and 44 female students (73.3%). Interestingly, it showed that there were 21 students having high reading ability level (35%) and 39 students having mid reading ability levels (65%). No students having low reading ability level.

This study also indicated that, in general, all 60 second year undergraduate Industrial Education students in the field of Applied Arts, majoring in English and enrolling the course of “Reading 2” during the first semester of 2015 academic year at King Mongkut’s Institute of Technology Ladkrabang (KMITL) could develop their reading methods in moderate level (mean=3.13).

However, considering students according to their reading abilities: high and low, it was generally found that high reading ability students (N=21) could develop their reading methods in great levels (mean=3.79) while mid reading ability students (N=39) could develop their reading methods only in moderate level (mean=2.78). Interestingly, considering how students could develop their reading methods in more details, by comparing each three categories: metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective reading methods, both HRA and MRA students could use social/affective developing reading methods to develop their reading methods in moderate levels (means = 3.07, 2.80 respectively). In contrast, they could use both metacognitive and cognitive reading methods to develop their reading in different levels. That is, HRA students used those two reading methods in great level whereas MRA students used them in only moderate level. Therefore, it could be conclude that HRA students could use either metacognitive reading methods or cognitive reading methods to develop their reading much better than MRA students (for

metacognitive reading methods: means = 4.22, 2.54; for cognitive reading methods: means = 3.89, 2.84 respectively), as shown in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1: Comparison HRA and MRA Students in Developing Reading Methods**

Items	Total means and levels of HRA students in each method	Total means and levels of MRA students in each method
Item 1- Item 3	4.22 = Great (MRM)	2.54 = Moderate (MRM)
Item 4 – Item 11	3.89 = Great (CRM)	2.84 = Moderate (CRM)
Item 12 -Item 14	3.07 = Moderate (S/ARM)	2.80 = Moderate (S/ARM)
Total means	3.79 = Great	2.78 = Moderate

Remarks: HRA = Hid Reading Ability, MRA = Mid Reading Ability, MRM = Metacognitive Reading Methods,

CRM =Cognitive Reading Methods, S/CRM = Social/Affective Reading Method

Similarly, considering students according to their gender: male and female, it was generally found that male students (N=16) could develop their reading methods in great levels (mean=3.51) while female students (N=44) could develop their reading methods only in moderate level (mean=2.99). Interestingly, considering how students could develop their reading methods in more details, by comparing each three categories: metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective reading methods, both male and female students could use social/affective developing reading methods to develop their reading methods in moderate

levels (means = 3.23, 2.99 respectively), but they used both metacognitive and cognitive reading methods to develop their reading in different levels. That is, male students could use those two reading methods in great level whereas female students could use them in only moderate level. Therefore, it could be conclude that male students could use either metacognitive reading methods or cognitive reading methods to develop their reading much better than female students (for metacognitive reading methods: means = 3.84, 2.90; for cognitive reading methods: means = 3.50, 3.02 respectively), as shown in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Comparison Male and Female Students in Developing Reading Methods**

Items	Total means and levels of Male students in each method	Total means and levels of Female students in each method
Item 1- Item 3	3.84 = Great  (MRM)	2.90 = Moderate  (MRM)
Item 4 – Item 11	3.50 = Great  (CRM)	3.02 = Moderate  (CRM)
Item 12 -Item 14	3.23= Moderate  (S/ARM)	2.99 = Moderate  (S/ARM)
Total means	3.51 = Great	2.99 = Moderate

Remarks: MRM = Metacognitive Reading Methods, CRM =Cognitive Reading Methods,  
S/CRM = Social/Affective Reading Method

Last but not least, the results of this study indicated that the students' use of social and affective methods was not in good levels. All 60 students used the reading

methods to develop their reading methods moderately. Although many students have always realized the importance of reducing anxiety and regaining their confidence by discussing, asking communicating on any reading problem/difficulty with their friends/instructors, or encouraging themselves, they still could not do well in communicating with/asking help from other students or their teachers.