INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES AND READING PROFICIENCY AMONG THE UNIVERSITY OF JEDDAH LEARNERS

Dr. **Saleh Mohammad Ali Alqahtani**

Department of English Language and Translation,
Faculty of Sciences and Arts, Khulais,
*University of Jeddah, **SAUDI ARABIA***

ABSTRACT

There exist various factors that enhance the reading comprehension and thus a significant role is played by the metacognitive reading strategies in this enhancement. Some studies focus on claiming the relation among reading proficiency, reading motivation, and strategies of metacognitive reading. Furthermore, this study tries to focus on the awareness level as well as metacognitive reading strategies usage when students' read texts related to academics in English, their motivation level as well as their interests and performance in reading by using the instrument of Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) (Mokhtari & Richard, 2002) having subscales of global strategies, problem-solving and support strategies. The goal of this study was to fill this gap through a comparison of 197 (96 = male; 101 = female) academic reading strategies. The results indicate that students of the University of Jeddah appear to use challenging approaches more frequently than regional and promotion methods, which confirm their previous studies. Moreover, it also revealed that there was a momentous variation level in the strategies used by the female and male students. The association between the reading approaches adopted by the students to increase their reading proficiency was significant. The results proved that the participants had a good understanding and reasonable control of the metacognitive strategies while reading the academic texts.

***Keywords:** Reading, Metacognitive strategies, motivation, English language proficiency*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is considered as a major input skill required, amongst the four basic skills of the English language for language learners. Several meanings have been proposed for the word "reading." Urquhart & Weir (1998) discusses on how knowledge is obtained and conveyed in the print form in a language system. According to Grabe & Stoller (2001), reading involves learning and integrating from a text with one's own knowledge and perceptions. The individual involved in reading and the text being read undergo a continuous and active interaction which

is clearly evident and visible. For a better understanding, a text keeps the reader completely immersed. On the other hand, if the readers do not have a clear understanding of what they have read, it is important to comprehend the understanding level of the reader and how they have dealt with the text. Researchers conducted during the recent times lay emphasis on the techniques adopted by readers during the reading process (Dündar, 2016). Particularly, the academic text reading ability is as a significant skill for the university or college students of EFL (Levine, Ferenz, and Reves, 2000). Precisely, thorough comprehension is considered significant for academic reading as it is related with necessity for performing distinguishable procedural as well as cognitive tasks like giving a speech, paper writing or test (Shih, 1992).

Experts investigated on the reading techniques used by the first and second-language readers (L1 and L2) to mitigate their absence of reading skills and to improve their comprehension of reading (Carell, Pharis & Liberto 1989; Mokhtari & Sheorey 2002). Researches also show that there is a strong relation between the metacognitive awareness of reading processes and their academic ability to read and excel, within the student (Singhal. 2001; Chan 2003; Mokhtari & Sheorey 2002; Arrastia, Zayed & Elnagar 2016).

L2 readers with a keen learning and insight are those who know and use suitable learning and communication strategies in the L2. The goal of the read-strategy application is to improve the performance in using L2. Strategies are the conscientious behavior adopted by the language learner to enhance the understanding of their language (Anderson, 2004).

Some strategies can be witnessed, like watching someone take notes in an academic speech and then comparing them with a chapter in the textbook to enable better understanding and to remember information; or they can be mental, for instance, the reader may already have a preconceived notion of what one already knows about the subject before reading the textbook passage. Due to the consciousness of strategies, the L2 reader is active in selecting and using them. Strategies are not an individual action, but involve a process of orchestrating more than one measure to achieve an L2 reading task (Anderson, 2004). Although individual reading strategies can be identified, a single strategy is rarely used alone. Strategies are interconnected and must not be perceived as a single action but as a process.

Various researchers considered that, difficulties faced while reading can be overcome effectively by employing metacognitive strategies. "The cognitive strategies are regulated or monitored by the functions that comprise of learning processes, thinking, learning planning, production or comprehension monitoring whereas on the other hand, learning process keeps on running as well as at learning activity's end learning is evaluated" (Ozek & Civelek, 2006, p. 2). Further, for the foreign/second language readers this strategy is found to be critical. Also, some researchers suggest that various problems that were faced by the readers can be solved by the learning metacognitive reading strategies. As these strategies provides the efficient ways in facilitating the reading comprehension in EFL studies Aziz, Nasir, & Ramazani (2019).

This study conducted among the students of Jeddah University discusses on the current usage of EFL strategies used in reading and identifies the gender-specific differences in the use of strategies. It also analyses the connecting factor between the strategies employed for reading and the increasing the proficiency regarding the reading habits of the students. The findings of this study provide an important basis for understanding the usage of EFL reading strategies amongst the students at the university level.

With regard to this concept, the following questions on research were addressed:

1. Are students of the University of Jeddah conscious of the different strategies that they apply to have a clear perspective of the academic texts in English language?
2. Is there an association between the strategies adopted by the students of Jeddah University, with regards to the level of motivation and their reading proficiency?
3. Is there any significance of using strategies based on gender?

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is a well acknowledged fact that reading comprehension is the outcome of the multi-faceted association existing between the academic text, the background of the written material, the condition of the reader, measures adopted for reading, native and target language, and the know how's of the reader managing the text (Erler & Finkbeiner, 2007).The role played by reading strategies is very important in facilitating an efficient reading process, since there is a strong connection existing among the comprehension text being read, the frequency of reading and the different reading strategies used (Bimmel & Van Schooten, 2004). Auerbach & Paxton (1997) and Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto (1989) consider the awareness or control of the metacognitive strategies as an important component of skillful and efficient reading strategy. Metacognition refers to the advanced levels of psychological measures learned and conducted to test individual thoughts or understandings (Danuwong, 2006). On the other hand, Flavell (1987) observes that apart being considered a cognitive element, it is also possible to explore metacognition in terms of the affective aspects also. Metacognition is the knowledge and reasoning related to the study and analysis of the cognitive elements according to Flavell (1987). However, the term may be designed to cover and lay focus on psychological concepts and not pertain only to cognitive entities (Dündar, 2016). Therefore, metacognitive knowledge is a small segment of the wider field that belongs to this field of material (Meniado, 2016).

Metacognitive approaches give priority to handle pre-evaluation and pre-management; on-line management and evaluation; post-evaluation of language learning behavior and subsequent language usage (Cohen, 1998). By organizing, planning, and evaluating the learning process, these strategies allow the learners to manipulate their own cognition (Dündar, 2016). Thus, L2 learners having meta-

cognitive knowledge are able to prepare for successful learning, coordinate and use particular strategies, know how to test the use of strategies, learn how to incorporate the various approaches to reading, and determine the efficient usage of strategies (Anderson, 2015).

Mokhtari & Sheorey (2002, p.436) classifies metacognitive reading strategy into three classes, based on their usage namely, 'Global Reading Strategies (GLOB), Problem Solving Strategies (PROB) and Support Strategies (SUP)'. The categorized metacognitive reading strategies are defined as follows:

1. Global Reading Strategies (GLOB) enables the students to monitor or manage their reading by deliberate, carefully organized strategies (e.g. selecting, pre-reading text in terms of design and structure, or using maps, charts, and figures).

2. Problem-solving approaches (PROB) are the trials and the measures used by the readers when engaging directly with the text. Readers use such approaches as limited, attentive methods when they are face difficulties while reading the texts. For example, when the text that is being read is hard to infer, the reader adjusts the reading speed, anticipates the meanings of words not understood and the text is being reread to gain a better understanding of the same.

3. Support Strategies (SUP) are critical backing programs meant to help the person who reads understand the text. Some examples of support strategies adopted by the readers are usage of a dictionary, note-taking, stressing and highlighting textual content.

Considering the usage of metacognitive reading strategies by the different language users, several recent studies with different participants are being conducted in various contexts. An analysis of the current ones would enable on to have a better understanding of the issue.

Sheorey & Mokhtari (2001) explored the reading strategies adopted by the native and migrated English speakers, while interpreting scholarly manuscripts. Based on the outcomes of the study, they came to the conclusion that both the US and ESL students were found to have a good knowledge of all categories of reading strategy. Moreover, considering their reading ability or gender, the partakers demonstrated the same outcomes for the reading strategies integrated in the study; they extensively adopted cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies and SUP strategies. In addition, competent readers in both groups have shown increased use of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. Finally, the higher frequency of the strategy was used by the US female students.

Knowledge of the different approaches in metacognitive reading plays a significant role in understanding the reading and the educational process (Ahmadi, Ismail, & Abdulla, 2013; Mytcowicz, Goss, & Steinberg, 2014). The metacognitive usage and a good understanding of it has a constructive and direct connection with the comprehension performance of reading. Students who employ these approaches excel in reading ability assessments and in reading classes (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2012; Al-Sobhani, 2013; Zhang & Seepho, 2013; Hong-Nam, 2014; Tavakoli, 2014). An important problem solution for poor reading comprehension, can be

having a thorough knowledge and understanding of the metacognitive skill strategy. Hence the need to develop and emphasize it in the training and learning processes of the EFL is a pressing need of the time in educational institutions (Meniado, 2016).

In Estacio 's (2013) study, it was identified that the application of metacognitive reading strategies is an interpreter of the assessment scores for reading comprehension. Ilustre (2011) also examined whether metacognitive reading strategies are better predictors of understanding the passage being read, and identified that strategies involved in solving reading difficulties were positively associated with reading comprehension.

Ismail and Tawalbeh (2015) carried out a quasi-experimental method to investigate the consequences of metacognitive reading approaches on EFL low achievers pertaining to reading achievements. The research exposed that training the low achievement of EFL readers with the use of metacognitive strategies improves their performance in reading comprehension. Sen (2009) did a similar analysis in Turkey as well. In this study shown the potential of metacognitive reading strategies for developing successful and effective readers. Royanto (2012) has also looked at the helpfulness of a scaffolding-based intervention curriculum to improve the metacognitive reading strategies amongst the readers. They identified that the program made use of the metacognitive strategies; leading to the conclusion that meta-knowledge is available to the learners.

Although most researches found positive associations and effects on reading comprehension by using metacognitive approaches, some found results that were quite contrary. Korotaeva (2012) examined in Russia, the metacognitive strategies used in the reading comprehensions of readers from different majors and instituted that the student's responses showed signs of inefficient usage of metacognitive strategies to the core. It was studied that in countries like Indonesia, Pammu, Amir and Maasum (2014) the EFL learners of Indonesia used varied strategies of metacognitive reading. However the metacognitive reading strategies practiced by them did not bring any noticeable enhancements in their reading efficiency.

Alsamadani (2009) investigated the occurrence and variety of metacognitive reading strategies used by the college-level students at Saudi EFL and correlated them with their EFL reading performance. He identified that the student from Saudi use planning strategies more often than participating in strategies and evaluating them. He also found that the use of metacognitive reading strategies by students does not affect their level of comprehension. Mehrdad, Ahghar and Ahghar (2012) also discovered that not always does cognitive and metacognitive education have a positive impact on the reading performance of EFL students. In Pei's study (2014), it has also been revealed that metacognitive reading did not lead to the development of comprehension skills amongst the students in China.

Temur & Bahar (2011) in their study entitled "Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies of Turkish Learners Who Learn English as a Foreign Language" came to the conclusion that the university students employed PROB, GLOB, and SUP strategies. The most widely recorded strategic method used by the students was PROB and the SUP was the least used. In addition, the findings of the study

revealed that the undergraduate students used GLOB, SUP, and PROB methods more than the students of other universities.

In another study conducted by Yuksel & Yuksel (2012), they explored the metacognitive strategies and the academic reading strategies of the learners studying at a Turkish university. The study results revealed that the learners used academic reading strategies quite frequently. In addition, they mainly used and knew about PROB strategies but in academic reading the SUP strategies were the least favored.

Alhaqbani & Riazi (2012) studied the understanding of read strategies among university learners when dealing with Arabic academic texts. The study established that learners from the African countries applied more GLOB strategies compared to the Asian learners and that the learners belonging to the senior and the junior levels used more strategies compared to the first and second years.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Participants
The respondents involved in this study were 197 EFL students pursuing their Undergraduate collegiate education *(96=male; 101=female)*. They were taken from the University of Jeddah. They majored into two disciplines namely, preparatory year (42.6 %) and English language (57.4 %). The demographic survey of the participants is shown in table (1):

Table 1. *Socio-demographic information for the participating learners in the first stage (N = 197)*

Category	Description	*n*	%
Level of the study	Preparatory	84	42.6
	Second year	43	21.8
	Third year	32	16.2
	Fourth year	38	19.3
Gender	Male	96	48.7
	Female	101	51.3
Age	18-20	125	63.5
	21-25	72	36.5

Instrument
The *Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS)* is a self-report survey designed to measure the frequency and the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among adult readers in academic contexts (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). This inventory measures metacognitive awareness with Likert-type items. The student responds to each statement by circling responses one to five; one meaning that "I never or almost never do this" and five meaning that "I always or almost always do this." In the current study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was 0.93. The inventory includes three subscales: Global Reading Strategies (13 items; α =.85),

Problem-Solving Strategies (8 items, α =.86), and Supplemental Reading Strategies (9items, α =.80). The average time to complete the questionnaire was 15 minutes. The SORS has been translated into Arabic language, which is the mother tongue of the learners in order to prevent the impact of the language interference on the result of the study. Mokhtari & Sheorey (2002) also give importance to the data that the SORS is achieved on a 5-point Likert scale. The scores of 2.4 or below point out low strategy use, 2.5 to 3.4 demonstrate the usages of strategies at an average level and scores of 3.5 or above are considered as those using high strategy.

Data Analysis

Using SPSS 22, as statistic software, final quantitative data were obtained and analyzed. A descriptive statistic was conducted on all the variables. Descriptive statistics includes frequencies, means, standard deviations, and ranges for each variable. Based on each student's answers to the demographic portion of the survey, they were categorized as either male or female, and as a level of the study of the students. Reliability estimates were calculated for each subscale. A Variance Analysis (ANOVA) was carried out to determine the statistical differences between reading technique and reading ability and motivation variables. *T*-test was used to identify the average strategy usage by the two gender groups.

RESULTS

Q1: Are students of the University of Jeddah conscious of the different strategies that they apply to have a clear perspective of the academic texts in English language?

To answer this question, the correlation co-efficient between SORS and variables of the study (gender, and level of study) was conducted. The results are shown in table (2).

Table 2. *Correlations co-efficient between SORS and variables of the study (gender, and level of study)*

		SORS	gender	level of the study
SORS	Pearson Correlation	1	.173*	.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.015	.081
	N	197	197	197
gender	Pearson Correlation	.173*	1	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015		.836
	N	197	197	197
level of the study	Pearson Correlation	.125	.015	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.081	.836	
	N	197	197	197

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table (3), the correlation co-efficient between the SORS and gender is r=.173, p<.05, which indicates that there is a significant relationship. While, there is no significance relationship between SORS and level of study at r=.125, p>.05.

A descriptive statistic was conducted on all the variables in order to find out the reading strategy used by the University of Jeddah students. According to (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2002) report of SORS scores, the results for each of the 30 individual reading strategies (GLOB, PROB, and SUP) are summarized in Table 3. The respondents identified 29 strategies above 3.5 of using them of high frequency and 5 strategies from 3.06 to 3.5 as moderate frequency ones. There were no methods for reading from low frequencies.

Table 3. *Results for Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) in Means and Standard Deviations*

Category	Statements	Mean Value	Std. Deviation
	I have a specific goal in my mind when I read	3.79	1.248
	I think about what I know to help me understand what I'm reading.	3.85	1.175
GLOB	Take an overview of the text to see its content before reading it.	3.76	1.192
	I am thinking whether the text content fits my reading purpose.	3.45	1.201
	I review the text first by noting its attributes such as its length and organization.	3.19	1.412
	When I read, I decide what I want to read more closely and what I want to ignore.	3.57	1.238
	I use the tables, figures, and images in the text to further my understanding of what I read.	3.74	1.281
	I use context references to help me understand what I'm reading to get a better understanding.	3.54	1.231
	I am trying to put on formal features like writing in bold or italic to define basic information.	3.71	1.247
	Critically analyze and evaluate the information in the text.	3.06	1.333
	I review and revise my understanding when I encounter new information.	3.86	1.069
	I try to guess the content of the text content when I read it.	3.87	1.171
	I review and check to see if my guesses about the text are true or false.	3.61	1.227
	I am writing a few notes while reading to help me understand what I'm reading.	3.69	1.275
	When the text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand.	3.13	1.381
	I put a line or circle around some information in the text to help me remember it.	4.11	1.218
SUP	I use references (like an Arabic-English dictionary) to help me understand what I'm reading.	3.71	1.337
	As I read my text, I go back and forth to find relationships between the ideas in the text.	3.39	1.247
	I ask myself some questions that I want to answer in the text.	3.68	1.299
	When I read I translate from English to my native language (Arabic).	4.13	1.092
	When I read, I think about the information in English and in my mother tongue (Arabic).	3.99	1.163
PROB	I read slowly, carefully and carefully to make sure that I understood what I was reading.	4.00	1.156
	I try to get back on track when I lose focus.	4.03	1.115

I rate my reading speed according to what I read.	**3.71**	**1.209**
When the text becomes difficult, I closely check what I read.	**3.95**	**1.110**
I stop from time to time to think about what I'm reading.	**3.73**	**1.206**
I try to put a picture or a picture of the information to help me remember what I'm reading.	**3.79**	**1.206**
When the text becomes difficult, read it back to increase my understanding of it.	**3.98**	**1.204**
When I read, I guess the meanings of words or phrases that I do not know.	**3.74**	**1.139**

The most widely used metacognition reading strategies was a support reading strategies, "I translate from English into my mother tongue (Arabic) while I wrote," (M=4.13); and "I put a line or circle around some details in the text to help me remember it," (M=4.11). The third strategy that scored highest mean is "I lose concentration and I try to get back on track," (4.03), which categorizes in Problem Solving Reading Strategies.

As shown in Table 4, every aspect of the SORS (Survey of Reading Strategies) has been analysed. The obtained results provide that PROB scored (M=3.86), GLOB (M=3.61), and SUP (M=3.72) were all used with high frequency, and the SORS mean was 3.73.the results also revealed that the University of Jeddah is aware of Problem Solving Reading Strategies as the most used strategy.

***Table 4.** SORS (Survey of Reading Strategies)*

Category	Mean	Std. Deviation
PROB	3.86	.811
SUP	3.72	.781
GLOB	3.61	.744

Q2: Is there an association between the strategies adopted by the students of Jeddah University, with regards to the level of motivation and their reading proficiency?

Pearson's correlation analysis was first performed in table 5 to determine whether the cumulative usage of SORS and its sub-categories- global reading strategies, support strategies and problem strategies was associated with their English reading proficiency and motivation to use, respectively. The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) was used for the purposes of collecting language proficiency data. The reading tasks were scored following the answer guide provided in the IELTS book. The reading skill was scored 20 marks for reading. As shown in Table 6, metacognitive approach and reading comprehension were significantly and positively correlated (r=.217 * *, p=.002). It implies students using more metacognitive strategies appeared to perform better on the reading proficiency test, when students using less metacognitive strategies were likely to get low scores. Moreover, the correlation between usage of metacognition strategies and motivation is significance (r=.150*, p=.036). This result indicated that the University of Jeddah students were motivated to use the strategies to read academic texts.

***Table 5.** Correlations co-efficient between SORS, motivation and English reading proficiency test*

		SORS	Motivation	Reading test proficiency
SORS	Pearson Correlation	1	.150*	.217**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.036	.002
	N	197	197	197
motivation	Pearson Correlation	.150*	1	.156*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.036		.028
	N	197	197	197
Reading test proficiency	Pearson Correlation	.217**	.156*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.028	
	N	197	197	197

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Because significant correlation was found between SORS and reading proficiency test in this sample, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare mean of *SORS* as well as the sub-categories of SORS on reading test proficiency. The results in table 6 revealed that there was a significant correlation between SORS and reading proficiency test (F (15.196) = 2.525, $p <.00$). The sub-categories of SORS were found statically significance with reading proficiency test as the following: GLOB (F (15.196) = 2.073, $p <.01$), SUP (F (15.196) = 2.096, $p <.01$), and PROB (F (15.196) = 2.746, $p <.00$), which indicates that most students aware of using metacognition strategies in reading academic texts score high grades in reading proficiency test.

***Table 6.** One-way ANOVA SORS and Reading Test Proficiency*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SORS	Between Groups	17.686	15	1.179	2.525	**.002**
	Within Groups	84.536	181	.467		
	Total	102.222	196			
GLOB	Between Groups	15.920	15	1.061	2.073	**.013**
	Within Groups	92.666	181	.512		
	Total	108.586	196			
SUP	Between Groups	17.694	15	1.180	2.096	**.012**
	Within Groups	101.845	181	.563		
	Total	119.539	196			
PROB	Between Groups	23.877	15	1.592	2.746	**.001**
	Within Groups	104.915	181	.580		
	Total	128.792	196			

Q3. Is there any significance of using strategies based on gender?

The difference between male and female in using metacognition reading strategies (SORS) was investigated by using independent sample test *t*-test table (7).

Table 7. *Independent Samples Test between male and female in using metacognition reading strategies*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SORS	Equal variances assumed	.026	.872	2.456	195	.015	.250	.102	.450	.049
	Equal variances not assumed			2.458	194.926	.015	.250	.102	.450	.049

The result of the t-test exposed that significant difference is identified between the male and female subjects. This is showed by the overall significant value t= (195) = 2.456, p <.01). Independent samples *t*-test revealed that as a whole there were significant differences between the male and female readers in using metacognition reading strategies (SORS) (*p* <.05). Male readers mean using strategies score (*M* = 3.58) was lower than that of female (*M* = 3.83).

In order to indicate the difference between male and female in using SORS based on GLOB, PROB, and SUP one way anova was used in table (8). The results show that female students use more strategies to read academic texts than male students; and the mean difference between the groups is significant as *F* test Global Reading Strategies (*F* (1,196) 5.294, *p*=.022), Problem-Solving Strategies (*F* (1,196) 4.848, *p*=.029), Supplemental Reading Strategies (*F* (1,196) 5.554, *p*=.019).

Table 8. *One-way ANOVA of Usage of SORS Between Male and Female*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
GLOB	Between Groups	2.870	1	2.870	5.294	**.022**
	Within Groups	105.716	195	.542		
	Total	108.586	196			
SUP	Between Groups	3.311	1	3.311	5.554	**.019**
	Within Groups	116.229	195	.596		
	Total	119.539	196			
PROB	Between Groups	3.124	1	3.124	4.848	**.029**
	Within Groups	125.668	195	.644		
	Total	128.792	196			

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE

Thus, it is concluded from the current review that students are categorized as strategic readers which uses the metacognitive reading strategies moderately. During the academic reading of the text, the students have the ability for preparing, supervising, and assessing the reading performance moderately. Furthermore, in the classrooms, metacognitive reading strategies' explicit instruction must be

integrated. With the PROB strategy, any issues related to text reading can be dealt with.

On reviewing the various literatures, it has been concluded that PROB strategy has been used by most of the students either male or female, followed by support strategy and finally the global reading strategy. Thus, global reading strategy is least used whereas PROB is the mostly used strategy among both the females and male students. Furthermore, in terms of Support Reading Strategies the only difference that exists in their usage by the females or males is that female uses these strategies more than the males.

In general, the metacognitive reading strategy study still has various unexplained areas that must be explored, thus there is a need for more and more empirical as well as theoretical researches that will help in the development of reading, learning as well as teaching of English language.

The results of the study will help EFL university teachers develop a good understanding on the usage of EFL reading strategies among their students and the steps that they should take to assist the students in developing their reading skills. The findings of this study will help teachers determine the appropriate reading strategies to be used in instruction during the comprehension of English reading. However, to ensure a good understanding of English reading, students must know which techniques to use and how to use them. Besides using these high-frequency techniques, EFL high school students must learn to use them effectively.

Future studies are proposed as follows: firstly, the findings can be used to gain a deeper understanding of undergraduate college students in the usage of reading strategies. After survey or evaluation, interviews may also be used. When these methods are used, not only does the way the students interpret the different reading techniques in EFL, but also the reading techniques that are most successful in enhancing the reader's ability to read English can be tested in practice. Secondly, contrasting the use of EFL reading strategies with ability rates would be beneficial to help the students to have a better control in using the EFL reading strategies. Thirdly, action work should be undertaken to see if effective reading techniques can be used to enhance EFL students' English literacy at the collegiate undergraduate level.

REFERENCES

1) Ahmadi, R. A., Ismail, H. N., & Abdullah, M. K. (2013). The importance of metacognitive reading strategy awareness in reading comprehension. *English Language Teaching, 6*(10), 235-249. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n10p235

2) Al-Sobhani, Y. A. (2013). Metacognitive reading strategies use by Yemeni EFL undergraduate university students. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching, 4*, 121-130.

3) Alsamadani, H. A. (2009). The relationship between Saudi EFL college-level students' use of reading strategies and their EFL reading comprehension. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/ohiou12 24685570/inline

4) Alhaqbani, A., & Riazi, M. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use in Arabic as a second language. *Reading in a Foreign Language,* 24(2), 231-155.

5) Anderson, N. J., (2004). Metacognitive reading strategy awareness of EFL and ESL learners. CATESOL Journal, 16, 11-27.

6) Anderson, N.J. (2015). Academic Reading Expectations and Challenges. In N. W. Evans, N.J., Anderson, & W. G. Eggington (Eds) *ESL Readers and Writers in Higher Education: Understanding Challenges, Providing Support.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

7) Arrastia, M.C., Zayed, A.M. & Elnagar, H.Z. (2016). Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Preservice Teachers: An Exploration of Gender and Developmental Differences. *International Research in Higher Education*. 1 (5), 46-57. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v1n2p46

8) Auerbach, E.R., & Paxton, D. (1997). "It's not the English thing": Bringing reading research into the ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 31, 237-261.

9) Aziz, Z., Nasir, C., & Ramazani, R. (2019). Applying metacognitive strategies in comprehending English reading texts. Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature, 19(1), 138-159. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v19i1.1863

10) Bimmel P, Schooten E (2004). The relationship between strategic reading activities and reading comprehension. L1-Educational Stud. Lang. Literature 4(1):85-102.

11) Carrell, P.L., Pharis, B. & Liberto, J., (1989), 'Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading', *TESOL Quarterly* 23, 647–678. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587536.

12) Chan, D.W., (2003), 'Reading strategy use and motivation among Chinese good and poor readers in Hong Kong', *Journal of Research in Reading* 26(2), 177–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.00195.

13) Cohen, A.D. (1998). "Strategies in learning and using a second language." New York: Longman.

14) Dündar, S. (2016). Determining EFL students' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies. ELT Research Journal, 5 (1), 0-0. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/eltrj/issue/28783/308024.

15) Erler, L., & Finkbeiner, C. (2007). A review of reading strategies: Focus on the impact of first language. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice (pp. 187–206). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

16) Estacio, M.J.M. (2013). Bilingual readers' metacognitive strategies as predictors of reading comprehension. *Philippine ESL Journal, 10*, 179-199.

17) Flavell, J.H. (1987). Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition. In Weinert, F., and Kluwe, R. (eds.), Metacognition, Motivation, and Understanding, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 21-29.

18) Grabe, W. & F.L. Stoller (2001). Reading for Academic Purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL Teacher. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching*

English as a Second or Foreign Language (3rd edition), 187-203. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

19) Hong-Nam, K. & Page, L. (2014). ELL high school students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use and reading proficiency. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language: The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 18*(1)*. Retrieved from* http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume18/ej69/ ej69a4.

20) Ilustre, C.A. (2011). Beliefs about reading, metacognitive reading strategies and text comprehension among college students in a private university. *Philippine ESL Journal, 7*(July 2011), 28-47.

21) Ismail, N.M., & Tawalbeh, T.I. (2015). Effectiveness of a metacognitive reading strategies program for improving low achieving EFL readers. *International Education Studies, 8*(1), 71-81.

22) Levine, A., Ferenz, O., & Reves, T. (2000). EFL academic reading and modern technology: How can we turn our students into independent critical readers? Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language Journal, 4(4). Retrieved from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej16/al.html

23) Mehrdad, A.G., Ahghar, M.R., & Ahghar, M. (2012). The effect of teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies on EFL students' reading comprehension across proficiency levels. *Procedia– Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 3757-3763. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.sbspro.2012.06.142.

24) Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive Reading Strategies, Motivation, and Reading Comprehension Performance of Saudi EFL Students. English Language Teaching, 9(3), 117-129. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.5539elt.v9n3p117.

25) Mokhtari, K. & Sheorey, R., 2002, 'Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies', *Journal of Development Education* 25(3), 2–10.

26) Mytcowicz, P., Goss, D., & Steinberg, B. (2014). Assessing metacognition as a learning outcome in a postsecondary strategic learning course. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 27*(1), 51-62.

27) Ozek, Y. and Civelek, M. (2006). "A Study on the Use of Cognitive Reading Strategies by ELT Students", in The Asian EFL Journal, 14: 1-26.

28) Pammu, A., Amir, Z., &Maasum, T. (2014). Metacognitive reading strategies of less proficient tertiary learners: A case study of EFL learners at a public university in Makassar, Indonesia. *Procedia – Social and behavioral Scences, 118*, 357-364. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.049.

29) Pei, L. (2014). Does metacognitive strategy instruction indeed improve Chinese EFL learners' reading comprehension performance and metacognitive awareness? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(5), 1147-1152. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.5.1147-1152.

30) Royanto, L. (2012). The effect of an intervention program based on scaffolding to improve metacognitive strategies in reading: A study of year 3 elementary school students in Jakarta. *Procedia – Social and*

Behavioral Sciences, 69, 1601-1609.

31) Sen, H. S. (2009). The relationship between the use of metacognitive strategies and reading comprehension. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*, 2301-2305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.404.

32) Sheorey, R. & K. Mokhtari (2001). Coping with academic materials: differences in the reading strategies of native and non-native readers. *System* 29: 431-449.

33) Singhal, M., (2001), 'Reading, proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness and L2 learners', *The Reading Matrix* 1(1), 1–23, available from www.readingmatrix.com

34) Tavakoli, H. (2014). The effectiveness of metacognitive strategy awareness in reading comprehension: The case of Iranian university EFL students. *The Reading Matrix, 14*(2), 314-336.

35) Temur, T. & Bahar, Ö. (2011). Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies of Turkish Learners Who Learn English as a Foreign Language. *European Journal of Educational Studies* 3(2), 421-427.

36) Urquhart, S., & C. Weir (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice.* London and New York: Longman.

37) Yuksel, I., &Yuksel, I. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 894-898. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.164.

38) Zhang, L., & Seepho, S. (2013). Metacognitive strategy uses and academic reading achievement: insights from a Chinese context. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 10*(1), 54-69.