Reading Strategies in Iranain EFL learners

Fatemeh Esmaeili
Islamic Azad University, Makou Branch, Iran.

ABSTRACT

Reading strategies are of interest for what they reveal about the way readers manage their interaction with written text and how these strategies are related to text comprehension. The aims of this study is to compare using of metacognitive strategies in reading skill by advanced, intermediate and elementary levels learners of English language. 200 Iranian EFL students both male and female were participated in this study. Their language proficiency level was classified to elementary, intermediate and advanced learners. It is convincing to mention that the participants were English major in teaching, translation and literature. The researcher utilized a questionnaire which was 22 items based on Likert Scale. The metacognitive reading strategies questionaire (MRSQ)is administered to investigate the frequency of participants'useof metacognitive reading strategies developed by Taraban,Kerr and Rynerson (2004). The results of the chi-square indicate that there is a significant relationship between the proficiency level of the students and their use of meta-cognitive strategies (x^2 (8) = 74.67, P = .000 < .05). That is, as proficiency level increases the students make more use of meat-cognitive strategies. It should be also noted that gender as an independent variable in this study didn't cause any significant difference in the performance, i.e., we can claim that no significant differences between male and female students exist regarding the use of metacognitive strategies.

Introduction

Reading is considered to be the most important language skill and defined as the ability of drawing meaning from the text and interpreting this information in an apprppriate way, Grabe and Stoller (2002). Reading is the kind of process in which one needs to not only understand its direct meaning, but also comprehend its implied ideas. As Tierney and Readence (2005) states, "Learning to read is not only learning to recognize words; it is also learning to make sense of texts" (p. 51).

The skill of reading is also the central point of attention in foreign language teaching (Richards &Renandya, 2002: 273) .According to them; there aretwo basic reasons for this. Their first reason indicates reading as the most important goal of many foreign language learners, whereas their second reason considers a great number of pedagogical aims of texts help reading to become so important. Also Anderson (1999) highlights that with a greater exposure to the target language via reading since foreign language learners greater possibilities of mastering their proficiency in English. He points out that by the help of reading learners are exposed to a great amount of language which results in proficiency in the target language.

Reading strategies are of interest for what they reveal about the way readers man a get heir interaction with written text and how these strategies are related to text comprehension. Research in second language reading suggests that learners use a variety of strategies to assist them with the acquisition, storage, and retrieval of information. Strategies are defined as learning techniques, behaviors, problem-solving or study skills which make learning more effective and efficient (Rigney, 1978).

People read different things with different aims and use different strategies for different tasks. In order for readers to achive their purpose in reading the text,they need to follow reading strategies during the process. In this respect,O'Malley andChamot listed learning strategies in three categories of metacognitive, cognitive and social/affective.The present study aims to focuse on metacognitive reading strategies.

One of the first definitions of metacognition comes from Flavell (1979), who describes it asone's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them. He also asserts that metacognition includes the active monitoring and consequent regulation andorchestration of information processing activities. He uses these ideas to provide the following succinct formulation: 'metacognition refers to the knowledge, awareness and control of one's own learning'. There are three aspect of metacognition: metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive monitoring, self regulation and control.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Some of the learners have problem in reading comprehension. It is supposed that appropriate use of metacognitive strategies have a positive impact on English as a foreign language (EFL) learners'reading comprehension.

The current research in second language reading has begun to focus on readers' strategies. Reading strategies are of interest for what they reveal about the way readers manage their interaction with written text and how these strategies are related to text comprehension.

In this respect,the aims of this study is to compare using of metacognitive strategiesin reading skill by advanced, intermediate and elementary levels learners of English language.

The study adressed the followingtwo research questions:

- **RQ1**: Is there any difference between advanced, intermediate and elementary level language students in terms of using metacognitive reading strategies?

- **RQ2**: Dose gender difference have any influence on the metacognitive strategy use?

Tele:
E-mail addresses: Fesmaeili76@yahoo.com

Review of the Related Literature
Reading Comprehension Strategies

Researches mostly regards reading processes as being of two major components, which are decoding and comprehension. Decoding is the recognition of words and their meanings, while comprehension requires relevant background knowledge and the application of general reading strategies, such as predicting the content of the text, guessing unknown words in context, making inferences, recognizing the type of text and text structure, and grasping the main ideas of the paragraph.

Brown (2001) states that for EFL learners who are already literate in a previous language, reading comprehension is primarily a matter of developing appropriate, effective comprehension strategies. Some strategies are related to bottom-up procedures, and others enhance the top-down processes.From the many reading strategies related to top-down processing, question-generation stands apart for more consideration, since it is believed that if this strategy and its key aspects are taught by EFL teachers, brilliant results will be observed in learners' reading comprehension performance. However the researcher would tend to review some key aspects related to this strategy first. Since question-generation is a cognitive learning strategy when used in reading for comprehension, the author finds it important to review issues like learning strategies, communication strategies, cognitive, meta-cognitive strategies, reading strategies and the importance of teaching them.

Strategy

Strategies are procedures used in learning, thinking, etc. which serve as a way of reaching a goal. In language learning, learning strategies and communication strategies are those conscious or unconscious processes which language learners make use of in learning and using a language.

Communication Strategies vs. Learning Strategies

Faerch and Kasper (1983, cited in Ellis 1985) used another dichotomy to distinguish learning strategies from other strategies. The dichotomy is learning style v.s learning strategies. Learning style refers to any individual's preferred ways of going about learning. It is generally considered that one's learning style will result from personality variables, including psychological and cognitive make-up, socio-cultural background, and educational experience. Learning strategies on the other hand are the mental processes which learners employ to learn and use the target language. These processes are called procedural knowledge.

According to Brown (1994) while learning strategies deal with the receptive domain of intake, memory, storage, and recall, communication strategies touch upon the employment of verbal or nonverbal mechanisms for the productive communication of information. In the arena of linguistic interaction, it is sometimes difficult, of course, to distinguish between the two, as Tarone (1983) cited in Brown (1994) aptly noted, since comprehension and production can occur almost simultaneously. Nevertheless, as long as you can appreciate the slipperiness of such a dichotomy, it remains a useful distinction in understanding the nature of strategies.

Oxford's Strategy System

Oxford's classification (1990) has six main categories of strategy. Three under the heading of 'direct', and three under 'indirect'.

A. Direct strategies : These strategies work with the language itself and are of three types :

1. Memory strategies for remembering and retrieving new information.

2. Cognitive strategies for understanding and producing the language.

3. Compensation strategies for using the language despite knowledge gaps.

B. Indirect strategies ' for general management of learning'. These strategies are of three types :

1. Meta-cognitive strategies for coordinating the learning process.

2. Affective strategies for regulating emotions.

3. Social strategies for learning with others.

Meta Cognitive Strategies

Richards &Renandye (2002) state that strategies of this type deal with the planning, monitoring, and evaluation of language learning activities. For example, students may develop a plan for monitoring their progress by constantly comparing their current level of proficiency with the course goals outlined in the curriculum. Here are three examples of metacognitive strategies (O' Malley and Chamot 1990) :

- Direct attention: deciding in advance to attend in general to a learning task and to ignore irrelevant distracters; maintaining attention during task execution.

- Self-management: understanding the conditions that help one successfully accomplish language tasks and arranging for the presence of those conditions; controlling one's language performance to maximize use of what is already known.

- Problem identification: explicitly identifying the central point needing resolution in a task or identifying an aspect of the task that hinders its successful completion.

Followed by metacognitive studies in the L1 context, second language researchers have also drawn increasing attention on metacognitive strategies in second language learning, especially in the reading domain. Many second language reading researchers have pointed out the positive correlation of proficient second language readers with more awareness of using appropriate reading strategies in English reading tasks. Moreover, several researchers (Carrell, 1998;Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001) assert that in order to make reading strategies effective in the reading process, metacognitive awareness or metacognition must be employed. This "metacognitive awareness" refers to knowledge of strategies as well as controlling this knowledge of action in the reading process (Carrell et al., 1989). In response to this positive relationship between metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension, several second language instructors began training second language learners with metacognitive reading strategies and the results suggested that metacognitive reading strategy instruction brings positive outcomes in language learner's metacognitive awareness and reading comprehension.

Reading Strategy Research

Reading strategies can be defined as "plans for solving problems encountered in constructing meaning" (Duffy , 1993 , p232) cited in (Richards & Renandya 2002). They range from bottom-up vocabulary strategies, such as looking up an unknown word in the dictionary, to more comprehensive actions, such as connecting what is being read to the reader's background knowledge. Research in the L1 and L2 fields has demonstrated that strategy use is different in more proficient and less proficient readers. More proficient readers use different types of strategies, and they use them in different ways (Pressley, Beard EL-Dinary, & Brown, 1992). Moreover, reading strategies can be taught to students, and when taught, strategies help improve student performance ontests of comprehension and recall (Carrell, 1985; Carrell, Pharis,

&Liberto, 1989;) cited in (Richards &Renandya, 2002). But what do these research results really mean for the classroom teacher? Given that strategies can be taught, and that one goal of teaching reading is to help students develop as strategic readers, how should this teaching be carried out? Strategy instruction has been discussed in general (see, e.g. Chamot&O'malley ; 1994), but in TESOL little has been published that relates to teaching reading strategies in an ongoing classroom reading program. This is not the case, however , in the L1 field, and one answer to the pedagogical dilemma is to adapt methods that have been found successful in L1 teaching to an ESL situation. In the teaching approach of Brown and Palinscar (1989), for example, students are taught four reading strategies: summarizing, predicting, clarifying, and asking questions. Versions of this have been tried with L2 students and have been found helpful. In the L1 field today, however, state-of-the-art-reading strategy instruction has moved to a more comprehensive approach. Up to this, the researcher of this study has tried to elaborate metacognitive reading strategies.

Methodology

Participants

In order to produce justifiable answer to the questions, 200 Iranian EFL students both male and female were participated in this study. Their language proficiency level was classified to elementary, intermediate and advanced learners. It is convincing to mention that the participants were English major in teaching, translation and literature. The kind of sampling was opportunistic sampling which means that the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the learner, since she was aware they were English major, and their level of language proficiency was suitable enough to answer the questionnaire.

Pilot Study

Before the research plan is prepared, it may be helpful to try out the proposed procedureson a few participants. This trial run, or pilot study, will first of all, help the researcher to decide whether the study is feasible, and whether it is worthwhile to continue. It provides an opportunity to access the appropriateness and practicality of data collocation instruments. It permits a preliminary testing of the hypothesis, which may give some indication of its tenability and suggest whether further refinement is needed. The pilot study will also demonstrate the adequacy of the research procedures and the measures which have been selected for the variables. Unanticipated problems that appear may be solved at this stage, thereby saving time and effort later. A pilot study is well worth the time required and is especially recommended for the beginning researchers. Accordingly, in order to gain access to almost proper instruments for the current research one pilot study was conducted. The researcher conducted a pilot study with thirty students – both male and female majoring in English language literature.

Instrumentation

The researcher utilized a questionnaire which was 22 items based on Likert Scale. In this study, is utilized aquestionaireas instrument to collect data on the use of metacognitive reading strategies.The metacognitive reading strategies questionaire (MRSQ) is administered to investigate the frequency of participants'useof metacognitive reading strategies developed by Taraban,Kerr and Rynerson (2004). It includes 22 items. Taraban, Kerr and Rynearson (2004) developed Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire (MRSQ) constituting of 22 statements in two broad categories of analytic and pragmatic to make language learners report their own position in terms of using metacognitive reading strategies. In other words, this instrument can be accepted as an assessment tool for measuring students' use of metacognitive strategies to understand the text. Taraban, Kerr and Rynearson also claim that many researchers have tended to develop related assessment tools before however neither of them was convenient for assessing the use of metacognitive strategies in college settings.

Procedures

The researcher distributed the questionnaire in three different branches of Islamic Azad Universities among EFL learners who were major in Translation, teaching and literature. Since the gender difference was one of the main concerns of the study the researcher included both male and female learners in this study.

Data analysis

An analysis of chi-square is run to probe any significant relationships between advanced, intermediate and elementary level language students in terms ofmetacognitive reading strategies use. As displayed in Table 1, as proficiency level increases from an elementary level to intermediate and then advanced, so the use of metacognitive strategies increases as well.

The Std. Residuals for the elementary students' selections of "Never" and "Seldom" choices are 3.8 and 3.7, i.e. the elementary students never of seldom use meat-cognitive strategies. On the other side of the table, they usually or always fail to use meat-cognitive strategies – as displayed though the negative Std. Residuals of -2 and -3.3.

None of the Std. Residuals are significant for the intermediate group, i.e. the intermediate students' use of meat-cognitive strategies or their avoiding of such strategies is not significant.

However the advanced students use meta-cognitive strategies significantly (Std. Residual = 3.9). The Std. Residuals are negative for the advanced group on the left side of the table, indicating that they do not avoid these strategies.

Table 1: Meta-Cognitive Strategies by Proficiency Level

		CHOICES					Total
		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always	
Elementary	Count	51	128	199	211	158	747
	% within PROFICIENCY3 LEVEL	6.8%	17.1%	26.6%	28.2%	21.2%	100.0%
	Std. Residual	3.8	3.7	1.6	-2.0	-3.3	
Intermediate	Count	193	618	1219	1701	1439	5170
	% within PROFICIENCY3 LEVEL	3.7%	12.0%	23.6%	32.9%	27.8%	100.0%
	Std. Residual	-1.2	-.9	-.2	.7	.5	
Advanced	Count	4	13	33	65	83	198
	% within PROFICIENCY3 LEVEL	2.0%	6.6%	16.7%	32.8%	41.9%	100.0%
	Std. Residual	-1.4	-2.3	-2.0	.1	3.9	
Total	Count	248	759	1451	1977	1680	6115
	% within PROFICIENCY3 LEVEL	4.1%	12.4%	23.7%	32.3%	27.5%	100.0%

As displayed in Table 2 the results of the chi-square indicate that there is a significant relationship between the proficiency level of the students and their use of meta-cognitive strategies $(x^2 (8) = 74.67, P = .000 < .05)$. Thus the null-hypothesis as there is not any significant difference between advanced, intermediate and elementary level language students in terms of metacognitive reading strategiesuses rejected. As proficiency level increase the students make more use of meat-cognitive strategies.

Table 2: Chi-Square Meta-Cognitive Strategy by Proficiency Level

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	74.673[a]	8	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.03.

Does gender difference have any influence on the metacognitive strategy use?

An analysis of chi-square is run to probe the effect of gender differences on the use of meta-cognitive strategies. As displayed in Table 3, none of the Std. Residuals are out of the ranges of +/- 1.96, i.e. the male and female student make the same use of metacognitive strategies.

Table 3: Meat-Cognitive Strategies by Gender

		CHOICES					Total
		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always	
Male	Count	13	32	90	114	103	352
	% within GENDER	3.7%	9.1%	25.6%	32.4%	29.3%	100.0%
	Std. Residual	-.4	-1.8	.8	.0	.6	
Female	Count	234	721	1336	1838	1568	5697
	% within GENDER	4.1%	12.7%	23.5%	32.3%	27.5%	100.0%
	Std. Residual	.1	.4	-.2	.0	-.1	
	Count	247	753	1426	1952	1671	6049
	% within GENDER	4.1%	12.4%	23.6%	32.3%	27.6%	100.0%

The non-significant chi-square value of 4.51 (P = .340 > .05) further supports the above mentioned conclusions as no significant difference between male and female students use of meat-cognitive strategies. Thus the second null-hypothesis as gender difference does not have any influence on the metacognitive strategy useis supported.

Table 4: Chi-Square Meta-Cognitive Strategy Use by Gender

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.518[a]	4	.340

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.37.

Conclusions

We understood the elementary students never or seldom use metacognitive strategies. In other words, they usually or always fail to use mteacognitive strategies. None of the Std. Residuals are significant for the intermediategroup, i.e. the intermediate students' use of metacognitive strategies or their avoiding of such strategies is not significant.However the advancedstudents usemetacognitive strategies significantly, i.e., they do not avoid these strategies.

It should be noted that proficiency as an independent variable in this study made a significant difference in the performance of the different levels (elementary, intermediate, advanced) i.e., we can claim that the more proficient a student the morethe employment of metacognitive strategies in the process of reading comprehension or vice versa. In other words, as proficiency level increase the students make more use of meat-cognitive strategies.

It should be also noted that gender as an independent variable in this study didn't cause any significant difference in the performance, i.e., we can claim that no significant differences between male and female students exist regarding the use of metacognitive strategies.

References

Aebersold, J. A. and Field, M. L. (1997).*From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, D., & Paris, S. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies.*The Reading Teacher*, 61, 364-373.

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. III* (pp. 285-310). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Al-Nujaidi, A. H. (2003). *The relationship between vocabulary size, reading strategies, and reading comprehension of EFL learners in Saudi Arabia* (Unpublished doctoraldissertation). Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA.

Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing.*Modern Language Journal,* 75, 460-472.

Anderson, N. (1999). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies.* Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second/ foreign language teaching and learning. ERIC Digest. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Anderson, N. J. (2003). Teaching reading.In D. Nunan (Ed.).*Practical English language teaching (*pp. 67-86). New York, NY: McGraw Hill Publishers.

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

Ary, D. Jacobs, L., &Razavieh, A. (1996). Introduction to research in education 5th ed. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006).*Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of theNational Literacy Panel on Language-MinorityChildren and Youth* (Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ).

Baker, L., &Brown, A. L. (1984).Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, M. Kamil, R. Barr, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of research in reading* (Vol. 1, pp. 353–395). New York: Longman.

Barnett, M. (1988). Reading through context: How real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension. *Modern Language Journal, 72,* 150-162

Benhardt, E. B. (1991).*Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bernhardt, E. (1993). Fertility and employment.*European Sociological Review* 9: 25-42.

Brantmeier, C. (2000). *The relationship between readers' gender, passage content, comprehension, and strategy use in reading Spanish as a second language* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA.

Brantmeier, C. (2002). The effects of passage content on second language reading comprehension by gender across instruction levels. In J. Hammadou Sullivan (Ed.).*Research in second language learning: Literacy and the second language learner* (pp. 149-176). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Brown, A. (1981). Metacognition in reading and writing: The development and

facilitation of selective attention strategies for learning from texts. In M. Kamil(Ed.), *Directions in reading research and instruction* (pp. 21-43). Washington D.C. National Reading Conference.

Brown, A. L. &Palincsar, A. S. (1989).Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.) *Knowing, Learning and Instruction: Essays in Honor of Robert Glaser*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, D. 1994. (3rd ed.) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Chap. 5: 103-136.

Brown, G. (2001). Locating categories & sources of information: How skilled are New Zealand children?*School Library Media Research, 4.*

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Strategies for success: A practical guide to learning English.*White Plains, NY: Longman.

Carrell, P. L. (1985*)*.Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 727-752.

Carrell, P. L. (1989).Metacognitive awareness and second language reading.*Modern Language Journal,* 73,121-134.

Carrell, P.L. (1998). Some Causes of Text-boundedness and Schema Interference. In P.L., Carrell, Devine, J. and Eskey, D. E., editors. Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading . (pp.101-13). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carrell, P.L. &, Eisterhold, J.C. (1983).Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy.*TESOLQuarterly. 17,* 553-573.

Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B. G., &Liberto, J. (1989).Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading.*TESOL Quarterly*, *23*, 647–678.

Chamot, A.U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 1(1): 14-26.

Chamot, A.U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues
and research. *Annual Review of applied Linguistics,* 25: 112-130.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994).*The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Chard, D.J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. (2002).A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities.*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *35*(5), 386–406.

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cheng, Y. Y. (1998). Adapted whole language teaching in an English class in junior high school.*Unpublished Master's thesis*. Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan.

Chern, C. (2003). *Active learning: Reading, writing and thinking in EFL classes*. Taipei: Taiwan ELT.

Davis, C. 1995. Extensive reading: an expensive extravagance? *ELT Journal* 49/4: 329―36.

Duke, N. (2003). Comprehension instruction for informational text.Presentation at the annual meeting of the Michigan Reading Association, Grand Rapids, MI.

Ellis, R. (1985). Sources of variability in interlanguage.*Applied Linguistics, 6*, 118-131.

Ellis Ormrod, J. (2006). *Educational psychology: Developing learners* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.

Enright, M. J. (2000). The Globalization of Competition and the Localization of Competitive Advantage: Policies towards Regional Clustering. In S. Young (Ed.), *The Globalization of Multinational Enterprise Activity and Economic Development* (pp. 303-326). Great Britain, Houndsmill: Macmillan Press Limited.

Eskey, D.E., Carrell, P. &Derine, J. (2000). Interactive approaches to SL reading. Cambridge University Press.

Eskey, D. E. (2002).Reading and the teaching of L2 learning.*TESOL Journal*, 11, 5-9.

Erten,I. H.; Razı, S. (2009)*.* The effects of cultural familiarity on reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 21* (1), 60-77.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). *Teaching reading to English language learners: A Reflective guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995). English-as-a-second-language reading instruction in the United States: A research review. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*(2), 115-152.

Flavell, J.H. (1987).Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition.In F.E. Weinert& R.H. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding* (pp. 21-29). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring.*American Psychologist, 34*, 906-911.

Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gates, A. (1949). Character and purposes of the yearbook. In N. Henry (Ed.), The forty eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II. Reading in the elementary school (pp. 1-9). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grabe, W. (1991).Current developments in second language reading research.*TESOLQuarterly*, *25*(3), 375-406.

Grabe, W. (2003).From theory to Practice in L2 reading. Paper presented at *The Third International ELT Research Conference-Languages for Life*.
Çanakkale: ÇanakkaleOnsekiz Mart University.

Grabe, W. (2004).Research on teaching reading.*Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 44–69.

Grabe, W. (2009).*Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. &Stoller, F. (1997). Reading and vocabulary development in a second language: A case study. In J. Coady& T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 98-122). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. and Stoller, F. L. (2002).*Teaching and researching reading.*Harlow:Longman.

Goodman, K. S. (1988). The reading process. In P. L. Carrell; J. Devine; D. E. Eskey(eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 11-21). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context.*Boston: Heinle&Heinle.

Harmer, J. (2001).*The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Hudson, R.F., Mercer, C.D., & Lane, H.B. (2000).*Exploring reading fluency: A paradigmatic overview*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, Gainesvill.

Hudson, R.F., Mercer, C.D., & Lane, H.B. (2000).*Exploring reading fluency: A paradigmatic overview*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Hyland, K. (1990). Purpose and strategy: Teaching extensive reading skills. *English Teaching Forum*, 28, 2: 14-17, 23..

Jenkins, J.R., Fuchs, L.S., van den Broek, P., Espin, C., &Deno, S.L. (2003). Accuracy and fluency in list and context reading of skilled and RD groups: Absolute and relative performance levels. *Learning Disabilities: Research& Practice*, *18*, 237–245

Karakas, M. (2002).*The effects of reading activities on ELT trainee teachers'*
comprehension of short stories. Unpublished MA thesis.Çanakkale: ÇanakkaleOnsekiz Mart University

Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Knutson, E. K. (1998). Reading with a purpose: Communicative reading tasks for the foreign language classroom. Retrieved May 14, 2001 from the World Wide Web: www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/reading_digest.htm

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S.J. (1974).Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading.*Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293–323.doi:10.1016/0010-0285(74)90015-2

Mokhtari, K., &Reichard, C. (2002).Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies.*Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94 (2), 249-259.

Mokhtari, K., &Reichard, C. (2008).The impact of reading purpose on the use of reading strategies.In K. Mokhtari& R. Sheorey (Eds.), Reading strategies of first-and second-language learners (pp. 85-97). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

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

Nassaji, H. (2003). Higher-level and lower-level text processing skills in advanced ESL reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*, 2: 261-276.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD).(2000a). *Report of the National Reading Panel: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. (NIH publication NO. 00-4754). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.(2000b). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: Anevidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on readingand its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Reading Panel (2000).*Report of the National Reading Panel--Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (Report of the subgroups). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child HealthanddHumanDevelopment.http://www.nichd.nih.gov/research/supported/nrp.cfm

National Reading Panel. (2000b).*Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research and literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*: *Reports of the subgroups* (NIHPublication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Development.

Nunan, D. 1999. *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language.*(2^(nd)ed.) Oxford: Heinemann.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L. & Russo, R.P. (1985), 'Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students', *Language Learning,* 35, 21-46

O'Malley, J.M. &Chamot, A.U. (1990), *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*, CUP

Oxford, R.L. (1990), *Language Learning Strategies*, Newbury House

Oxford, R. (2003). Towards a more systematic model of L2 learner autonomy. In Palfreyman, D. and Smith, R. C. (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives.* Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke (pp. 75–92)

Paris, S.G., Wasik, B.A., & Turner, J.C. (1991).The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.

Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 609-640). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Pressley, M. (2002).Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup& S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 219–309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M., &Afflerbach, P. (1995).*Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pressley, M., El-Dinary, P. B., Gaskins, I., Schuder, T., Bergman, J., Almasi, J., & Brown, R. (1992). Beyond direct explanation: Transactional instruction of reading comprehension strategies. *Elementary School Journal*, 92, 513-555.

Pressley, M.; Woloshyn, V. (1995).*Cognitive strategy instruction: That really improves children's academic performance* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Brookline Books

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica,CA: RAND Corporation.

Ransom, G.A. 1978.*preparing to teach reading*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Rasinski, T.V. (2004). *Assessing reading fluency*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Resources for Education and Learning.

Rasinski, T.V. (2006). A brief history of reading fluency.In S.J.

Richards, J.C., Platt J. & Platt H. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002).*Methodology in Language Teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rigney, J. W. (1978). Learning strategies a theoretical perspective. In H. F. O'Neil(Ed.), *Learning strategies.* New York: Academic Press.

Riley, L. &Harsch, K. (1999). "Using strategy journals to compare ESL and EFL students' awareness, development, and use of language learning strategies."In J. E. Purpua and R. L. Oxford, *Language learning strategies in the context of autonomy* (compendium compiled for invitational symposium). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Rivers, W. M.; Temperley, M. (1978).*A practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Robb, T.N., & Susser, B. (1989).Extensive reading vs. skills building in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language.* 5, 239-251.

Samuels, S.J., & Farstrup, A.E. (2006). Reading fluency instruction: Will it be a passing fad or a permanent fixture? In S.J. Samuels & A.E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research hasto say about fluency instruction* (pp. 1–3). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schoonen, R., Hulstijn, J. and Bossers, B. 1998: Metacognitive and language-specific knowledge in native and foreign language reading comprehension: an empirical study among Dutch students in grades 6, 8 and 10 . *Language Learning 48,* 71-106 .

Scrivener, J. (1994).*Learning Teaching. A guidebook for English language teachers*. Oxford: The Bath Press.

Sheorey, R. & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers.*System*. 29:431-449.

Singhal, M. (2001). Reading Proficiency, Reading Strategies, Metacognitive Awareness and L2 Readers. *The Reading Matrix 1, 1-9.*

Smith F, (1971).Understanding reading. New York; Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stanovich, K.E. (1980). Towards an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency.*Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 32-71.

Sweet, A.P., & Snow, C.E. (2003) (Eds.). (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford.

Taraban, R.; Kerr, M.; and Rynearson, K. (2004).Analytic and pragmatic factors in college students' metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology, 25* (2) 67-81.

Taraban, R.; Rynearson, K.; Kerr, M. (2000). College students' academic performance and self-reports of comprehension strategy use.*Reading Psychology, 21*, 283–308.

Tarone, E. 1983: On the Variability in Interlanguage Systems. *Applied Linguistics* 4/2: 142-163

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Vygotsky, L. S. (1962) *Thought and language* Cambridge[Mass] : M.I.T. Press.

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

Wallace, C. (2001). Reading. R. Carter; D. Nunan (eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, R. (1991). Linguistic diversity and reading in an American society. In Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2.eds. R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and D. Pearson. New York: Longman.

Whiting, P.R. **(1988)** Improvements in reading and other skills using Irlencoloured lenses. *Australian Journal of Remedial Education.* 20,1, 13-15

Wu, C. P. (2005). An investigation of metacognitive reading strategies by EFL Taiwanese college students to comprehend familiar versus unfamiliar Chineseand English texts (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Idaho, ID, USA.

Young, D. J. and R. Oxford. 1997. A gender-related analysis of strategies used to process input in the native language and in a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning* 8: 43-73.