

Abstract

It is known that metacognitive strategies are important for successful foreign language readers. These strategies are used to enhance reading comprehension. Hence, the present study is an attempt at shedding light on metacognitive reading strategies and then aims at finding out the relationship between metacognitive strategy use and reading achievement of Iraqi learners of English as a foreign language. Participants of this study are twenty second-year students, Department of English, College of Education, University of Al-Qadissiyah for the academic year 2014–2015. It is hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference between strategy use

The Relationship between Metacognitive Strategy Use and Reading Comprehension Achievement among Iraqi EFL Learners

**Instructor: Ali Abdulhussein Sagban (Ph.D.)
Technical Institute of Al- Diwaniya
Foundation of Technical Education**

and EFL students' reading comprehension achievement. The study focuses on five main issues. First, it discusses the definition of metacognitive reading strategy. Second; it displays the significance of metacognitive reading strategy. Third, it presents the skills of metacognitive reading strategy. Fourth, the definition of reading comprehension and different models of reading comprehension are reviewed. Fifth, the relationship between metacognition and reading comprehension are considered. The data were collected by means of a metacognitive strategy questionnaire and a reading comprehension test. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that using metacognitive strategies plays a very important role in the students' English reading comprehension.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Problem

Reading is a necessary skill in academic learning. It is the interaction of four things including the reader, the text, the fluent reading or –the ability or read at an appropriate rate with adequate comprehension and strategic reading, or –the ability of the reader to use a variety of reading strategies to accomplish a purpose for readings (Anderson, 2003:8).

Reading strategies refer to “the mental operations in-

involved when readers purposefully approach a text and make sense of what they read.” (Barnett, 1989: 68). Specifically, metacognitive strategies are used to monitor or regulate cognitive strategies, and evaluate one’s strategies for learning (Pressley, 2002:298). In addition, Garner (1987:35) states that it is important to instruct non-proficient second as well as foreign language learners to increase their awareness of using reading strategies and then improve their reading comprehension proficiency.

As for Iraqi university students, reading proficiency is very important to them. However, a large number of second year students still feel that their reading proficiency is not satisfying after many years of English study at school. There are certain students who are able to read fluently but do not understand the text that they have read and the meaning that it conveys. Usually, they will read and continue to read until the last sentence without understanding the text. This condition continues until a stage where the students do not know and do not realise their weaknesses. The weaknesses comprise awareness aspects such as not being able to detect their own reading, reading without any control and not being aware of what they understand and vice versa.

To be more specific, there are students who do not use appropriate reading strategies when reading certain texts.

Consequently, they are not able to fully understand the text that they have read. In addition, by just reading once, one definitely could not grasp the meaning that the author is trying to convey. Students are supposed to know the significance of using appropriate strategies when reading.

Therefore, this study focuses on investigating the use of metacognitive reading strategies adopted by second-year students

1.2 Aims

This study aims at finding out the relationship between students' adoption of metacognitive reading strategies and their reading achievements.

1.3 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference between strategy use and EFL students' reading comprehension achievement.

1.4 Limits

The present study is limited to Iraqi EFL second year students, Department of English, College of Education, University of Al-Qadissiyah for the academic year 2014–2015

1.5 Value

It is hoped that this study will be of value in helping the

students develop effective reading strategies to improve their reading proficiency. It is also expected to help instructors develop appropriate methodologies in teaching English reading.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Definition of Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Literally, metacognition means “cognition of cognition or thinking about thinking” (Carrel, 1989:128). It refers to the “knowledge that takes as its object or regulates any aspect of any cognitive behavior”. In other words, the function of metacognition is to monitor or regulate cognitive strategies (Flavell, 1978: 58)

Metacognitive reading strategies are conscious means by which students monitor their own reading processes including evaluating the effectiveness of the cognitive strategies being used. Such strategies may involve, for example, planning how to approach the reading of a text, testing, and revising according to purpose and time available (Devine, 1993:115).

Oxford (1990:26) considers metacognitive strategies to be behaviours undertaken by the learners to plan, arrange, and assess their own learning. These strategies include directed attention and self-assessment, organization, setting goals and objectives, and seeking opportunities for prac-

tice. In the context of reading, self monitoring and correction of errors were further examples of these strategies.

2.2 Skills of Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Strategies specific to reading can be classified into three clusters of metacognition: planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies (Pressley and Afflerbach, 1995:43).

2.2.1 Planning

To Zare-ee (2007:98), planning refers to the selection of appropriate strategies and the allocation of resources that affect performance. For instance, making predictions before reading, strategy sequencing, and allocating time or attention selectively before beginning a task. In addition, Almasi (2003:56) states that those planning strategies are used before reading; activating learners' background knowledge to get prepared for reading.

By a planning strategy, learners may check whether their reading material has a certain text structure, such as cause and effect, question and answer, and compare and contrast and setting the purpose for reading (Pressley, 2002:296).

2.2.2 Monitoring

Monitoring is an invaluable tool for better controlling and taking care while reading, and it requires a useful base for evaluation. It enables students to determine whether the

resources they have are sufficient and are being well used. Hence, monitoring refers to personal conscious awareness of comprehension and text performance (Slife and Weaver, 1992:19).

Pressley (2002:297) points out that monitoring strategy occurs during reading. Some examples of monitoring strategies are comprehension of vocabulary, self-questioning (reflecting on whether they understood what they have read so far), summarizing, and inferring the main idea of each paragraph.

2.2.3 Evaluation

According to Baker (1989:31), evaluation is defined as appraising the conclusion and regulatory processes of an individual's learning. For example, evaluation involves re-evaluating personal's aims and conclusions. Evaluation looks at what students set out to do, at what students have accomplished, and how they accomplish it. It can be informative. It is one of the most important factors that facilitate reading comprehension. Further; evaluating strategies are employed after reading. For instance, after reading a text, learners may think about how to apply what they have read to other situations.

2.3 Significance of Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Metacognition plays a vital role in reading. The context

of reading is usually understood as consisting of two types of cognition: First, one's knowledge of strategies for learning from texts, and, second, the control readers have of their own actions while reading for different purposes (Brown, Armbruster and Baker, 1986:49).

O'Malley et al (1985: 289) point out "students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to review their progress, accomplishments, and future directions".

Further, metacognition helps students to be consciously aware of what they have learned, and to recognize situations in which it would be useful, and progress in using it (Pressley, Snyder and Cariglia-Bull, 1987:81).

Anderson (2002:13) indicates that the use of metacognitive strategies force learners to apply a higher level of thinking for better performance.

Auerbach and Paxton (1997:339) argue that strategic reading can only become efficient when metacognitive strategies, such as working towards a particular goal while reading, are actively used.

Additionally, Brown (1980:456) proposes the significant examples of metacognitive strategies involved in reading comprehension as follows: (a) clarifying the purposes of reading; (b) identifying the important aspects of

a message; (c) monitoring ongoing activities to determine whether comprehension was occurring; (d) engaging in self-questioning to determine whether goals were being achieved; and (e) taking corrective action when failures in comprehension were detected.

Finally, a major contribution of reading strategies to fluent reading is their increasing automaticity as a reader becomes more proficient (Block and Pressley, 2007:222).

2.4 Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension is the process of making meaning from text. The goal, therefore, is to gain an overall understanding of what is described in the text rather than to obtain meaning from isolated words or sentences. In understanding text information readers develop mental models, or representations of meaning of the text ideas during the reading process. (Kintsch, 1998:72)

Harris and Hodges (1995: 39) assert that reading comprehension is the construction of the meaning of a written or spoken communication through a reciprocal, holistic interchange of ideas between the interpreter and the message. The presumption here is that meaning resides in the intentional problem-solving, thinking processes of the interpreter that the content of the meaning is influenced by that person's prior knowledge and experience.

Similarly, Rumelhart (1994:865) states that reading comprehension is an interactive activity between students and contexts. In the period of this interaction between students and contexts, students utilize different experiences and knowledge which involve language skills, cognitive information and world knowledge.

2.5 Reading Comprehension Models

Reading comprehension has three important models that should be emphasized in the reading comprehension process. These models facilitate reading comprehension and help readers to figure out texts and solve their problems while reading (Eskey, 2005:567).

2.5.1 The Bottom-Up Model

The emphasis of this model is on the text. Readers begin reading by understanding the words, the letters and gradually improve toward larger linguistic chunks to sentences, and actually ending in meaning (Gough, 1972:332). In this model, the whole reading process is based on the words and learners construct meaning from context by recognizing each word. Individual words are emphasized in this model in isolation and rapid word understanding is important in the bottom-up model (vanDuzer, 1999:114). According to this model, it is believed that readers who utilize this pro-

cess quickly become skilled readers. Moreover, readers who are successful at recognizing the words become proficient readers whose proficiency is improved by their ability to decode (Pressley, 2000:298).

2.5.2 The Top-Down Model

On the contrary to the bottom-up model, the top-down model refers to a “notion” driven model where the students’ prior information and expectations help them to construct meaning from a reading text. Such model is based “from brain to text” and focuses on the whole reading process (Eskey, 2005:264). In this model the learner begins with certain expectations about the reading context derived from his/her prior information and then utilizes his/her word information they possess in decoding vocabulary to confirm and modify previous expectations (Aebersold and Field, 1997:63). To this model, a reader acts a very active function in the process of translating print into meaning by using knowledge of a relevant language, subject matter, and how to read to confirm or reject his/her hypotheses (Smith, 2004:49).

According to Ahmadi, Hairul, and Pourhossein (2012:87), the top-down model emphasizes reading skills like prediction, and summarizing as well as anticipating from texts. The top-down model affects both L1 and L2 reading instruc-

tion in improving the importance of prediction, guessing from the text, and getting the gist of a text's meaning.

2.5.3 The Interactive Model

The interactive model is a combination of the both bottom-up and top-down models and emphasizes the interrelationship between a reader and the text (Ibid:88). Similarly, Rumelhart (1994:870) states that the interactive reading model refers to the reader that "takes into account the critical contributions of both lower-level processing skill (word identification) and higher-level comprehension and reasoning skills (text interpretation)." So, reading comprehension is the result of meaning construction between the reader and the text, rather than simple transmission of the graphic information to the readers' mind.

The purpose of this model stresses that a proficient reader simultaneously synthesizes the information available to him or her from several knowledge sources of either bottom-up or top-down in the period of reading process (Stanovich, 1980:45).

2.6 Metacognition and Reading Comprehension

The goal of constructing meanings or comprehension lies at the heart of reading. Specifically, reading comprehension is both the process and product of the ideas represented in the text linked to the reader's prior knowledge

and experiences and the mental representation in memory of the text (Kintsch, 1998:73).

Metacognition plays an important role in reading comprehension. It has revealed that less proficient learners do not recognize the purpose of reading and tend to focus on word-by-word reading rather than reading for meaning (DiVesta, Hayward, and Orlando, 1979:98). Additionally, Harris, Graham, and Freeman (1988:335) assert that poor readers often finish reading passages without even knowing that they have not understood them. Also, poor readers are less able to adjust their reading rate to suit the purpose of reading. They are less efficient in monitoring their understanding of the material read or are deficient in metacognitive skills.

By contrast, Borkowski, Carr, and Pressley (1987:62) highlight the idea that a good reader automatically employs metacognitive strategies to focus his/her attention, to derive meaning, and to make adjustments when something goes wrong. In addition, Harris, Graham, and Freeman (1988:336) confirm that readers who have higher metacognitive skills are able to check for confusion or inconsistency, undertake a corrective strategy, such as re-reading, relating different parts of the passage to one another, look for topic sentences or summary paragraphs, and relating the current information to their past knowledge.

Further, Borkowski, Carr, and Pressley (1987:64) have concluded that since metacognitive strategies are potentially conscious and potentially controllable, learners with good metacognition are able to monitor and direct their own learning processes quite efficiently.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The study comprises twenty second year students at the Department of English, College of Education, University of Al-Qadissiya for the academic year 2014–2015.

3.2 Instruments of the Study

In order to achieve the aim of the study, a metacognitive reading strategy questionnaire and reading comprehension test have been prepared to be the instruments used in this study.

In this study, a questionnaire is prepared for the students in order to investigate their adoption of metacognitive reading strategies when doing their reading comprehension tests. The researcher has compromised a metacognitive reading strategy questionnaire from both Phakiti (2003), and Taraban, Kerr, and Rynearson (2004). The questionnaire consists of 24 statements related to metacognitive reading strategies. In the questionnaire, the 1–5 Likert Scale is used, so five choices are offered for each statement. The

rating scale includes the following options: never, rarely, sometimes, usually, and always. Participants are asked to choose the option that best represents their opinions (see Appendix A).

In order to measure student's reading achievement, a reading test is administered to the participants. The reading comprehension test used in the present study is proposed by Phillips (2003:497). The testees are required to read a passage followed by ten items in the form of multiple choice, each with four suggested answers marked A, B, C and D and then choose the best answer. The total mark of the test is twenty. All these reading tasks should be finished within 50 minutes. Answers of participants to the test are scored by the researcher. Two scores for each correct item. (see Appendix B).

To ensure the face validity, the questionnaire and the test have been exposed to a jury of experts in the field of ELT and Linguistics to decide their validity (see Appendix C).

To estimate reliability of the questionnaire and the test, by using Alpha Cronbach and Pearson Formulae, it has been found that the reliability coefficient for the questionnaire is 0.86, whereas that of the test is 0.82.

3.3 Analysis and Discussion

The data collected from the reading comprehension test

and the questionnaires are analyzed by the SPSS. By using this system, descriptive statistics including the mean and standard deviation of 24 individual metacognitive reading strategy items are calculated. In addition, the statistical correlations between the use of metacognitive strategies and the participants' reading achievements are also obtained through the SPSS. In this paper, frequency refers to the extent to which different metacognitive reading strategies are employed by the participants. The analysis of the frequency of strategies used by the subjects in this study is based on the scale delineated by Oxford (1990) which is shown in Table 1.

(Table 1: Frequency scale delineated by Oxford (1990)

Mean score	Frequency scale	Evaluation
1.0-1.4	Low	Never or almost never used
1.5-2.4		Generally not used
2.5-3.4	Medium	Sometimes used
3.5-4.4	High	Usually used
4.5-5.0		Always used

According to Oxford (1990), the average value (mean score) reveals the frequency of strategy use. Scores be-

tween 1.0 and 1.4 indicate “never or almost never used”. Scores between 1.5 and 2.4 indicate “generally not used”. Scores between 2.5 and 3.4 indicate “sometimes used”. Scores between 3.5 and 4.4 are “usually used” and scores between 4.5–5.0 are “always used”.

3.3.1 Analysis of the Results of the Questionnaire

The following are descriptive statistics about the 24 items of metaconitive reading strategies in the questionnaire as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of each item of metacognitive strategies

Items	Number of Participants	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mcs 1	20	2.40	1.273206
Mcs 2	20	2.30	1.031095
Mcs 3	20	2.20	0.748331
Mcs 4	20	2.35	1.424411
Mcs 5	20	2.60	1.429022
Mcs 6	20	4.15	1.136708
Mcs 7	20	2.70	1.174286
Mcs 8	20	2.80	1.472556
Mcs 9	20	2.75	1.517442
Mcs 10	20	2.65	0.933302
Mcs 11	20	1.85	1.136708
Mcs 12	20	3.00	1.486784
Mcs 13	20	2.25	1.208522
Mcs 14	20	3.85	1.136708
Mcs 15	20	2.95	1.276302
Mcs 16	20	3.05	1.431782
Mcs 17	20	2.85	1.308877
Mcs 18	20	2.50	1.235442
Mcs 19	20	1.95	1.234376
Mcs 20	20	3.15	1.308877

Mcs 21	20	2.05	1.234376
Mcs 22	20	3.45	1.468081
Mcs 23	20	3.35	1.496487
Mcs 24	20	2.45	1.316894

Mcs=metacognitive strategy

According to table 2, Mcs refers to metacognitive strategy, and the numbers 1–24 represent the 24 statements in the questionnaire related to metacognitive strategies. From the table, it can be seen that the frequency of two strategies is high with means above 3.5. They are strategies Mcs6 and Mcs 14. The results show that Mcs6 (M=4.15) is the most frequently used strategy of all the 24 statements of metacognitive strategies and its frequency scale is high, so it is usually used by the students. The statement of Mcs6 is “I underline or circle key words or key sentences while reading”. It reflects that most subjects realize the importance of marking out the useful information during reading and pay much attention to it. Mcs 14 is also in high frequency use with the mean of 3.85. The statement of Mcs 14 is “I keep track of my own progress to complete the questions on time”. It shows that most participants frequently monitor their completion of the reading tasks. Mcs11 (M=1.85) is the least frequently used strategy of all the 24 statements

and its frequency scale is low. According to Oxford (1990), Mcs11 belongs to “generally not used”. The statement of Mcs11 is “I mark the topic sentences of every paragraph”. It reveals that most participants have no habit of highlighting the topic sentences of each paragraph. There are 13 strategies with their means between 2.5 and 3.4 which belong to the level of medium use, so they are sometimes used by the students. The means of Mcs1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 19, 21 and 24 are below 2.5, which indicates that these strategies are not favored by the students.

3.3.2 Analysis of the Results of the Reading Comprehension Test

Twenty students participated in taking the reading comprehension test. They were divided into three groups on the basis of their scores. The students whose scores were above 14 marks were regarded as high-proficiency readers and those students whose scores were between 10 and 14 were categorized as intermediate-proficiency readers. The participants who scored below 10 were viewed as low-proficiency readers (see Table3).

Table 3: classification of the participants according to their scores.

Scores	Number	Percentage
Above 14	3	15%
10-14	10	50%
Below10	7	35%
Total number	20	100%

3.4 Correlations between the Use of Reading Meta-cognitive

Strategies and the Participants' Reading Achievements

In order to find the relationship between the use of metaconitive reading strategies and reading achievements, Pearson's analysis of correlation coefficient is used in this study. Correlation coefficient is significant if sig. (2-tailed) probability (p) reaches the significant level of .05 or .01. As for the Pearson correlation, the closer it is to 1, the more significant is the correlation between the two variables (see Table 4).

Table 4: Correlation between metacognitive strategies and the participants' scores

Correlations			
		Reading achievement	Metacognitive strategies
Reading achievement	Pearson Correlation	1	.914**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	20	20
Metacognitive strategies	Pearson Correlation	.914**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	20	20
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

N= Number of participants

Table 4 shows that the correlation between metacognitive strategies and reading achievements is .914^{xx}; its probability (.000) is lower than .01. Moreover, .914 is much closer to 1, which reflects that the correlation between metacognitive strategy use and reading achievement is very significant. This result shows that metacognitive strategies play a very important role in the students' English reading comprehension. It further indicates that the participants who adopt metacognitive reading strategies more frequently achieve higher reading achievements. Thus, the

hypothesis which indicates that “there is no statistically significant difference between strategy use and EFL students’ reading comprehension achievement.” is rejected.

3.5 Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the correlations between the use of metacognitive reading strategies and the participants’ English reading achievements, it can be concluded that metacognitive reading strategies are positively correlated to reading achievements. This means that students who have better reading proficiency use metacognitive reading strategies more frequently. Thus, the study indicates that metacognitive reading strategy awareness promotes both performance and understanding of one’s reading comprehension. The study further supports the claim that metacognitive strategies facilitate students’ reading comprehension.

Bibliography

Aebersold, J. A., & Field, M. L. (1997). *From Reader to Reading Teacher: Issues and Strategies for Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ahmadi, M. R., Hairul, N. I., & Pourhossein, A. G. (2012). Impacts of Learning Reading Strategy on Students' Reading Comprehension Proficiency. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 1(1), 78-95.

Almasi, J. F. (2003). *Teaching Strategic Process in Reading*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest__pdfs/0110__Anderson.pdf.

----- (2003). *Exploring Second Language Reading: Issues and Strategies*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Auerbach, E. R., & Paxton, D. (1997). "It's not the English Thing:" Bringing Reading Research into the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 237-261.

Baker, L. (1989). Metacognition, Comprehension Monitoring, and the Adult Reader. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, 1, 3-38.

Barnett, M. (1989). *More than Meets the Eye: Foreign Language Reading: Theory and Practice*. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Block, C. & Pressley, M. (2007). *Best Practices in Teaching Comprehension*. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. & Pressley, M. (Eds.), *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 220–242). New York: Guilford Press.

Borkowski, J., Carr, M., & Pressley, M. (1987). “Spontaneous Strategies Use: Perspectives from Metacognitive Theory.” *Intelligence*, 11, pp. 61–75

Brown, A. L. (1980). *Metacognitive Development and Reading*. In R. J. Spiro, B. Bruce & W F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension* (pp. 453–479). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brown, A. L., Armbruster, B. B. & Baker, L. (1986). *The Role of Metacognition in Reading and Studying*. In Orasanu, J. (Ed.), *Reading Comprehension: From Research to Practice* (pp. 49–75). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carrell, P.L. (1989). *Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading*. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol.73, No.2, 121–134.

Devine, J. (1993). *The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Reading and Writing*. In G. Joan and L. I. Carson (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom*. second lan-

guage perspective (pp. 105–130). Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers

DiVesta, F. J., Hayward, K. G., & Orlando, V. P. (1979). “Developmental Trends in Monitoring for Comprehension.” *Child Development*, 50, pp. 97–105.

Eskey, D. E. (2005). Reading in a Second Language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Book on Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 563–579). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flavell, J.H. (1978). Metacognitive Development. In Scandura, J.M. & Brainerd, C.J. (Eds.), *Structural Theories of Complex Human Behavior*. Sijthoff&Noordoff: International Publishers B.V.

Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and Reading Comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Gough, P. B. (1972). One Second of Reading. In J. F. Kavanaugh, & I. C. Maltingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and Eye*(pp. 331–358). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harris, K., Graham, S., & Freeman, S. (1988). “Effects of Strategy Training on Metamemory among Learning Disabled Students.” *Exceptional Children*, 54, pp. 332–338.

Harris, T. L., & Hodge, R. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The Vocabulary of Reading and Writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Kintsch, W. (1998) Comprehension: A paradigm for Cognition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Mazanares, G., Russo, R. & Kupper, L. (1985). Learning Strategies Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 285-296.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. New York: Newbery House Publishers.

: Phakiti, A. (2003). A Closer Look at the Relationship of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Use to EFL Reading Achievement Test Performance. Language Testing, Vol.20, No.1, 26-56.

Phillips, D. (2003). Longman Preparation Course for the TOFEL Test: The Paper Test. Pearson Education, Inc.

Pressley, M. & Afflerbach, P. (1995). Verbal Protocols of Reading: The Nature of Constructively Responsive Reading. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and Self-regulated Comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samules (Eds.), What Research Has to Say about Reading Instruction (3rd ed., p. 291-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M., Snyder, B. & Cariglia-Bull, B. (1987). How

Can Good Strategy Use Be Taught to Children? Evaluation of Six Alternative Approaches. In Cormier, S. & Hagman, J. (Eds.), *Transfer of Learning: Contemporary Research and Application* (pp. 81–120). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1994). Toward an Interactive Model of Reading. In R. Rudell, M. R. Rudell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (4th ed.) (pp. 864–894). Newark, DA: International Reading Association.

Slife, B. D., & Weaver, C. A. (1992). Depression, Cognitive Skill, and Metacognitive Skill in Problem Solving. *Cognit. Emotion*, 6, 1–22.

Smith, F. (2004). *Understanding Reading* (6th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an Interactive–compensatory Model of Individual Differences in the Development of Reading Fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 32–71.

Taraban, R., Kerr, M. & Rynearson, K., (2004). Analytic and Pragmatic Factors in College Students' Metacognitive Reading Strategies. *Reading Psychology*, 25, 67–81.

Van Duzer, C. (1999). Reading and the Adult English Language Learner. ERIC Digest. ED433729. *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (pp. 112–130). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Zare-ee, A. (2007). The Relationship between Cognitive

and Meta-cognitive Strategy Use and EFL Reading Achievement. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol.2. No.

Appendix A

Metacognitive Strategy Questionnaire for Reading

Consider the following item and choose the response by ticking (√) in the box.

Items	Contents	Never	Rare-ly	Some-times	Usu-ally	Al-ways
19	I set plans on how to complete the test.					
2	I determine what the test tasks or questions required me to do.					
3	I am aware of the objectives of the reading tasks.					
4	I make sure I know what is needed to be done and how to do it.					
5	I pay attention to the questions and memorize them before reading the given text.					

6	I underline or circle key words or key sentences while reading.					
7	I know what to read closely and what to ignore.					
8	I read the text quickly to find out the relevant information of reading tasks.					
9	I revise the anticipated information based on text content.					
10	I adjust reading speed on the basis of different reading purposes or reading tasks.					
11	I mark the topic sentences of every paragraph.					
12	I am aware of how much of test remained to be completed.					

13	I monitor the understanding of the reading materials and reading tasks.					
14	I keep track of my own progress to complete the questions on time.					
15	I pause time to time and think whether I have understood the contents I have read.					
16	I am aware of my ongoing reading tasks.					
17	I distinguish the easy and difficult questions and spend much more time on difficult reading tasks.					
18	I correct mistakes immediately when I think I am misunderstanding of the text or tasks.					

19	I evaluate whether the reading plans are achieved.					
20	I evaluate my own performance and progress while completing the test.					
21	I check the answers of reading tasks carefully before submitting the test.					
22	I am aware of my nerves or anxiety while doing the reading tasks.					
23	I try to find out my weakness in reading activity, and think how to improve my reading efficiency.					

24	I evaluate the effectiveness of strategies I used while doing the reading tasks.					
----	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix B

Reading Comprehension Test

Read the following passage carefully, and then choose the correct answer for the statements below.

Harvard University, today recognized as part of the top echelon of the world's universities, came from very inauspicious and humble beginnings. This oldest of America universities was founded in 1636, just sixteen years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. Included in the Puritan emigrants to the Massachusetts colony during this period were more than 100 graduates of England's prestigious Oxford and Cambridge universities, and these university graduates in the New World were determined that their sons would have the same educational opportunities that they themselves had had. Because of this support in the colony for an institution of higher learning, the General Court of Massachusetts appropriated 400 pounds for a college in October of 1636 and early the following year decided on a parcel of land for the school; this land was in an area called Newetowne, which was later renamed Cambridge after its

English cousin and is the site of the present-day university.

When a young minister named John Harvard, who came from the neighboring town of Charlestowne, died from tuberculosis in 1638, he willed half of his estate of 1,700 pounds to the fledgling college. In spite of the fact that only half of the bequest was actually paid, the General Court named the college after the minister in appreciation for what he had done. The amount of the bequest may not have been large, particularly by today's standards, but it was more than the General Court had found it necessary to appropriate in order to open the college.

Henry Dunster was appointed the first president of Harvard in 1640, and it should be noted that in addition to serving as president, he was also the entire faculty, with an entering freshman class of four students. Although the staff did expand somewhat, for the first century of its existence the entire teaching staff consisted of the president and three or four tutors.

1. The main idea of this passage is that

- A. Harvard is one of the world's most prestigious universities
- B. What is today a great university started out small.
- C. John Harvard was key to the development of a great University
- D. Harvard University developed under the auspices of

Ali Abdulhussein Sagban

- the General Court of Massachusetts.
2. The passage indicates that Harvard is
 A. one of the oldest universities in the world B. the oldest university in the world C. one of the oldest universities in America D. the oldest university in America.
 3. It can be inferred from the passage that the Puritans who traveled to the Massachusetts colony were.....
 A. rather well educated
 B. rather rich C. rather supportive of the English government
 D. rather undemocratic
 4. The pronoun “they” refers to.....
 A. Oxford and Cambridge universities
 B. university graduates C. sons
 D. educational opportunities
 5. The “pounds” are probably.....
 A. types of books
 B. college student C. units of money
 D. school campuses
- The “ English cousin” refers to
 a.....
 A. city
 B. relative
 C. person

- D. court
7. Which of the following is NOT mentioned about John Harvard? A. What he died of
B. Where he came from C. Where he was buried
D. How much he bequeathed to Harvard
8. The underlined word “fledgling” could best be replaced by which of the following? A. newborn
B. flying
C. winged
D. established
9. The passage implied that..... A. Henry Dunster was an effective president B. Someone else really served as president of Harvard before Henry Dunster C. Henry Dunster spent much of his time as president managing the Harvard faculty D. The position of president of Harvard was not merely an administrative position in the early years.
10. The word “somewhat” in line 20 could best be replaced by A. back and forth
B. to and fro
C. side by side
D. more or less

Appendix C

The Academic Rank, Names, and the Location of the Jury Members

1	Prof. Hameed H. Al-Mas'udi, Ph.D., College of Education for Human Sciences - University of Babylon
2	Asst. Prof. Rajaa Mardan, M.A., College of Education - University of Al-Qadissiya.
3	Asst. Prof. Salam Hamid Abbas, Ph.D., College of Education for Human Sciences / Ibn-Rushd - University of Baghdad.
4	Asst. Prof. Saleema Abdulzahraa, M.A., College of Education - University of Al-Qadissiya.
5	Asst. Prof. Shaima' A. Al-Bkri, Ph.D., College of Education for Human Sciences / Ibn-Rushd - University of Baghdad.

الملخص

العلاقة بين استعمال الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية والتحصيل القرائي لدى الطلاب العراقيين متعلمي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية من المتعارف عليه ان الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية تعد ذات اهمية كبيرة لدى القراء الماهرين في اللغة الاجنبية، اذ تستعمل هذه الاستراتيجيات في تعزيز الاستيعاب القرائي. ولذلك تعد الدراسة الحالية محاولة لتسليط الضوء على استراتيجيات القراءة فوق المعرفية، اذ تهدف الدراسة الى ايجاد العلاقة بين استعمال الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية والتحصيل القرائي لدى الطلاب العراقيين متعلمي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية. وتضم الدراسة عشرين طالبا جامعا في المرحلة الثانية في قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية التربية، جامعة القادسية للعام الدراسي 2015-2014. وافترض الباحث بانه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة احصائية بين استعمال الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية والتحصيل القرائي لدى الطلاب. وتركز الدراسة على خمسة محاور اساسية: اولا، تناقش الدراسة تعريف استراتيجيات القراءة فوق المعرفية. ثانيا، انها تعرض اهمية هذه الاستراتيجيات. ثالثا، ان الدراسة تقدم مهارات استراتيجيات القراءة فوق المعرفية. اما المحور الرابع فانه يضم تعريف الاستيعاب القرائي ونماذجه. في حين يهتم المحور الخامس بالعلاقة بين الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية و الاستيعاب القرائي. جمعت البيانات بواسطة اداتين هما استبيان استراتيجيات القراءة فوق المعرفية واختبار الاستيعاب القرائي. وبعد تحليل النتائج احصائيا، اتضح ان استعمال الاستراتيجيات فوق المعرفية يلعب دورا مهما في التحصيل القرائي.