

## **Effects of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Training on Achievement in and Motivation for College Reading Comprehension**

**Abdulaziz I. Fageeh**

*College of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia*

(Received 25/04/1431H.; accepted for publication 05/04/1432H.)

**Abstract.** The present study aimed to explore the effectiveness of training on both cognitive and metacognitive strategies of EFL Saudi college students ( $n = 29$ ) on their achievement in and motivation for English reading comprehension in an EFL reading class. The study utilized the experimental method of the type “pretest, posttest control group design”. The objective of the training course was improved reading comprehension of texts in English based on Tapestry Reading Comprehension II. The experimental group was taught by the researcher with the interactive reading processing approach grounded in schema theory by using the interactive reading processing approach (bottom-up and top-down), which emphasized the process of recalling background knowledge, guessing, prediction, inference, analysis and synthesis, self-evaluation, self-regulation and self-monitoring in English reading. Findings indicated that cognitive and metacognitive strategy training through manipulating bottom-up and top-down processing of reading texts, and schema-activating techniques like word-mapping, inferencing, analysis, synthesis, self-evaluation, self-regulation and self-monitoring has proven effectual for developing reading strategy use, increasing motivation for reading, and, consequently, reading comprehension.

### **Introduction and Background**

Research on the strategies that ESL/EFL learners utilize in foreign language learning has been available in galore (Wenden, 1998; 2002; Vandergrift, 1998; 2003; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Chamot, 2005; Macaro, 2006; Gao, 2007; Coiro and Dobler, 2007; Macaro and Erler, 2008, to cite just a few). Some of this research has been allocated to reading comprehension strategy use, mostly tapping into the effects of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use on reading comprehension improvement (e.g., Carrell, 1989; Kitajima, 1997; Zhang, 2001; Vandergrift, 2003; Coiro and Dobler, 2007).

The case being as such, the most significant goal underlying EFL instruction is to nurture EFL learners' skills of self-study and lifelong learning in English which can more frequently occur via reading. According to a plethora of EFL research findings (Culver, 2008; Noronha-Nimmo, 2008; Murray, 2008; Thampradit, 2006; Tapinta, 2006; Pan, 2006; Brown, 2005), effective learning strategies appropriate for the individual learner's need can facilitate English learning, given the fact that listening and reading are highly significant receptive skills for foreign/second language learning/acquisition.

It is appropriate here to cite Wenden (1998), who in turn, cited a multitude of studies, asserting that “Foreign and second language educators involved in learner training, i.e., providing instruction in the use of cognitive strategies or the skills for self-directed language learning, agree that metacognitive knowledge should also be a component of these programmes” (p. 515). Wenden (1998: p. 515) further indicates that the area of language learning strategies (LLS) was at the time under-researched, especially that “there has been no explicit, theoretically-based discussion of the function of metacognitive knowledge in language learning”. Curiously enough, this remark has been picked up by several researchers at the present time, all indicating that due to the difficulty involved in introspecting internal mental representations, findings and theoretical conceptualizations of language learning strategies still remain a nebulous area in second and/ or foreign language research. Gao (2007: p. 616) sums up this observation as follows:

As a construct, LLS remains under-theorized (Ellis, 1994; Hsiao and Oxford, 2002; Zhang, 2003) and researchers have yet to arrive at a consensus on whether ‘learning strategies should be regarded as

either observable behaviours or inner mental operations, or both (Tseng *et al.*, 2006: p. 80).

As said earlier, reading comprehension is occasioned by the appropriation of both cognitive and metacognitive strategy use. Learners to be efficient readers have to make best use of these two types of language learning strategies (LLS). Therefore, more research is needed to explore what strategies are employed by foreign language readers and how these strategies can affect the way they learn their target languages.

Prior research on the topic explained that reading comprehension is not just understanding words, sentences, or even texts, but it involves a complex integration of the reader's prior knowledge, language proficiency and their metacognitive strategies (Hammadou, 1991). Reading is more than merely sounding out words, memorizing vocabulary, learning syntactical rules, and translating written passages; it is a process that involves complicated cognitive and metacognitive processes (Tsai, 2005). Reading is an active, interactive process with texts; learning with texts, therefore, helps readers contribute to the reading process as they interact with texts to make meaning and construct knowledge (Vacca and Vacca, 2002). In other words, both cognition and metacognition play an important part in enhancing and developing reading comprehension.

Metacognition is considered by most educators to be an element necessary for many cognitive learning tasks. Metacognition refers to "one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them" (Flavell, 1976: p. 232). It also includes "the active monitoring and consequent regulation and orchestration of these processes in relation to the cognitive objects or data on which they bear, usually in the service of some concrete goal or objective" (p. 232). In other words, learners have knowledge about their cognitive processes and are able to use that knowledge to choose the most efficient strategies for problem solving. Simply stated, metacognition is the ability to stand back and observe oneself. It is also an ability often related to effective learning and to competent performance in any area of problem solving (Block, 1992). According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990: p. 150), metacognitive strategies:

"involve both knowledge about learning (metacognitive knowledge) and control or regulation over learning (metacognitive strategies). Metacognitive knowledge refers to knowledge of one's own

cognitive processes and those of others ... Regulation of learning, as distinguished from knowledge about learning, entails the use of metacognitive strategies"

Reading strategies, especially cognitive and metacognitive strategies, stress the mental decoding process in reading, including prediction, extrapolation, inferencing, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Metacognitive reading include planning, monitoring, and checking. Flavell (1992) argued that metacognitive strategies are especially likely to occur in situations that stimulate a lot of careful, highly conscious thinking. Examples of metacognitive strategies include self-evaluation and consciously directing one's attention to the learning task (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990: p. 55).

Therefore, effective English reading strategies help build English reading metacognition and increase English reading comprehension. For academic reading, an important purpose of teaching reading is help students to obtain reading comprehension for long-term memory, which can shape individuals' schemata or experiences both for developing their declarative and procedural knowledge. This is connected to Goodman's (1967) cliché that "reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game", a statement that emphasizes the point that schemata or background knowledge is helpful to English reading comprehension.

College readers who possess high metacognitive abilities are able to exploit effective cognitive reading strategies to meet their comprehension and language acquisition needs. A strategy is an action selected deliberately to achieve particular goals (Oxford and Crookall, 1989; Oxford, 1990). Readers can plan, predict, analyze, synthesize, verify, adjust and evaluate their use of reading strategies, and then feedback their learning to another field. Cognitive reading strategies focus on the thinking process in reading and more direct manipulation of the learning materials for forming and revising internal mental modes as well as receiving and producing messages in the target language. As well, cognitive reading strategies include a broad range of strategies such as repetition, collecting information, translating texts, classifying, note-taking, deduction, induction, recombination, imaginary, key word, conceptualization, evaluation, transfer, and inference (O'Malley *et al.*, 1985b).

Effective reading strategies can enhance individuals' reading skills inductive to active reading motivation. Numerous studies (Oxford and Ehrman, 1995; Bremner, 1999; Grabe and Stoller,

2002; Anderson, 1999; Brown, 2001; Tsai, 2005; Brown, 2005) have borne out empirical evidence indicating that EFL reading comprehension is highly correlated with effective reading strategies, motivation, and positive learning attitudes. Therefore, EFL instructors should consider developing students' basic language skills as well as their motivation for English reading and provide them with appropriate reading materials for their needs, interests, and English proficiency levels.

The present study aims to explore the effectiveness of training on both cognitive and metacognitive strategies of EFL Saudi college students on their achievement in and motivation for English reading comprehension in an EFL reading class.

Reading is one of the language skills, and reading comprehension is a part of overall language proficiency. It is necessary for English teachers to cultivate students' English reading skills by providing students with effective reading strategies such as cognitive reading strategies and metacognitive strategies in class.

A number of studies on ESL/EFL reading show some common obstacles encountered by Saudi college students. For instance, Abu Ghararah (1991) indicated that the Latin script being different from the Arabic script has led to perceptual difficulties hampering rapid visual recognition of graphemes, and consequently hindering learners' reading comprehension. This observation is commensurate with Drucker's remark that "differences between languages with deep orthographic structures (having many irregular sound-letter correspondences) versus shallow ones (having mainly regular sound-letter correspondences) might cause difficulty for some nonnative readers of English" (Drucker, 2003: p. 23).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Researchers indicated that Saudi college students could read an essay better than the other text genres such as newspaper articles, poems, and novels. They read very slowly, and in general, students' vocabulary is deficient. They do not know how to guess the meaning of the unfamiliar words. Most students lack English grammar ability. They lack cultural background knowledge in the target culture. Most of them adopt the 'word by word' reading strategy for interpreting a text. Even though they understand the meaning of each word in a text, they are not able to comprehend the whole meaning of the text. They have no motivation for reading and do not have efficient problem-solving ability in reading comprehension. Most of students lack clear and

specific objectives for their reading tasks in English. Difficulties in Saudi EFL students' reading may be due to the EFL students' lack of background knowledge in the target culture, and their lack of background knowledge seems to make the students overly rely on their linguistic knowledge of English, even when they do not have sufficient linguistic knowledge of English, it is incumbent upon college students to be equipped with effective reading strategies that span both cognitive and metacognitive processing of reading.

Beckman (2002) supposed that strategic learners had strong motivation, self-monitoring, and self-regulation ability. If students are good at using effective reading strategies, they may become active, strategic, and independent readers who can adjust their strategies to different reading situations, evaluating their products and behaviors for full comprehensions.

### **Objectives of the Study**

Given these difficulties and intricacies involved in the reading process, this study seeks to explore some effective cognitive reading strategies and metacognitive strategies to improve their EFL reading comprehension, building up background knowledge of texts and enhancing the motivation in learning English reading. In other words, the present study aims to explore the relationship among schema, reading strategies, especially graphic organizers and the interactive reading processing approach, and reading comprehension for improving reading comprehension in EFL college students of the English Department of King Khalid University. More specifically, it aims at:

1. Examining students' ability to apply their schema or background knowledge to English reading comprehension.
2. Examining students' motivation for the traditional grammar-translation method and the interactive reading processing approach (manipulating both bottom-up and top-down processing).
3. Recognising effective reading strategies preferred by college students of EFL.
4. Recognising the relationships amongst schema, reading strategies, graphic organizers, reading metacognition, interactive reading processing approach, and reading comprehension.

### **Research Questions**

The following questions have been formulated to base the present study:

1. Are there statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their performance on a reading comprehension test administered before and after the experiment?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their motivation for reading in English on pretesting and posttesting?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to facilitate their reading comprehension of EFL texts?
4. What strategies - cognitive or metacognitive - that Saudi college students in a Saudi university prefer to use for deciphering reading texts and reading comprehension?

### **Research Methodology**

#### **Design**

This study utilised the experimental method of the type, pretest, posttest control group design.

#### **Participants**

The population consisted of sophomores (aged 20 or older), studying in the English Department of the College of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University in Saudi Arabia, who voluntarily participated in this study for one semester in the academic year 2009/2010. The objective of the course was improved reading comprehension of texts in English based on Tapestry Reading Comprehension II. All students had completed eight years of English or the equivalent and had achieved the required level in the English sub-test of the entrance examination administered by the university. The participants were 49 in number, 20 were assigned to the traditional teaching group (control) and 29 were assigned to the experimental strategic reading group (experimental).

#### **Procedures**

The experimental group was taught by the researcher with the interactive reading processing approach grounded in schema theory; i.e., the experimental group was instructed by using the interactive reading processing approach (bottom-up and top-down), which emphasized the process of recalling background knowledge, guessing, prediction, inference, analysis and synthesis, self-evaluation, self-regulation and self-monitoring in English reading.

In this case, students were trained on how to use advance organizers and reading outlines as well as other strategies described by Anderson (1991: pp. 460-472). And the control group was instructed by another English teacher, who used the traditional grammar-translation method, which emphasized the translation of the texts from English into Arabic on a sentence by sentence or word by word, with grammar rules explanation, memorisation of lexicon, drill and practice of post reading activities.

#### **Materials and testing**

Students were given training on strategic reading using the first five units of Reading and Comprehension of Level Two Tapestry Reading Series. The same units were instructed to the control group in a traditional way of presentation and teaching, involving lexical training, translation, silent reading and reading aloud protocols, etc. This experimental course was performed three hours per week for one semester from February to May, 2009.

One day prior to the onset of the training, all subjects were given a pretest. Two months later, immediately after the training, all subjects were given the same test as a posttest. The rationale for using exactly the same test for both pre- and posttesting was to assure exactly comparable tests, thus avoiding the problem of equating different forms of pre- and posttests. The two-month interval between administrations was deemed long enough to control for any short-term memory effects; since subjects were not provided with the correct answers after the pretest, even were they to remember how they had answered a question the first time, they had no way of knowing whether that answer was correct.

The test consisted of one reading passage with three multiple-choice comprehension questions: (a) a factual information or detail question, (b) a direct inference question, and (c) an indirect inference question. Multiple-choice questions were used as the most basic and common measure of reading comprehension. In addition, a partial semantic map was set up to be completed much like a cloze test.

The students in both groups of the research were given after the termination of the strategic training for the experimental group and the traditional teaching for the control group, two questionnaires: *The English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire* tapping into the participants' motivation for EFL reading comprehension and *The Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies*, which examined the participants' preference of using effective reading strategies.

### Findings

To answer research question number (1), which investigates whether there are statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their performance on a reading comprehension test administered before and after the experiment, gain scores were calculated for the mean differences between testing and retesting after the training. Results of the Reading Test on pretesting and posttesting are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Gain scores of pretesting/posttesting of reading comprehension**

Group	N	Pretest Mean	Retest Mean	Gain
<b>Traditional Teaching (Control)</b>	20	39.60	52.20	+ 12.60
<b>Standard Deviation</b>		11.30	15.43	
<b>Strategic Reading (Experimental)</b>	29	30.17	45.55	+ 15.38
<b>Standard Deviation</b>		11.92	13.29	

Data from Table 1 above shows the mean scores for both the traditional-frontal group and the self-test group at the beginning of the study (pre-test) and at the end (re-test). It also shows the gain between the two mean scores and the standard deviation for each mean. Using a t-test for the two uncorrelated means, it was found that there was a

significant increase ( $p < 0.01$ ) in the experimental group's gain scores in comparison with those of the control group's ( $t$ -test = 5.469).

The second question of the study which reads "Are there statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their motivation for reading in English?" was explored by the *English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire* which taps into students' motivation for reading in EFL; the results are shown in Table 2.

Findings in Table 2 indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on pretesting their motivation for reading in English. To tap into the participants' motivation levels in reading in English after the experiment on posttesting, a t-test was calculated to check the mean differences between control and experimental participants in their motivation levels as well as on the total score. Table 3 summarizes the findings.

Findings in Table 3 indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on posttesting their motivation for reading in English in favour of the experimental group.

Further, a t-test was calculated to check the differences between pretesting and posttesting on the *English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire* for the experimental participants. Table 4 summarizes the findings.

**Table 2. The t-test of mean differences between experimental and control groups on pretesting on the English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire**

Variables	Group	No	M	Standard Deviation	t-value	Sig.
<b>Motivation</b>	Control	20	21.20	1.795	0.014	0.988
	Experimental	29	21.21	1.521		
<b>Total</b>	Control	20	37.5000	3.10348	0.509	0.613
	Experimental	29	37.1034	2.35045		

**Table 3. The t-test of mean differences between experimental and control groups on posttesting on the English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire**

Variables	Group	No	M	Standard Deviation	t-value	Sig.
<b>Motivation</b>	Control	20	21.45	1.572	31.679	0.01
	Experimental	29	36.03	1.592		
<b>Total</b>	Control	20	37.7000	3.13050	25.222	0.01
	Experimental	29	57.9655	2.48543		

**Table 4. t-test of mean differences between pretesting and posttesting motivation for reading in English (experimental group)**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-value	Sig.
<b>Motivation</b>	14.828	0.928	0.172	86.000	0.01
<b>Total</b>	20.86207	0.78940	0.14659	142.318	0.01

Table 4 shows statistically significant differences between pretesting and posttesting on the English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire for experimental participants to the good of posttesting as is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5. Mean differences between pretesting and posttesting motivation for reading in English**

Variables	Testing	Mean
Motivation	Pre-testing	21.21
	Posttesting	36.03
Total	Pre-testing	37.1034
	Posttesting	57.9655

By the same token, a t-test was calculated to check the differences between pretesting and posttesting the control group on the *English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire*. Table 6 summarizes the findings.

Table 6 shows no statistically significant differences between pretesting and posttesting on the English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire for experimental participants as is shown in Table 7.

These findings, overall, demonstrate that the experimental participants' motivation for reading in

English have been improved upon training in strategic training on both cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. However, no differences in motivation levels for reading in English were detected for the control participants.

The third question of the study which reads "Are there statistically significant differences between the participants of experimental and control groups in their use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to facilitate their reading comprehension of EFL texts?" was explored by the Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies. A t-test for independent samples was calculated to check differences between both research groups on pretesting. The results are shown in Table 8.

Findings in Table 8 indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on pretesting their strategy use. A t-test for independent samples was calculated to check differences between both research groups on posttesting their use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to facilitate their reading comprehension of EFL texts. The results are shown in Table 9.

**Table 6. t-test of Mean Differences between Pretesting and Posttesting Motivation for Reading in English (control group)**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-value	Sig.
Motivation	0.250	0.786	0.176	1.422	0.171
Total	0.20000	1.19649	0.26754	0.748	0.464

**Table 7. Mean differences between pretesting and posttesting motivation for reading in English**

Variables	Testing	Mean
Motivation	Pre-testing	21.20
	Posttesting	21.45
Total	Pre-testing	37.5000
	Posttesting	37.7000

**Table 8. The t-test results for the mean differences between experimental and control participants on pretesting**

Group	No	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Sig.
Control	20	22.8000	2.74533	0.919	0.363
Experimental	29	22.1379	2.27916		

**Table 9. The t-test results for the mean differences between experimental and control participants on posttesting**

Group	No	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Sig.
Control	20	22.9500	2.92853	27.98	0.01
Experimental	29	43.3448	2.17577		

Findings in Table 9 indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on posttesting their strategy use to the good of posttesting. By the same token, a t-test for independent samples was calculated to check the differences between pretesting and posttesting the experimental and the control groups on their strategy use. Table 10 summarizes the findings.

Table 10 shows statistically significant differences between pretesting and posttesting as shown in mean scores between both pre-administration and post-administration of the Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies to the experimental group (Table 11). The table also shows that there are no statistically significant differences between pretesting and posttesting as shown in mean scores between both pre-administration and post-administration of the same checklist to the control group (Table 11).

As for the fourth question which reads “What strategies - cognitive or metacognitive - that Saudi college students in a Saudi university prefer to use for deciphering reading texts and reading comprehension?”, numerical responses to the Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies suggest that the most frequently used strategies by experimental participants include the following with percentages of occurrence on the numerical Likert scale on the post-administration of the scale:

1. Previewing and making predictions based on titles subtitles and pictures before or while reading (94%).

2. Paraphrasing and summarizing (91%).
3. Scanning (89%).
4. Note-Taking (88%).
5. Skimming and looking for the gist in the text (87%).
6. Graphic organisers and word-mapping (83%).
7. Contextual guessing (81%).
8. Inferencing from textual evidence (74%).
9. Distinguishing facts from opinion (71%).

Numerical comparisons between the first administration of the scale and the second administration after strategic training for the experimental participants indicate poignant improvements in strategy use of the participants in the second posttesting of the scale.

Responses from the English Reading Comprehension Questionnaire also indicated that participants' preferences for EFL reading strategies and methods included the Communicative Approach (Mean = 15.19), Extensive Reading for general understanding of the text, using scanning and skimming (Mean = 14.08), Interactive Reading Processing Approach or Bottom-up and Top-down Approach (Mean = 12.99) on the pretest. On posttesting, however, the top three preferred English reading instruction methods were ranked from the most preferred to the least preferred as including Communicative Approach (Mean = 21.05), Extensive reading for general understanding of the text, using scanning and skimming (Mean = 20.02), Intensive reading (read the text for linguistic and semantics details) (Mean = 19.96) and Interactive reading processing approach (Mean = 18.96).

**Table 10. The t-test of mean differences between pretesting and posttesting on the Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-value	Sig.
Experimental	21.20690	1.26433	0.23478	90.327	0.01
Control	0.150	0.988	0.220	0.976	0.505

**Table 11. Mean differences between pretesting and posttesting on the Checklist of Effective English Reading Strategies**

Variables	Testing	Mean
Experimental	Pre-testing	22.1379
	Posttesting	43.3448
Control	Pre-testing	22.8000
	Posttesting	22.9500

Differences between control and experimental participants on pretesting and posttesting may be particularly surprising since the participants in this study were students in developmental reading courses in early levels of study. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider that increases in scores between administrations may be at least partly due to regression to the mean, and changes in scores between pre- and post-treatment administrations of the tests and scales used should be examined carefully.

### Discussion

Findings from the present study indicate that cognitive and metacognitive strategy training on strategic reading with the interactive reading processing approach was effective in enhancing reading comprehension. This approach which is grounded in schema theory, manipulating bottom-up and top-down processing of reading texts, schema-activating techniques like word-mapping, inferencing, analysis, synthesis, self-evaluation, self-regulation and self-monitoring has thus proven effectual for developing reading strategy use and, consequently, reading comprehension.

These findings commensurate with prior research on strategy use suggests that less competent learners are able to improve their skills through training in strategies evidenced by more successful learners (Carrell *et al.*, 1989; Carrell, 1989; O'Malley, 1987; Carrell, 1985; Padron, 1985; Sarig and Folman, 1987). The same is true of reading strategies; less competent readers are able to improve through training in strategies evidenced by more successful readers. Findings from this study support this claim.

Therefore, the results of this study suggest that second language reading pedagogy, especially for adult students in academic EFL college study programmes, should benefit from the inclusion of explicit, comprehension-fostering cognitive and metacognitive strategy training. The basic reason for this is that meaning-making and comprehension resultant from reading does not come from the text alone; it needs the reader to predict and interpret the message presented in print, which is, finally, the outcome of interaction between bottom-up processing and top-down processing. This occurs when readers' prior knowledge or schemata are compatible with the information retrieved from the text. Therefore, it was appropriate when Goodman (1967) advocated that reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game.

When readers encounter new words they do not know in reading, they need to synthesize, analyze, infer, and judge the complex meaning of words by the linguistic factors (vocabulary, syntax, rhetoric, semantics) and non-linguistic factors (background knowledge, experience, cultural literacy).

Furthermore, results of the present research suggest that the types of such training should be varied to accommodate individual students' differing learning styles of students as to those teaching styles of teachers as well.

Based on these findings and results of the present study and from implications from prior research, the following practical recommendations are advisable:

- Teachers should provide students with learning methods and cognitive strategies so as to develop students' metacognition.
- Metacognitive strategies for directing and controlling the acquisition of knowledge can be instructed and trained.
- Inspiring students' learning motivation is also indispensable for effective reading.
- Integrating the four skills of language and inspiring students to do social involvement such as cooperative learning method, group work, or pair work.
- Using graphic organisers as an effective cognitive reading strategy for visual presentation of reading content.
- Encouraging students to do scanning, skimming, and summarising of reading passages in class as well as encouraging them to do intensive and extensive reading at home.

### References

- Abu Ghararah, A.** "The Impact of Perceptual Skills Training on the EFL Reading Speed and Comprehension." *Journal of King Saud University*, Vol. 3, No. (2), (1991), 123-139.
- Aebersold, J. and Field, M. L.** *From Reader to Reading Teacher: Issues and Strategies for Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1997).
- Aebersold, J. A. and Field, M. C.** *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1997).
- Afflerbach, P. P. and Johnston, P. H.** (1986). "What Do Expert Readers Do When the Main Idea is not Explicit?" In: J. F. Baumann (Ed.), *Teaching Main Idea Comprehension*. Newark International Reading Association, (1986), pp. 49-72.
- Anderson, N.** "Individual Differences in Strategy Use in Second Language Reading and Testing." *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 75, (1991), 460-472.
- Barnett, M.** "Reading through Context: How Real and Perceived Strategy Use Affects L2 Comprehension." *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 72, (1988), 150-162.

- Beckman, P.** *Strategy Instruction. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education* (ERICEC), (2002).
- Brown, C.** "An Investigation of the Influence of Metacognition, Reading Comprehension Skill, and Background Knowledge on Studying." *Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Columbia University*, Proquest Database, AAT 3159724, (2005).
- Brown, D. H.** *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2nd ed., Longman, (2001).
- Camahalan, F.** "Effects of a Metacognitive Reading Program on the Reading Achievement and Metacognitive Strategies of Students with Cases of Dyslexia." *Reading Improvement*, Vol. 43, No. (2), (2006), 77-93.
- Carrell, P. L.** "Facilitating ESL Reading by Teaching Text Structure." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19, (1985), 727-752.
- Carrell, P. L.** "Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading." *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 73, (1989), 121-134.
- Carrell, P.; Pharis, B. and Liberto, J.** "Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. (4), (December 1989), 647-678.
- Chamot, A.** "The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA): An Update." In: P. Richard-Amato and M. Snow (Eds.), *Academic Success for English Language Learners*. White Plains, NY: Longman, (2005), pp. 87-101.
- Cohen, A.** "Verbal Reports as a Source of Insights into Second Language Learner Strategies." *Applied Language Learning*, Vol. 7, No. (1 & 2), (1996), 5-24.
- Cohen, A. D.** *Language Learning: Insights for Learners, Teachers, and Researchers*. New York: Newbury House, (1990).
- Coiro, J. and Dobler, E.** "Exploring the Online Reading Comprehension Strategies Used by Sixth-grade Skilled Readers to Search for and Locate Information on the Internet." *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. (i2), (2007), 214-257.
- Culver, T. F.** "An Investigation of Study Guides and Quizzes to Improve College Students' Reading Compliance, Comprehension, and Metacognitive Strategies." *Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Mississippi State University*, Proquest Database, AAT 3315169, (2008).
- Drucker, M. J.** "What Reading Teachers Should Know about ESL Learners." *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 57, No. (1), (2003), 22-29.
- Fedderholt, K.** "Using Diaries to Develop Language Strategies." Online document at: <http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/98/apr/fedderholt.html>, (1998).
- Flavell, J. H.** *Cognitive Development*. 2nd ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, (1985).
- Gao, X.** "Has Language Learning Strategy Research Come to an End? A Response to Tseng *et al.* (2006)." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 28, No. (4), (2007), 615-620.
- Garner, R.** "Verbal-report Data on Reading Strategies." *Journal of Reading Behavior*, Vol. 14, (1982), 159-167.
- Garner, R.** *Metacognition and Reading Comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, (1987).
- Grabe, W.** "Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. (3), (1991), 375-402.
- Grabe, W. and Stoller, F. L.** *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Longman, (2002).
- Hammadou, J.** "Interrelationship among Prior Knowledge, Inference and Language Proficiency in Foreign Language Reading." *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 75, (1991), 23-37.
- Hismanoglu, M.** "Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching." *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. 6, No. (8), (2003), [http://iteslj.org/Articles/Hismanoglu\\_strategies.html](http://iteslj.org/Articles/Hismanoglu_strategies.html), February 4, 2003.
- Hosenfeld, C.** "A Preliminary Investigation of the Reading Strategies of Successful and Nonsuccessful Second Language Learners." *System*, Vol. 5, (1977), 110-123.
- Kitajima, R.** "Referential Strategy Training for Second Language Reading Comprehension of Japanese Texts." *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 30, No. (1), (1997), 84-97.
- Macaro, E.** "Strategies for Language Learning and for Language Use: Revising the Theoretical Framework." *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 90, (2006), 320-37.
- Macaro, E. and Erler, L.** "Raising the Achievement of Young-beginner Readers of French through Strategy Instruction." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 29, No. (1), (2008), 90-119.
- Murray, B. P.** "Prior Knowledge, Two Teaching Approaches for Metacognition: Main Idea and Summarization Strategies in Reading." *Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Fordham University*, Proquest Database, AAT 3302116, (2008).
- Noronha-Nimmo, A.** "Effectiveness of Skills- versus Metacognitive Strategy-based Approaches on Reading Comprehension of College Developmental Students." *Unpublished EdD Dissertation, Florida International University*, Proquest Database, AAT 3319014, (2008).
- O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. U.** *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1990).
- O'Malley, J. M.; Chant, A. U.; Stewnw-Manzanares, G.; Russo and Kupper, L.** "Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. (3), (1985b) 557-584.
- O'Malley, J. M.** "The Effects of Training in the Use of Learning Strategies on Learning English as a Second Language." In: A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, (1987), pp. 133-144.
- Oxford, R.** *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers, (1990).
- Oxford, R. and Crookall, D.** "Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods, Findings, and Instructional Issues." *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 73, (1989), 404-419.
- Padron, Y. N.** "Utilizing Cognitive Reading Strategies to Improve English Reading Comprehension of Spanish-speaking Bilingual Students." *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston*, (1985).
- Pan, L-M.** "The Implication of Schema Theory, Metacognition and Graphic Organizers in English Reading Comprehension for Technical College Students in Taiwan." *Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Spalding University*, Proquest Database, AAT 3205304, (2006).
- Robb, L.** *Reading Strategies that Work, Teaching Your Students to Become Better Readers*. Professional Books, (1995).
- Rosenshine, B.** "Synthesis of Research on Explicit Teaching." *Educational Leadership*, (April 1986), 60-69.
- Sarig, G. and Folman, S.** "Metacognitive Awareness and Theoretical Knowledge in Coherence Production." Paper presented at the *20th Anniversary Communication and Cognition International Congress*, Ghent, Belgium, (1987).
- Tapinta, P.** "Exploring Thai EFL University Students' Awareness of Their Knowledge, Use, and Control of Strategies in Reading and Writing." *Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of North Texas*, Proquest Database AAT 3254227, (2006).

- Thampradit, P.** "A Study of Reading Strategies Used by Thai University Engineering Students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang." *Southern Illinois University at Carbondale*, Proquest Database AAT 3215042, (2006).
- Tsai, C-C.** "Cognition and Metcognition of English Reading Strategies in Successful Taiwanese Comprehensive High School Student Readers: Opportunities and Obstacles." *Unpublished EdD*, UMI No. 3199286, (2005).
- Vacca, R. T. and Vacca, A. L.** *Content Area Reading: Literacy and Learning across the Curriculum*. 7th ed., Boston: Pearson Education, (2002).
- Vandergrift, L.** "Successful and Less Successful Listeners in French: What Are the Strategy Differences?" *The French Review*, Vol. 71, (1998), 370-95.
- Vandergrift, L.** "Orchestrating Strategy Use: Towards a Model of the Skilled L2 Listener." *Language Learning*, Vol. 53, (2003), 461-94.
- Wade, S. E.** "Using Think Alouds to Assess Comprehension." *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 43, No. (7), (1990), 442-451.
- Wenden, A.** "Metacognitive Knowledge and Language Learning." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 19, (1998), 515-37.

## أثر التدريب على الإستراتيجيات المعرفية وما وراء المعرفة في تحسين التحصيل والدافعية نحو الفهم القرائي لدى طلاب الجامعة السعوديين

عبدالعزیز إبراهيم الفقيه

كلية اللغات والترجمة، جامعة الملك خالد، أبها، المملكة العربية السعودية

(قدم للنشر في ٢٥/٤/١٤٣١هـ؛ وقبل للنشر في ٥/٤/١٤٣٢هـ)

**ملخص البحث.** هدفت الدراسة الحالية إلى التعرف على مدى فعالية التدريب على إستراتيجيات معرفية وما وراء معرفية في تحسين تحصيل طلاب الجامعة السعوديين لمهارات الفهم القرائي وزيادة دافعتهم في صفوف تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية. وقد استخدم الباحث المنهج التجريبي ذي التصميم القبلي والبعدى المضبوط بمجموعتين تجريبية وضابطة (ن = ٢٠ للمجموعة التجريبية، و ٣٠ للضابطة)، واستفاد الباحث من برنامج تدريبي على مهارات معينة بعضها معرفي والبعض الآخر ما وراء معرفي طبقت على مستوى تابستري الثاني في مقرر الفهم القرائي، تأسيساً على نظرية الخرائط المعرفية ومدخل عمليات القراءة التفاعلي، من خلال التدريب على إستراتيجيات المعالجة التصاعديّة والتنازليّة التي أكدت أهمية استرجاع المعارف السابقة للمتعلّمين، والتخمين والتنبؤ والاستدلال والتحليل والتركيب والتقويم الذاتي والتنظيم الذاتي ومراقبة الذات أثناء القراءة باللغة الإنجليزية. انتهت الدراسة إلى جملة من النتائج خلصت ختاماً إلى تأكيد فعالية التدريب على إستراتيجيات المعالجة المعرفية وما وراء المعرفة من خلال الاستفادة من طرق المعالجة التصاعديّة والتنازليّة وأساليب تنشيط الخرائط المعرفية والاستدلال والاستنتاج والتحليل والتركيب وتنظيم الذات وتقويم الذات ومراقبة الذات كأساليب فعالة في تحسين إستراتيجيات القراءة، وزيادة الدافعية نحو القراءة باللغة الإنجليزية، ومن ثم تحسين الفهم القرائي وتحسن أداء الدارسين على الاختبارات التحصيلية في الفهم القرائي.