

**COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING
STRATEGIES OF IRANIAN EFL LEARNERS**

REZA AGHAEI

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2011

**COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES
OF IRANIAN EFL LEARNERS**

REZA AGHAEI

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2011

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: **REZA AGHAIE** (I.C/Passport No: **B2925047**)

Registration/Matric No: **THA070019**

Name of Degree: **PhD**

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis (“this Work”):

COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES OF IRANIAN EFL LEARNERS

Field of Study: Applied Linguistics

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

(1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;

(2) This Work is original;

(3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;

(4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;

(5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya (“UM”), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;

(6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate’s Signature

Date

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness’s Signature

Date

Name: **Assoc Professor Dr Stefanie Pillai**

Designation: **Supervisor**

ABSTRACT

Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Iranian

EFL Learners

This study explored the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners. It also examined significant relationships between cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies and the gender and English proficiency of the learners. Further, it looked at the impact of explicit teaching of these strategies on reading performance and self-efficacy.

The study employed two instruments for data collection: a questionnaire adopted from Chamot and O'Malley's (1994) cognitive and metacognitive strategies and think-aloud protocols. A total of 300 high school students participated in this study. The study, mixed method in design, utilized quantitative and qualitative methods.

Independent t-tests and analysis of think-aloud protocols showed that cognitive reading strategies were used more frequently than metacognitive ones. Further, high-proficient students used metacognitive reading strategies more frequently than low-proficient students. However, no gender differences were found with respect to the use of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies based on the results of the independent t-tests and think-aloud analysis.

Analysis of the transcripts of the think-aloud protocols suggests that the difference between high-proficient students and low-proficient students is not only the frequency of strategies used but also their quality and the way they use them. Analysis of the transcripts does not indicate differences between male and female students regarding frequency of strategies, though there are differences with respect to the quality and the

way they used strategies. The findings of this study indicate that Iranian certain context of leaning strategy that is, teachers' instructional goals and assessment formats use determine learners' strategy use.

To test the impact of explicit teaching of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies on reading performance and self-efficacy, the study examined a control group and an experimental group. The experimental group achieved significantly better results than the control group. Results of paired-sample t-tests and independent t-tests and effect size showed that reading comprehension, strategy and self-efficacy can be improved with strategy instruction; that within certain contexts, strategy instruction contributes to independent reading behaviours. Additional analysis showed that the experimental group developed a positive attitude after strategy instruction and was able to transfer the strategies to other languages and reading materials.

In sum, teaching reading strategies promoted learners' autonomy as students become aware that strategy allows them to learn independently of teachers. The results suggest that language practitioners should teach strategies to EFL learners and encourage their use in the language learning process to promote learning and learners' autonomy.

Keywords: EFL, Language learning strategies, Language proficiency, Cognitive and Metacognitive reading strategies, Foreign language reading, and Self-efficacy

ABSTRAK

Strategi Membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif

Pelajar-pelajar Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Asing di Iran

Kajian ini meneliti strategi membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif yang digunakan oleh pelajar-pelajar Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Asing di Iran. Ia juga mengkaji hubungan utama antara strategi membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif, jantina serta tahap kecekapan bahasa Inggeris pelajar-pelajar tersebut. Selanjutnya, penyelidikan ini mengenal pasti kesan pengajaran eksplisit strategi-strategi tersebut ke atas prestasi membaca dan keberkesanan diri pelajar.

Kajian ini menggunakan two instrumen untuk pengumpulan data: soal selidik yang diadaptasi dari strategi Kognitif dan Metakognitif Chamot dan O'Malley (1994), Protokol Pemikiran Verbal, dan temubual terbuka. Seramai 300 pelajar sekolah menengah menyertai kajian ini. Rekaan kajian ini yang menggunakan kaedah pensampelan campuran melibatkan kaedah kuantitatif dan kualitatif.

Ujian-t bebas dan analisis Protokol Pemikiran Verbal menunjukkan bahawa strategi membaca Kognitif lebih kerap digunakan berbanding strategi Metakognitif. Selanjutnya, pelajar yang mempunyai kemahiran bahasa tinggi lebih kerap menggunakan strategi membaca Metakognitif daripada pelajar yang mempunyai kemahiran bahasa rendah. Namun, tidak ada perbezaan antara jantina yang ditemui berhubung penggunaan strategi membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif berdasarkan hasil ujian-t bebas dan analisa Protokol Pemikiran Verbal.

Analisis transkrip Protokol Pemikiran Verbal menunjukkan bahawa perbezaan antara pelajar berkemahiran bahasa tinggi dengan pelajar berkemahiran bahasa rendah tidak hanya bertumpu pada frekuensi penggunaan strategi tetapi juga pada jenis dan kualiti

strategi yang digunakan, dan perbezaan penting seringkali sukar untuk ditentukan. Dalam erti kata lain, kesesuaian strategi yang digunakan untuk sesuatu tugas atau masalah tertentu mungkin lebih penting dalam pemrosesan bahasa kedua yang berkesan berbanding frekuensi ataupun jenis strategi yang digunakan. Analisis transkrip Protokol Pemikiran Verbal juga menunjukkan bahawa tidak ada perbezaan antara pelajar lelaki dan perempuan dalam frekuensi penggunaan strategi, tetapi terdapat perbezaan berhubung dengan jenis dan kualiti strategi yang digunakan. Dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa penggunaan strategi bukan sahaja merupakan pilihan kognitif pelajar tetapi juga melibatkan pengantaraan konteks pembelajaran mereka, iaitu tujuan pengajaran guru dan format penilaian.

Bagi tujuan menguji kesan pengajaran eksplisit strategi membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif ke atas prestasi membaca dan keberkesanan diri, kajian ini membandingkan kumpulan eksperimen dengan kumpulan kawalan. Kumpulan eksperimen memperolehi keputusan yang lebih signifikan daripada kumpulan kawalan. Keputusan ujian-t berpasangan, ujian-t bebas dan kesan saiz menunjukkan bahawa pemahaman membaca, strategi dan keberkesanan diri dapat dipertingkatkan dengan pengajaran strategi; bahawa dalam konteks tertentu, pengajaran strategi menyumbang kepada pembacaan secara sendiri tanpa bimbingan. Analisis tambahan menunjukkan bahawa sikap positif di kalangan kumpulan eksperimen berkembang selepas pengajaran strategi dan mereka mampu memindahkan strategi tersebut kepada bahasa dan bahan bacaan lain.

Kesimpulannya, pengajaran strategi membaca mempromosikan autonomi pelajar kerana pelajar sendiri akan menyedari bahawa penggunaan strategi membolehkan mereka belajar secara sendiri tanpa bimbingan guru. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa pengamal bahasa harus mengajar strategi-strategi untuk pelajar Bahasa Inggeris sebagai

Bahasa Asing dan memberikan mereka motivasi untuk menggunakan strategi ini dalam proses pembelajaran bahasa serta menggalakkan pembelajaran dan autonomi pelajar.

Kata kunci: EFL, Strategi pembelajaran bahasa, Kecekapan bahasa, Strategi membaca Kognitif dan Metakognitif, Pembacaan Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Asing, dan Keberkesanan diri

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to say that I feel grateful for my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Stefanie Pillai who has always supported me and helped me throughout my academic career at the University of Malaya. Without her help, I would not have been able to complete my thesis. I therefore would like to acknowledge her kind support, motivation and assistance.

I would like to express my sincere thanks for my defence panel members, Dr. Ng Lee Luan, Associate Professor Dr. Mohana Nambiar and Dr. Jawakhir Mior Jaafar for their support and meticulous feedback. Without their expertise and advice on my proposal and dissertation, I would not have been able to complete my work.

In terms of research methodology and academic writing, I am indebted to Associate Professor Dr. Rajeswary, Dr. Ng Lee Luan, Professor Dr. Azirah Hashim and most of all, Dr. Mahmud Hassan Khan for their time and support. I appreciate their assistance and motivation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Language Learning Strategies and Cognitive Psychology.....	1
1.2. Language Learning Strategies and Metacognition.....	2
1.3. Background of the Study.....	2
1.4. Statement of the Problem	4
1.5. Objective of the Study.....	5
1.6. Significance of the Study	6
1.7. Definition of Key Terms	7
1.8. Limitations of the Study.....	8
1.9. Conclusion and Overview of Forthcoming Chapters.....	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review	9
2.1. Introduction	9
2.2. Distinction between Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	10
2.3. Learning Strategies and Different Models	10
2.4. Culture and Language Learning Strategies	12
2.5. Gender and Learning Strategies	13
2.5.1. Gender and Overall Learning Strategies	13
2.5.2. Differences in Strategy between Males and Females in Relation to the Type	

of Strategy	14
2.6. Language Learning Strategy Use and Language Proficiency	15
2.6.1. Differences in Strategy use with different proficiency levels in relation to the Type of Strategy	16
2.7. Differences in Strategy Use with Different Proficiency Levels in Relation to Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies	17
2.8. Reading Strategy Training	19
2.8.1. Reading Strategy Training Research.....	19
2.8.2. Language Learning Strategy Training Models	20
2.9. Self-efficacy	21
2.9.1. Introduction	21
2.9.2. Strategy Instruction and Self-efficacy.....	22
2.10. Transfer of Strategies to New Tasks and Other Foreign Languages	23
2.10.1. Language Proficiency and Transfer of Strategies	23
2.10.2. Strategy Instruction and Transfer of Strategies.....	24
2.11. Summary	25
 Chapter 3: Methodology	 26
3.1. Introduction	26
3.2. Participants.....	26
3.2.1. Sampling	26
3.3. Instrumentation	29
3.3.1. Validation of Questionnaires.....	29
3.3.1.1. Item Analysis of Reading Strategy Questionnaire.....	30
3.3.1.2. Factor Analysis for Cognitive Strategy Use	32
3.3.1.3. Factor Analysis for Metacognitive Strategy Use	34
3.3.2. Face and Content Validity.....	37

3.3.3. Validating the Reading Test.....	38
3.3.4. Validating the Self-efficacy Questionnaire through Item Analysis	40
3.3.4.1. Factor Analysis for Self-efficacy Questionnaire.....	44
3.3.5. Face and Content Validity of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategy Questionnaire	45
3.4. Instrumentation with Regard to Qualitative Phase of Question 1	46
3.4.1. Data Collection Procedures for Qualitative Part of Question 1	46
3.4.2. Data Collection Procedures for Questions 1 and 2	46
3.5. Data Collection Procedures for Question 3.....	47
3.6. Data Analysis Procedures for Questions 1, 2, and 3	48
3.7. Conclusion	49
Chapter 4: The Quantitative Results for Questions 1 and 2.....	50
4.1. Introduction.....	50
4.2. Results of Reading Strategy Questionnaire.....	50
Chapter 5: Qualitative Results in Relations to Questions 1 and 2	59
5.1. The Results of Think-aloud Protocols.....	59
5.2. Synthesis of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies and Think-aloud Protocols.....	63
5.3. Frequency of Strategy use in Terms of Think-aloud Protocols	70
5.4. The Type and Quality of Strategies between High-Proficient Students and Low-Proficient Students	71
5.5. Mediation of Exam-based Reading Strategies in Strategy Choice	77
5.6. Mediation of Teachers' Instructional Goals in Strategy Choice	78
5.7. The Type and Quality of Strategies between Male and Female Learners	80
5.8. Summary of the Findings	81

Chapter 6: Results of Strategy Instruction	82
6.1. Results of Strategy Instruction on Learners' Perceived Use of Reading Strategies.....	82
6.2. Results of Strategy Instruction on Self-efficacy	89
6.3. Results of Strategy Instruction on Reading Performance	93
6.4. Transferability of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies	96
6.5. Attitude toward Strategy-based Instruction	99
6.5.1. Experimental Group's Comments after Strategy Training	101
6.5.2. Control Group's Comments after Strategy Training.....	102
6.6. Summary of Results for Strategy Training	104
 Chapter 7: Discussion of Findings, Conclusions and Implications of the Study	105
7.1. Introduction	105
7.2. Synthesis of the Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategy Questionnaire and Think-aloud Protocols in Relation to Question 1	105
7.3. Synthesis Discussions of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Proficiency Levels and Gender.....	106
7.3.1. Synthesis of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Proficiency Levels	106
7.3.2. Synthesis of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Gender	108
7.4. The role of Iranian EFL context of learning in strategy use	108
7.5. Discussion for Question 3	109
7.5.1. The Impact of Strategy Training on Reading Improvement and Reading Strategies.....	109
7.5.2. The Impact of Strategy Training on Self-efficacy	110

7.5.3. The Impact of Strategy Training on Transfer of Strategies	111
7.5.4. Students' Reaction to Strategy Instruction.....	111

List of Tables

Table 2.1 CALLA model (Chamot, 2005; Chamot et al., 1999)	21
Table 3.1 Proportional Stratification Sampling	27
Table 3.2 Background information of the 20 participants for the thin-aloud protocol...	28
Table 3.3 Item analysis for reading strategies.....	30
Table 3.4 Inferential statistics of factor analysis for cognitive strategy use items	32
Table 3.5 The Barlett test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure for cognitive strategies	33
Table 3.6 Inferential statistics of factor analysis for metacognitive strategy use items..	35
Table 3.7 The Barlett test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin for metacognitive strategy use items	36
Table 3.8 Reliability of the reading questionnaire given as a pre-measure and post- Measure.....	37
Table 3.9 Item analysis for the reading test	39
Table 3.10 Reliability for the reading test given as a pre-measure and post-measure....	39
Table 3.11 Item analyses for self-efficacy	41
Table 3.12 Inferential statistics of factor analysis for self-efficacy items	45
Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics for the overall use of reading strategy and strategy categories	51
Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics on the most frequently cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies	52
Table 4.3 Results of T-Tests for Means of Strategies between Males (145) and Females (155)	54
Table 4.4 Interaction effects on strategy use, dependent variable: strategy Use	55
Table 4.5 T-test of reading strategy use for proficiency differences	57
Table 4.6 T-test of reading strategy use for proficiency differences	58

Table 5.1 Iranian high school students' reading strategies.....	60
Table 5.2 Reading strategies in relation to proficiency levels	61
Table 5.3 Use of reading strategies between males (N=12) and females (N=8)	62
Table 6.1 Perceived reading strategy use by the two groups before and after strategy instruction (N = 80).....	83
Table 6.2 Instructional effects on the experimental group's reading strategy use (N = 40).....	87
Table 6.3 Amount of self-efficacy by the two groups before and after strategy instruction (N = 80)	90
Table 6.4 Amount of self-efficacy by the experimental group in pre-test and post-test (40)	92
Table 6.5 EFL reading performance before and after strategy instruction for control and experimental groups (N = 80).....	95
Table 6.6 Transfer to other new texts.....	97
Table 6.7 Transfer to other foreign languages	98
Table 6.8 Attitude toward strategy training	100

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 The Scree plot for eigenvalues of cognitive strategies	34
Figure 3.2 The Scree plot for eigenvalues of metacognitive strategies	36
Figure 6.1 Frequency of transfer of strategies to other new texts.....	97
Figure 6.2 Frequency of transfer of strategies to other foreign languages	98
Figure 6.3 Frequency of transfer of strategies to L1	99
Figure 6.4 Frequency of students' attitude to strategy training	100
References	113
Appendices.....	128