BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmadi, R. A., Ismail, H. N., & Abdullah, M. K. (2013). *The Importance of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension*. English Language Teaching, 6(10), 235-249. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n10p235.

Ahmed, Z. A.-A. (2016). *The Effect of Motivation on Developing EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension Skills*. International Journal of English Language Teaching, 4.

Al-Jarf, R. (2007). *Developing Reading and Literacy in Saudi Arabia*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext /ED497944.pdf.

Al-Sobhani, Y. A. (2013). *Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by Yemeni EFL Undergraduate University Students*. Frontiers of Language and Teaching, 4, 121-130.

Alsamadani, H. A. (2009). *The Relationship between Saudi EFL College-Level Students' Use of Reading Strategies and Their EFL Reading Comprehension.* Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/ ohiou12 24685570/inline.

Alsamadani, H. A. (2011). *Saudi Students' Awareness of Reading Strategies and Factors Affecting Their EFL Reading Comprehension*. British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences. Retrieved from www.bjournal.co.uk /paper/BJASS_2_2/BJASS_02_02_01.pdf.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). *A Schema-Theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading Comprehension*. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 255-291). New York: Longman.

Anderson, N.J. (2005). *L2 Learning Strategies*. In E. Hinkel (ed.), Handbook ofResearch in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Mahwah, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 757–772.

Azevedo, R. (2005). *Using Hypermedia as A Metacognitive Tool for Enhancing Student Learning? The Role of Self-Regulated Learning*. Educational Psychologist,40(4), 199–209.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). *Metacognitive Skills and Reading*. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil and P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research (pp. 353-394). New York: Longman.

Barnett, M. A. (1988). *Reading through Context: How Real and Perceived Strategies Use Affects L2 Comprehension*. Modern Language Journal, 72, 150-162.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). *Reading Development in Second Language*. New Jersey. Alex Publishing Corporation.

Carrell, P. (1998). *Interactive Text Processing: Implications for ESL/Second Language Reading Classrooms*.In P. Carrell, J. Devine & D. Eskey, (eds.), Interactive approaches to second language reading (pp. 73-92).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. New York: Longman.

Colleman, J.A. (1998). A Model for the Strategic Use of Metacognitive Reading Comprehension Strategies. Language Teaching.

Dagget, W., & Hasselbring, T. (2007). *What We Know about Adolescent Reading*. International Center for Leadership in Education. Retrieved from http://www.leadered.com/pdf/what_we_know_about_adolesent_ reading_2014. Pdf.

Dardjowidjojo., S. (2003). *English teaching: Where and How Do We Begin?. Kumpulan Essay Soenjono Dardjowidjojo*. Jakarta. Yayasan Obor Indonesia, pp.29-40.

Ditzel, S. N. (2010). *Metacognitive Reading Strategies Can Improve Self-Regulation*. Journal of College Reading and Learning, 40(2), 45-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2010.10850330.

Estacio, M. J. M. (2013). *Bilingual Readers' Metacognitive Strategies as Predictors of Reading Comprehension*. Philippine ESL Journal, 10, 179-199.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). *Metacognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive-Developmental Inquiry*. American Psychologist, 34, 906-911.

Flavell, J. H. (1987). *Speculations about The Nature and Development of Metacognition*. In F. E.Weinert & R. H. Kluwe (Eds.), Metacognition, Motivation and Understanding (pp. 21-29).Hillside, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Goodman, K. S. (1969). *Analysis of Oral Reading Miscues: Applied Psycholinguistics*. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, 9-30.

Goodman,K.S.(1998).*TheReadingProcess*.InP.L.Carrell,J.Devine&D.E.Eskey(Eds.), Interactiveapproachestosecondlanguagereading(pp.1121).Cambridge:Cambr idgeUniversityPress.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*.London: Longman.

Hermosa, N. (2002). *The Psychology of Reading*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Open University.

Hong-Nam, K. & Page, L. (2014). *ELL High School Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Use and Reading Proficiency*. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language: The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language,18(1). Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume18/ ej69/ej69a4/.

Ilustre, C. A. (2011).*Beliefs about Reading, Metacognitive Reading Strategies and Text Comprehension among College Students in A Private University*. Philippine ESL Journal, 7(July 2011), 28-47.

Ismail, N. M., & Tawalbeh, T. I. (2015). *Effectiveness of A Metacognitive Reading Strategies Program for Improving Low Achieving EFL Readers*.International Education Studies, 8(1), 71-81.

Iwai, Y. (2011). *The Effects of Metacognitive Reading Strategies: Pedagogical Implications for EFL/ESL Teachers*. The Reading Matrix,11(2), 150-157.

Just, M. A. & Carpenter, P. A. (1987). *The Psychology of Reading and Language Comprehension*. In Bernhardt, E. B. 1991. Reading Development in Second Language: Theoretical, Empirical, & Classroom Perspectives. New Jersery. Ablex Publising Corporation.

Khani & Tazik. (2013). *Towards the Development of an Academic Word List for Applied Linguistics.* RELC Journal: Vol. 2.

Korotaeva, I. V. (2012). *Metacognitive Strategies in Reading Comprehension of Education Majors*. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,69(2012), 1895-1900. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.143.

Kummin, S., & Rahman, S. (2010). *The Relationship between The Use of Metacognitive Strategies and Achievement in English*. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,7, 145-150. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.021.

Koda, K. (2007). *Reading Language Learning: Cross Linguistic Constraints on Second Language Reading Development.* Language Learning, 57(1), 1-44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.101997010-i1.

Lauder, Allan. 2008. *The Status and Function of English in Indonesia: A Review of Key Factors. Makara Social Humaniora*. Vol.12 .July 2008. pp.9-20.

Lie, Anita. 2007. *Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: Between The Commitment to Competence and The Quest for Higher Test Scores. TEFLIN Journal*, Volume 18, Number 1, February 2007.

Louca, E. P. (2003). *The Concept and Instruction of Metacognition*. Teacher Development, 7(1), 9-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13664530300200184.

Magogwe, J. M. (2013). *Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies of University of Botswana English as A Second Language Students of Different Academic Reading Proficiencies*. Reading and Writing, 4(1), 1-8. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/rw.v4i1.29.

Mehrdad, A. G., Ahghar, M. R., & Ahghar, M. (2012). *The Effect of Teaching Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies on EFL Students' Reading Comprehension Across Proficiency Levels*. Procedia– Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46, 3757-3763. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.142.

Memis, A. & Bozkurt, M. (2013). *The Relationship of Reading Comprehension Success with Metacognitive Awareness, Motivation, and Reading Levels of Fifth Grade Students*. Global Journal of Educational Foundation, 1(1), 034-038.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). *Assessing Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(2), 249–259.

Mokhtari, K. & Sheorey, R. (2002). *Measuring ESL Students' Awareness of Reading Strategies*. Journal of Development Education 25(3), 2–10.

Mytcowicz, P., Goss, D., & Steinberg, B. (2014). *Assessing Metacognition as A Learning Outcome in A Post Secondary Strategic Learning Course*. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 27(1), 51-62.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

New South Wales Department of Education and Training. (2010). *Teaching Comprehension Strategies: Curriculum K-12*. New South Wales: NSW Department of Education and Training. Retrieved from http://www.curriculum support.education.nsw.gov.au/literacy/assets/pdf/packages/combook.pdf.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Pammu, A., Amir, Z., &Maasum, T. (2014). *Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Less Proficient Tertiary Learners: A Case Study of EFL Learners at A Public University in Makassar, Indonesia*. Procedia – Social and behavioral Scences, 118, 357-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.049.

Pei, L. (2014). *Does Metacognitive Strategy Instruction Indeed Improve Chinese EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension Performance and Metacognitive Awareness?* Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(5), 1147-1152. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.5.1147-1152.

Perfetti, C. A., Landi, N., and Oakhill, J. (2004). *The Acquisition of Reading Comprehension Skill.* Retrieved from http://www.pitt.edu/~perfetti/PDF/The%20Acquisition%20of%20Reading%20 Comprehension%20Skill.pdf.

Phakiti, A. (2006). *Modeling Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies and Their Relationships to EFL Reading Test Performance*. Melbourne Papers in Language Testing, 1, 53-95.

Pintrich, R. R., Wolters, C. A., & Baxter, G. P. (2000). *Assessing Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning*. In G. Shraw, & J. C. Impara (Eds.), Issues in the measurement of metacognition (pp. 43-97). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Pressley and Afflerbach's (1995). *The Nature of Constructively Responsive Reading*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Pressly, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Mistretta-Hampston, J., & Echevarria, M. (1998). *The Nature of Literacy Instruction in Ten Grade – 4/5 Classrooms in Upstate New York*. Scientific Studies of Reading,2, 159-194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0202_4.

Radha M.K. Nambiar (2005). *Enhancing Academic Literacy among Tertiary Learners: A Malaysian Experience*.Journalof Language learning, Linguistics and Literature, 13, 77-94.

Rehearne, M. P., & Doctorow, R. (2005). *Reading Comprehension: Strategies That Work*. In Comprehensive Literacy Resource: Grade 3-6 (Chapter 2). Retrieved from https://www.hand2mind.com/pdf/miriam/ ch2_clr3_ 6.pdf.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978/1994). *The Reader, The Text, The Poem: The Transactional Theory of The Literary Work* (Revised paperback edition). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Royanto, L. (2012). *The Effect of An Intervention Program based on Scaffolding to Improve Metacognitive Strategies in Reading: A Study of Year 3 Elementary School Students in Jakarta*. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69, 1601-1609.

Rumerlhart, D. E. & McClelland, J. L. (1981). *Processing through Spreading Activatio*n. In A. M. Lesgold, & C. A. Perfetti (Eds) Interactive Processing in Reading (pp. 37-60). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sen, H. S. (2009). *The Relationship between The Use of Metacognitive Strategies and Reading Comprehension.* Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,1, 2301-2305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro. 2009.01.404.

Tavakoli, H. (2014). *The Effectiveness of Metacognitive Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension: The Case of Iranian University EFL Students.* The Reading Matrix, 14(2), 314-336.

Tsai, C. C. (2004). *Beyond Cognitive and Metacognitive Tools: The Use of The Internet as an ''Epistemological'' Tool for Instruction.*British Journal of EducationalTechnology, 35(5), 525–536.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension.* New York: Academic Press.

Vandergrift, L. (2002). *From Prediction through Reflection: Guiding Students through The Process of L2 Listening.* Candian Modern Language Review, 59, 425-440. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.3.425.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yuksel, I., &Yuksel, I. (2012). *Metacognitive Awareness of Academic Reading Strategies.*Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31, 894-898. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.164.

Zhang, L., & Seepho, S. (2013). *Metacognitive Strategy Use and Academic Reading Achievement: Insights from a Chinese Context.* Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 10(1), 54-69.

APPENDIXES

A.: Formal letter of Inquiry for Conducting Data collection

10 October 2020

Dr.Harlinah Sahib, M.Hum
The Head of English Language Study Program Faculty of
Cultural Sciences Hasanuddin University

Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan KM 10 Tamalanrea

Makassar.

Re: An Inquiry for conducting data collection

Dear Madam Harlinah

This letter is to inquire the legal permission from ELS authority to conduct data collection of my Master thesis, entitled Metacognitive Reading Strategies of ELS Students at Faculty of Cultural Sciences for ELS students. The collection of data will require samples that ELS students who have been at the FIB for 2-3 semesters.

Thanks in advance for your consideration and authorization in this investigation.

Sincerely Yours,

Hartina Mahardhika
(ELS Student)

B. Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory
   Version 1.0
   1.Subject Information
   a.Name   :_____
   b.Age   :_____
   c.Gender   :_____
   d.Last TOEFL score   :_____
   h.Contact/Tlp.No.   :_____

2,Direction:
Below are statements about what people do when they read academic related materials, such as textbooks or library books. Five numbers follow each statements (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) and each number means the following. (1) means "*I never or almost never do this*", (2) means "*I do this only occasionally*", (3) means "*I sometimes do this-about 50% all the time*".,(4) means "*I usually do this*", and (5) means "*I always or almost always do this*". After reading each statement, circle one of the number (1,2,3,4,5) that applies to you using the scale provided. Please remember that there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers to the statements in this inventory. YOU MUST READ THE ACCOMPANYING TEXT BEFORE CIRCLING EACH OF THE SCALE PROVIDED.

Type	STRATEGIES	SCALE				
GLOB	1.I have a purpose in mind when I read	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	2.I take notes while reading to help me understand what I ad	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	3.I think about what I know to help me understand what I ad	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	4.I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it	1		3	4	5
SUP	5.When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me nderstand	1		3	4	5
SUP	6.I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	7.I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	8.I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I am reading	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	9.I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	10.I skim the text first by noting characteristics like	1	2	3	4	5

	length and organization					
PROB	11.I try to get back on track when I loose concentration	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	12.I underline or circle Information in the text to help me remember it	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	13.I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	14.I decide what to read closely and what to ignore	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	15.I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	16.when text become difficult , I pay closer attention to what I am reading	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	17.I use table, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	18.I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	19.I use context clues to help me understand what I am reading	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	20.I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	21.I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	22.I use typographical aids like bold face & italics to identify key information	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	23.I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	24.I go back and forth in the text to find relationship among ideas in it	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	25.I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	26.I try to guess what the material is about when I read	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	27.When text become difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	28.I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	29.I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	30.I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases	1	2	3	4	5

Adopted from: Mokhtari & Reichard (.2002)

Note:GLOB= Global, SUP=Support, PROB=Problem Solving

C. <u>Categories of Reading Strategies Measured by the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory</u>

Global Reading Strategies (GLOB)

Examples include setting purpose for reading, activating prior knowledge, checking whether text content fits purpose, predicting what text is about, confirming predictions, previewing text for content, skimming to note text characteristics, making decisions in relation to what to read closely, using context clues, using text structure, and using other textual features to enhance reading comprehension. (Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29)

Support Reading Strategies(SUP)

Examples include taking notes while reading, paraphrasing text information, revisiting previously read information, asking self questions, using reference materials as aid, underlining text information, discussing reading with others, and writing summaries of reading (Items 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 20, 24, 28)

Problem-Solving Strategies(PROB)

Example include reading slowly and carefully, adjusting reading rate, paying close attention to reading, pausing to reflect on reading, rereading, visualizing information read, reading text out loud, and guessing meaning of unknown words. (Items 8, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 27, 30)

(Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002)

D. Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

Scoring Rubric

Student Name: _____ Age: _____ Date: _____

Grade in School: ☐ 6th ☐ 7th ☐ 8th ☐ 9th ☐ 10th ☐ 11th ☐ 12th ☐ College ☐ Other

_____

1. Write your response to each statement (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in each of the blanks.
2. Add up the scores under each column. Place the result on the line under each column.
3. Divide the score by the number of statements in each column to get the average for each subscale.
4. Calculate the average for the inventory by adding up the subscale scores and dividing by 30.
5. Compare your results to those shown below.
6. Discuss your results with your teacher or tutor.

Global Reading Strategies (GLOB Subscale)	Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB Subscale)	Support Reading Strategies (SUP Subscale)	Overall Reading Strategies
1. _____	8. _____	2. _____	GLOB _____
3. _____	11. _____	5. _____	PROB_____
4. _____	13. _____	6. _____	SUP _____
7. _____	16. _____	9. _____	
10. _____	18. _____	12. _____	
14. _____	21. _____	15. _____	
17. _____	27. _____	20. _____	
19. _____	30. _____	24. _____	
22. _____		28. _____	
23. _____			
25. _____			
26. _____			
29. _____			

GLOB Score _____ PROB Score _____ SUP Score _____ Overall Score _____ GLOB Mean _____ PROB Mean _____SUP Mean _____Overall Mean

KEY TO AVERAGES: 3.5 or higher = High 2.5 – 3.4 = Medium 2.4 or lower = Low

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES: The overall average indicates how often you use reading strategies when reading academic materials. The average for each subscale of the inventory shows which group of strategies (i.e., global, problem-solving, and support strategies) you use most when reading. With this information, you can tell if you are very high or very low in any of these strategy groups. It is important to note, however, that the best possible use of these strategies depends on your reading ability in English, the type of material read, and your purpose for reading it. A low score on any of the subscales or parts

of the inventory indicates that there may be some strategies in these parts that you might want to learn about andand consider using when reading (adapted from Oxford 1990: 297-300).

E.: Descriptive Findings of ELS Students' Metacognitive awareness

Mean score of **Global Strategy** used by the ELS FIB Students

Global	Mean	S.td	Level
14. I have a purpose in mind when I read	3.78	.95	High
15. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read	3.95	.85	High
16. I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it	3.70	1.11	High
17. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose	3.28	1.15	Medium
18. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization	2.83	.87	Medium
19. I decide what to read closely and what to ignore	3.50	1.01	High
20. I use table, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding	3.40	1.17	Medium
21. I use context clues to help me understand what I am reading	3.45	1.26	Medium
22. I use typographical aids like bold face & italics to identify key information	3.30	1.11	Medium
23. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text	3.18	1.06	Medium
24. I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information	3.70	.76	High
25. I try to guess what the material is about when I read	3.98	.89	High
26. I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong	3.78	.97	High
Overall Global	**3.52**	**.60**	**High**

Mean Score of **Support Strategy** used by ELS FIB learner

Support	Mean	SD	Level
10. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read	3.18	.98	Medium
11. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand	3.58	1.26	High

12. I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text	3.48	1.04	Medium
13. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding	3.33	1.10	Medium
14. I underline or circle Information in the text to help me remember it	4.28	1.01	High
15. I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read	4.08	.97	High
16. I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read	3.30	1.20	Medium
17. I go back and forth in the text to find relationship among ideas in it	3.25	1.03	Medium
18. I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text	3.43	.96	Medium
Support	3.54	.55	High

Table 5 Mean score of **Problem Solving** strategy used by ELS FIB learners

Problem Solving	Mean	S.td	Level
17. I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I am reading	3.98	1.10	High
18. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration	3.78	.97	High
19. I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading	3.63	.93	High
20. when text become difficult , I pay closer attention to what I am reading	3.95	1.11	High
21. I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading	3.33	1.19	High
22. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read	3.38	1.13	High
23. When text become difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding	4.18	.87	High
24. I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases	4.10	.90	High
Problem Solving	3.79	.54	High