CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Research findings and data analysis have been presented in the previous chapter. In this final chapter, the major findings and the data are briefly summarized. The later section will present some recommendations for future research and/or developments.

5.1 Conclusion

Derived from the findings and the data analysis which focus on the reading strategy used by high achieving students and low achieving students, the most frequently reading strategy used among group of students, and the correlation between reading strategy and reading comprehension achievement, the researcher could report the following findings.

Refering to the research question (RQ) 1, the high achieving students of the exact sciences program of the second grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat had a highest mean score (3,84) in overall the global strategy, indicating high use. Overall problem solving strategy indicated 4,35. It showed that the level they used was higher. Overall support strategy revealed 3,61, meaning that they belonged to high level in using support strategy. To facilitate them to learn to read, they tended to always use the four items as favourite item of reading strategy in each three reading strategy categories; global strategy, problem solving strategy, and support strategy. The detailed favorite reading activities of each three reading strategies category are as follows.

First, in global strategy, four favourite reading activities were used by the high achieving students of second grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat were they tended to always have a purpose when reading, use context clues to help better understanding of the reading, think about what they know to help them understand what they read, and check to see if guesses about the text are correct.

Besides, for problem solving the high achieving students tended to re-read to increase understanding when the text became difficult, read slowly and carefully to make sure understand what to read, pay closer attention to the material when the text became difficult, and try to get back on track when distracted or lose concentration.

Moreover, for the support strategy most of the high achieving students tended to translate from English into native language when reading, use reference materials (dictionaries, etc), go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas, and paraphrase/restate to better understanding.

In contrast, the low achieving students of the second grade of the exact sciences program of SMA Muhammadiyah tended to use less reading strategy. They tended to ignore the overall items of global strategy when they were reading because the result indicated most of items of global strategy were of low use. The finding coincides with Palincsar & Brown (1984) statement which state that the poor readers rarely prepare before reading. They often begin to read without setting goals. They seldom consider how best to read a particular type of text.

However, in the finding, it indicated that the some of low achieving students of the second grade of the exact sciences program of SMA

Muhammadiyah tended to sometimes employ problem solving and support strategy eventhough only some reading activities indicated medium usage. It demonstrated that the highest mean score of overall problem solving was 2,16, meaning that the low achieving students tended to sometimes try to get back on track when distracted or losing concentration, reading slowly and carefully makingsure understand what to read, paying closer attention to the material when the text became difficult, and re-reading to increase understanding. The highest mean score of overall support strategy was 2,11, meaning that the low achieving students sometimes translated from English into their Indonesian when reading, using reference materials (dictionaries, etc), going back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas, and reading the text when the text became difficult.

Regarding the research question 2 (RQ2)-the most frequently used strategy-problem solving strategies placed the first position. It means that problem solving strategy are the most frequently used strategies (M= 3,52). The second position is global strategy with the mean score of 2,84. The last position is support strategy, with the mean score of 2,81. This finding is line with the findings of studies by Monos (2005), Nashiriyah (2009), Zhang & Wu (2009), Li (2010), Aziz, et.al (2011), and Ghyasi, Safdarian, & Farsani (2011). It is found that the problem solving strategies scored the highest then followed by global strategies and support strategies. Considering the language which some studies' sample used, most of students under study used English as a foreign language like the sample of this study.

Based on the analysis of each of the three major categories, the students of the Exact Sciences program of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat tended to have a favorite reading activities to enhance the understanding the text. In the global reading strategy use, they indicated superior in the activity of reading with a purpose in mind (M=3,46).

In problem solving use, the students mainly employed four reading activities; reading slowly and carefully (M= 4,46), trying to get back on track when distracted or losing concentration (M= 4,14), when text becomes difficult, re-reading to increase understanding (M= 3,96), and when text becomes difficult, paying closer attention to the material (M= 3,71). Meanwhile, in support strategy use, two reading activities were categorized as favorite reading activity; when reading, translating from English into native language (M= 3,93) and using reference materials (dictionaries, etc) (M= 3,91). In the fact, the finding shows that most of the second graders of the Exact Sciences program of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat usually needed dictionary as an aid tool to translate the unfamilir words to their Indonesian so they obtained good score in reading comprehension test. Considering the time allocation in Indonesia school especially senior high school, the KTSP English curicculum stated that they study English for four hours a week. As a result, the translation and using dictionary are the favorite reading activity used to improve their reading as effective reading strategy.

Among thirty (30) reading activities, there were only two reading activities which were categorized as low. G15 (I use tables, figures, and pictures in text

to increase my understanding) and S26 (I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text) are not favorite reading activities. Since the cultural background of the students of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat tended to be less critical, asking by themselves to understand the content of the text is only ocassionally done.

Concerning the third research question (RQ3)- the correlation between reading strategy and reading comprehension achievement. This study found that there was a high correlation at the level of significance of $P<.05$ between reading strategy and reading achievement of high achieving students of the second grade of the Exact Sciences program of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Babat. It demonstrated that r= .716 and P= .013 less than $P<.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that the high achieving students had high score in both reading comprehension test and reading strategy.

Meanwhile, the correlation between reading strategy and reading achievement of low achieving students indicated that there were mark correlation at significance level of $P<.05$. The present study found that r was 0.684 and p was .029, meanin that the correlation coefficient was less than the significance level ($p<.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that the low achieving students had low score both reading comprehension achievement and reading strategy.

As a result, the high achieving students got high scores in both reading comprehension test and reading strategy questionnaire. In contrast, the low achieving students got low scores in both reading comprehension test and reading

strategy. It can be concluded that the reading strategy affects the reading comprehension achievement.

5.2 Suggestions

5.2.1 For the Teachers

The first suggestion for the teacher of English as foreign language is that when he/she is teaching in reading class, he/she should teach and encourage the students, especially the low achieving students/poor students to use their metacognition and develop the reading strategy by giving reading exercises since the finding of the reading strategy used by groups of students indicated that the mean scores of both global strategy and support strategy were medium, meaning that the students still tended to have difficulty to activate their schema and metacognition to comprehend the reading text.

The second suggestion is the teachers use the effective reading strategy to the students such as how to comprehend the reading English academic text and reading English test so that they can comprehend the reading English academic text and reading English tests.

The third suggestion is that teachers ask the students to keep reading when they do not know some meanings of words or sentences in the text because the result of the most frequently used strategy indicated that the students who had good reading comprehension score usually used more translation to help them enhance their understanding of the text.

The last suggestion is to apply the reading strategy to the students in the classroom as teaching technique. It means that when the students are given some models of the effective reading strategy, they will practice it directly to train their reading skill especially for low achieving students.

5.2.2 For the Learners.

For the learners, the researcher would like to motivate and raise their strategic awareness in order to be able to select and use reading strategy more properly.

The reseacher would like to ask the students to read a lot of English materials from different sources, evaluate their own progress in reading comprehension by exercises in reading comprehension, and motivate them to ask their teacher about their reading difficulties.

5.2.3 For the School Principal.

The researcher suggests that the principal should introduce the reading strategies earlier such as placing the reading strategy as learning material in the MOS (New Students' Orientation Week) program so that they can read English materials more easily.

The researcher suggested that the principal should facilitate the teachers to get the knowledge about teaching reading strategy such as sending them to join seminar, workshop, etc.

The researcher suggests that the principal should provide some fun English materials in the school library and in the English laboratory so that the students

have chances to read and practice reading English materials happily using the poper reading strategy.

5.2.4 For Future Researchers.

The following are recommended for future researchers who would like to conduct this study about reading strategy and reading achievement of high achieving students and low achieving students. First, it is recommended that a similar study be conducted experimentally with two groups involving various English texts. Second, it is recommended that a non experimental study with different texts such as hortatory exposition, analytical exposition, and discussion text be conducted to explore the extent of reading comprehension. Third, it is recommended that both non experimental study and experimental study for EFL students be also conducted in senior high schools (social sciences or language program) or vocational schools. Fourth, it is recommended that trying out the instrument (reading comprehension test) be done twice to the pilot group to get the best instrument since this study tried out the instrument to the pilot study once. Last, it is recommended to replicate this study with bigger sample size to explore to what extent each reading strategy differs if applied to bigger population since this study was conducted with a limited number of students.

Bibliography

Abidin, M. J., & Riswanto. (2012). The Use of Comprehension Strategies in Reading Academic Text Among the Students of State Collage for Islamic Studies (STAIN). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* ,2, 254-261.

Adams, M.J (1990) *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning about print (4th ed).* Cambridge. Mass: MIT Press.

Andanty, Ferra Dian.2006. Reading Strategies used by Second Grade High School Students of SMA Negeri I Surabaya. *Thesis. Master's Program in Teaching English as Foreign Language.* The Graduate School of the English Education Department. MPBI.Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.

Agency, T. E. (2002). *Comprehension Instruction*, 4-8. Retrieved from http://www.netxv.net/pm_attach/67/TRI-Comprehension_Instr.pdf

Alderson. N.J. (1991). Individual differences in Strategy use in second Language Reading and Testing. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 640-472.

Alderson, N.J. (2002). Using telescopes, microscopes and Keleidoscopes to Put Metacognition into Perspective. *TESOL Matters*, 12, 1-2.

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

Al- Nujaidi, A.H (2003), *The Realationship between Vocabulary Size, Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension of EFL Learner in Saudi Arabia*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma. State University.

Aurbach, E & Paxton. D. (1997)." It's not the English thing": Bringing Reading Reseach into the ESL Classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*. 32 (2):237-261.

Aziz. (2011). The Reading Strategies Awareness among English as a Second Language (ESL) Learners in Malaysia University. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 1 (7): 778-784.

Baker, L. (2002). Metacognition in comprehension Instruction. In C.C. Block & M. Presseley (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research based best practices*. (pp.77-95). NY: Guidford.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. (1984). *Metacognitive Skills and Reading*. In David. P. P (Ed.). New York: Longman.

Barnet, M. (1989). *More than Meets the Eyes*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall   Regents.

Barrett. (1968). *www.google.com.* Retrieved December 12, 2012, from Barrett's Taxonomy   Reading   Comprehension: www.Barrett'staxonomyreadingcomprehension.pdf.

Block, E. (1986). *The Comprehension Strategies of second language readers*. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 463-494.

Bowling A. (2002). *Research Methods in Health. In Investigating health and health services*. Second edition. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Brantmeier. (2002). Second Language Reading Strategy Research at the Secondary and the University level: variations, disparities, and Generalizability. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*. 3 (2).

Brown, H. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices.* NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (2002). *Criterion Referenced Language Testing*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Burns, B. (1999). *How To Teach Balanced Reading and Writing*. USA: SkyLight Training and Publishing Inc.

Carnine, D., Silbert, J., & Kameenui, E.J. (1990). *Direct Instruction Reading*. Columbus: Merril.

Carrell, P.L., & Eisterhold, J.C. (1983). Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. *TESOL. QUARTERLY,* 17(4), 553-573.

Carrell, P.L, Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL Reading. *Instructional Science*, 26, 97-112.

Careell, P. (1989). Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading. *Modern Language Journal* , 73, 121-134.

Chamot, A., Robbins, J., & El-Dinary, P. (1993). Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(1) , 13-24.

Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and using A second language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited Inc.

Darabie, M.Y. (2000). *The relationship between college-level Jordanian students' Metacognitive   Awareness   Strategies   and   Their   Comprehension*

Achievement in English as a Foreign Language (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Ohio University. USA.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2002). *Bahasa asing sebagai bahasa pengantar dalam sistem pendidikan*. 22 (1), 48-65.

Depdiknas. (2002).*Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (Competency-Based Curriculum).* Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas.

Detik-detik UN *bahasa Inggris*; 2005/2006; Intan Pariwara

Dhanapala. K. (2010) Srilanka University Student' s Metacognitive Awareness og L2 Reading Strategies. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation.* 16 (1): 65-82.

Douglas Brown, H. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. The United State of America: Longman.

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

Ghyasi, M., Safdarian, Z., & Farsani, M. A. (2011). Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies: A Triangulated Study of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Conference on Language, Literature and Linguistics , IPEDR Vol.26.*

Garrisson, Karl C., Kingston, Albert J., Mc Donald Arthur S. (1964). *Educational Psychology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Division of Meredith Publishing Company.

Gersten, R., Fuchs, L., Williams, J., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies to Students with Learning Disabilities: A Review of Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 71, 279–   320.

Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A Psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*. 6. 126-135

Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. *Visible Language*, 6, 291-320.

Gourgey, A. (2001). *Metacognition in basic skills instruction.* In H. In H.J (Ed.). Dortrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language Moving from Theory to Practice.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Group, R. R. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Towards a research and development program in reading comprehension.* Santa Monica CA: RAND.

Hamra, A. (1993). Advancing Child Language Development. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Keguruam* , XVIII (3), 167-171.

Hamra, A. (1996). Developing Questioning Competencies through Radio Reading. *Jurnal Jaringan* , 1 (3), 199-195.

Harold, S. Madsen. (1983). *Techniques in Testing*. Land. Oxford University Press.

Heaton, J.B. (1991). *Writing English Language* Test. NewYork: Longman

Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics*. Great Britain: Palgrave MacMillan.

Henning, G. (1987). *A guide to Languge Testing Development Evaluation Research.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Hernia, N.D. (2003). Evaluating the effectiveness of Metacognitive Strategy Training or Research article in an ESP Context. *English for Specific purpose*. 22 (4): 387-417.

Horwitz, E.K. (2008) *Becoming a language teacher: A Practical Guide to Second Language Learning and Teaching.* USA: Pearson Education

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of sucessful and unsuccessful second language learners. *System*, 5 , 11-123.

Huang, H. -C, Chern, C.-L, & Lin, C.-C. (2009). *EFL Learners' use of online Reading Strategies and Comprehension of Texts: An Exploratory study. Computers & Education*, 52 (1), 13-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.003.

Hudson, T. (2007).*Teaching Second Language Reading*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, Arthur. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers*. (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cup.

Jansen. (2003). Developing Strategic Readers in Elementary School." *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly*. 24: 25-55.

Kamil, M. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Kweldju, S. (2001). Vocabulary and Lexicogrammatical Units: Graduate Students' Main Problem in Reading Their Textbooks. Linguistik Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia* , 1, 35-56.

Liberman, I., Shankweiler, D., Fischer, F., & Carter, B. (1974). Explicit syllable and phoneme segmentation in the young child. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 18, 201- 212.

Li, F. (2010). A Study of English Reading Strategies used by senior middle school students. *Asian Social Science* , 6, 184.

Lien Hsin-Yi. (2011). EFL Learners' Reading Strategy use in Relation to Reading Anxiety. *Language Education in Asia*. 2 (2).

Madsen, H.S. (1983). *Techniques in Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mardiana. (1993). *The Correlation between the reading comprehension achievement of the fifth semester students of the English Departement of FPBS IKI   UjungPandang and   their attitude towards English*. Ujung Pandang FPBS IKIP: unpublished Sarjana Thesis.

Martinez, M.E. (2006). What is Metacognitive? *Phi Delta Kappan*. 696-699.

Matthew, D. (1989, pebruary 20). Retrieved from *Teaching Reading Fluency*: http://www.sil.org/lingualinks/literacy bibliography/nol.hlm.

McNamara, D. (Ed). (2007). *Reading Comprehension Strategies*. New York: L. Erlbaum.

McMillan, J. H. (2004). *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the Cunsumer*. The United States of America: Pearson Education.

Mey-yun, Y. (1989). Teaching Effecient EFL Reading. *English Teaching Forum*. 17: 13-16.

Mokhtary, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL Students Reading Strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25 (3), pp. 2-10.

Mokhtary, K., & Richard, C. (2004). Investigating the Strategic Reading Process of First and Second Language Readers in Two different Cultural Context. *System*. 32 (3): 379-394.

Monos. K. (2005). A Study of the English Reading Strategies of Hungarian University Students with Implications for Reading Instruction in an Academic Context. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research* Retrieved from http://www.melta.org.my/Doc/Monosk_Eng_Reading_Strategies.pdf.

McKay, P. (2006). *Assessing Young Language Learners*. In Alderson J. C., & Bachman. L (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mueller, D. (1992). *An Interactive Guide to Educational Research A Modular Approach.* USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Namara, T. M. (2000). *Language Testing Oxford.* (H. Widdouson, Ed.) Oxford: Oxford.

Nashiriyah. (2009, December 8-10). A study of Indonesian Students' Readfing Strategies. *TEFLIN International Conference* , 84-101.

National Reading Panel. (2002). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. Teaching Children to read. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institute of Health. US. Departement of Health and Human Services. http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/report.cfm.

Nist, S.L. & Mealey, D.L. (1991). *Teacher-directed comprehension strategies*. In R. Flippo & D. Caverly (Eds.). Teaching reading and study strategies at the college level. Newark, DE: International Reading Association
Wenden, A. 1998. Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology. Great Britain: Prentice Hall* International Ltd.

Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching Reading Skill*. UK: Macmillan Education.

O'malley, J.M & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acqusition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R & Crookalld. (1989). Research on Six Situational Language Learning Strategies: Methods, and Instructional Issues. *Modern Language Journal*. 73 (4).

Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L (1984). *Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Fostering and Comprehension-monitoring Activities Cognition and Instruction.* 1: 117-175.

Paris.s & Jacob, S.J. (1984). The benefits of informaed instruction for Children's Reading Awarreness and Comprehension Skill. *Child Department*. 55: 2083-2093.

Parris, S., Wasik, B., & Turner, J. (1991). *The development of strategic readers*. In B. In R, K. M.L, M. P.B, & P. (. P.D, Handbook of reading research (Vol. 2, pp. 609-640). New York: Longman.

Plaister, T. (1968). Reading Instruction for College Level Foreign Students. *TESOL Quarterly* 2 (3), pp 164 – 168

Prakiti, A. (2003). A Closer Look at the Realtionship of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Use to EFL Reading Achievement Test Performance. *Language Tests*. 20 (1): 26-56.

Peraturan Pemerintah no 19 th 2005 *Tentang Standard National Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Fokus Media.

Peraturan Menteri pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 th 2006 tentang *Standard Isi untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MA*. Depdiknas: Jakarta.

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

Pressley, M., & Forrest-Pressley, D. *What is strategy instructional enrichment and how to study it: Illustrations from research on children's prose memory and comprehendion*. (W. In. F.a, Ed.) Hllsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pressley, M & Hilden, K. (2006). Cognitive Strategies. In W. Damon & R.M. Lerner (Eds.in-Chief) &D. Kuhn & R. Sirgler (Vol. Eds), *Handbook of Child Psychology:* Vol. 2. Cognition, perception, and language (6th ed., pp.511-556). Hoboken. NJ: John Wiley &Sons.

Pritchard, R. (1990). The effect of cultural schemata on reading processing strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly* , 273-295.

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for Understanding Toward and R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: Science & Technology Policy Institute, RAND Education.

Reiss, J. (2005). *Teaching Content to English Language Learners: Strategies for Secondary School Success*. NY: Longman.

Rivers, W. (1964). *The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good languge learner" can teach us? *TESOL Quarterly,* 9, 41-51.

Sheorey, R, Mochtary, K. (2001). Differences in the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies among nature and non-native speakers. *System.* 29(4): 431-449.

Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting General Metacognitive Awareness. *Instructional Science*, 26(1-2), 113–125.

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

Shih, M. (1992). Beyond comprehension exercises in the ESL academic reading class. *TESOL Quarterly* , 289-318.

SPSS (2004). *SPSS 13.0 For Windows Realease*. SPSS.Inc.

Song, M.J. (1999). Reading Strategies and Second Language Reading Ability: The Magnitude of the Relationship. *English Teaching*. 54 (3):73-95.

Stern, H. (2000, august). Issue and Options in Language Teaching. Retrieved march 10,   2005, from OUP. *in TESL Journal Vol VI no8*: http://iteslj.org/articles/hismanoglu.strategies.html.

Syatriana, E. (1998). *The Levels of Reading Comprehension of Fifth Semester students of   STKIP YPUP Ujung Pandang*. Ujung Pandang, STKIP YPUP: Unpublished Sarjana Thesis.

Vacca, J.A.; Vacca, R.T.; Gove, M.K.; Burkey, L.; Lenhart, L.A.; and McKeon, C.(2003). *Reading and learning to read* (5th ed.). United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc

Wallace, M. (1998). *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Wolf, Dieter. 1987. *Some Assumption about Second Language Text Comprehension.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2. Cambridge University Press, 309-325.

Wong, M. (2005). Language Learning strategies and language self-efficacy. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 36(3) , 245-269.

Yang, L. (1995, March). Effective awareness-raising in language learning strategy training. *paper presented at the29th Annual Convention&Exposition of teachers of English to speakers of   other languages* .

Yorio, C. A. (1971). Some sources of reading problems for foreign language learners. *Language Learning* 21 (1), pp.107-115

Youth, R. D. (2006). *Develoving Test*. Retrieved January 2, 2013, from www.11_test_4th.pdf

Zare-ee, Abbas. (2008) The Relationship between Cognitive and Metacognitive strategy use and EFL Reading Achievement English Language Teaching & Literature. Islamic Azad University Roudehen Branch. *www.faculty.ksu.edu.sa/al Jaf/documents English Language Teaching Conference Iran*.

Zhang, L. J. (2009). Chinesse senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use. *Reading in a Foreign Language* , 21 No. 1, 37-59.

Zhang, Z. (1992). *English reading strategies*. Beijing: Transportation Press.