

THE METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES USED IN READING COMPREHENSION FOR STUDENTS' PROBLEMS

Nuse A. Rahmati and Diah R. Widowati

Universitas Islam Malang

nuse.rahmati@gmail.com; d.retnowidowati@gmail.com

Abstract:

The crucial issue of the role of metacognitive awareness in reading will be stated by knowing and understanding two dimensions of metacognitive ability: "knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition". Students who metacognitively active will aware of their own cognition and demonstrate strategy consciously in the learning process in order to accomplish the learning goals. Therefore, metacognition will likely to give beneficial phases in the learning process, particularly by helping students to plan and use resource more effectively, to monitor their learning progress accurately, and to evaluate their performances. This study is descriptive qualitative which is designed to (1) know the students' difficulties, both from high and low level achievement in reading academic text and (2) what metacognitive strategies the students used to overcome their problems in reading academic text. This study employed two questionnaires to collect the data respectively; the MRAQ (Metacognitive Reading Awareness Questionnaire) and the MRSQ (Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire). This study found that each group of students with different level of reading achievement described the various different metacognitive strategies to overcome problem in reading academic text.

Keywords: metacognitive strategies, reading comprehension, students'

INTRODUCTION

The statement of English as the first foreign language in Indonesia in the decree of the Ministry of Education and Culture no. 096/1967 on 12 December 1967 stimulates the government to officially promote English as one of compulsory subjects in teaching and learning process in every school. The massive implementation of the English learning is aimed to teach students of elementary schools until university students to be able to comprehend English, both in receptive skills and productive skills, in order to either dig some more detail and comprehensive information or transfer knowledge (Venditaningtyas, 2013) in English. These objectives can be achieved through the concept of metacognition.

Metacognition refers to "one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and product related to them" (Flavel, 1976 as cited in Forrest-Pressley & Waller, 1984). It means a comprehension of something being comprehended. Where people think about thoughts, comprehend knowledge, and reflect some actions (Wijayati, 2013). Metacognition requires students' awareness to think before learning and strategies to engage in academics assignments. In order to activate students' metacognition, teacher needs to implement metacognitive strategy. According to Ahmadi, Ismail, and Abdullah (2013), metacognitive strategy in language learning, especially in reading, is effective in promoting students' reading comprehension. Metacognitive strategy consists of three stages, planning, monitoring, and evaluating.

Reading has a significant role in the process of obtaining information especially in the academic context. In the university or college level, reading takes on a central role as part of the approach of learning. It is compulsory to read various and heaps of academic texts independently and effectively. However too many students passively, failing to construct accurate comprehension of the selected reading materials. The result is that too many students begin to dislike their reading and come to view it as a demanding task. In addition, they have difficulty to use reading strategies are appropriate to them and they lack of learning autonomy; even most of them do not know that they are possible reading strategies they may use. To avoid the ill feeling about reading, the students need to invest adequate time to develop more active reading strategies. The lecturer needs to teach the students to use the reading strategies consciously, especially metacognitive strategies.

Therefore, the study is designed to know the students' difficulties, both from high and low level achievement in reading academic text and what metacognitive strategies the students employ to overcome their problems in reading academic text. The reading problems and metacognitive strategies

used both from high and low level achievement students are listed and descriptively compared and explained.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section reviews some related literatures and previous studies.

Metacognitive Reading Awareness and Strategies

Reading requires language comprehension, some sort of semantic processing, and the ability to understand the meaning of the visual symbols which provide the form of language to be comprehended. Reading, per se, must involve not only particular type of language behavior, but also special form of non-verbal thinking (i.e. metacognition) (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). It is expected to make a student aware of what is needed to perform his/her reading comprehension effectively, and it is possible to make steps to achieve the goals of reading successfully. Forrest-Pressley and Waller (1984) suggested that in terms of metacognition, reading is not merely decoding process from print to sound and comprehending the written material, but it also involves advanced reading strategies and knowledge about those skills and how to control them. When skilled readers decide to read, they usually have particular purposes in mind. Therefore, they do more than decode a word; the skilled readers know that there are various ways to decode and do something on their decoding activities, such as monitoring, changing, and predicting their sufficiency.

In addition, there are several strategies that students need to do in order to be skilled readers. The activities are: (1) clarifying the purposes of reading (i.e., understanding the task demands), (2) identifying the important aspects of the message, (3) allocating attention to relevant information, (4) monitoring activities continuously to determine if comprehension is occurring, (5) engaging in review and self-testing, (6) taking corrective action when failures in comprehension is occurred, and (7) recovering from distractions and disruptions (Brown, 1980).

Metacognition and Reading Comprehension

Forrest-Pressley and Waller (1984) proposed that metacognitive aspects of comprehension include knowing when readers have understood what they have read, knowing what they do not understand, and being able to use this knowledge to monitor comprehension. Further, they said that advanced readers can monitor their own reading comprehension, and if necessary, modify reading activities to increase comprehension. The purposeful use of reading strategies will most likely to increase reading efficiency since they are able to know how to read in different purposes and can do it properly. It also has been suggested that achievement in any given reading situation depends not only on the flexibility of using reading skills, but also on the capacity to monitor the progress of reading in order to correct the failures of comprehension (Brown, 1980). Then, it is argued that the ability to monitor comprehension depends upon what a reader knows about his/her own comprehension processes.

In principle, conscious control awareness during reading comprehension is influenced by several factors (Collin as cited in Yin & Agnes, 2001). The first factor is textual features of the particular text read, such as the syntax, vocabulary, clarity of the author's designation, arrangement ideas in the text, and the reader's interest and familiarity with the text may influence reading comprehension. The second factor is background knowledge of the text will likely facilitate reader to have greater control of strategies use. The last factor is the maturity of the reader is also essential. In addition, the mature readers have the flexibility in applying reading skills, such as have the ability to use strategies of reading for a purpose. The metacognitive aspects of these advanced strategies involve knowing that the readers will read differently depend on the situation, that there are several ways to help retention, and that some strategies are more appropriate and efficient than other in any particular situation (Forrest-Pressley & Walter, 1984).

The Good Strategy User

Based on Pressley, Borkowski, and Schneider (1987 as cited in Bruning, Schraw, Norby, & Ronning, 2004) a good strategy user are (1) a wide-ranging selection of strategies, (2) metacognitive knowledge about why, when, and where to use strategies, (3) a broad knowledge base, (4) ability to ignore distractions, and (5) automaticity in the four components described earlier.

Furthermore Pressley et al. (1987, as cited in Brunning et al. 2004) explained that there are five criteria that need to be possessed by skilled readers. The first criterion is to know and to apply the two types of strategies, which are *domain-specific strategy*, for example, the readers are able to know the content or the topic of the texts, and *higher order strategy*, when the reader can control the use of other strategies. For clearer example is when a skilled reader is able to sequence strategies while reading. He skims before starting to read, then selectively focusing on important information, then he does monitoring and the last is reviewing. Therefore, it is important to have knowledge how to coordinate related strategies in order to be good strategy users to regulate their learning efficiently. The second criterion mentioned by Pressley et al. is about *self-awareness and the ability to self-regulate*. The skilled readers are not only to know *how* to do something but also they need to know *when or where* to use particular strategy. Being able to determine the text is about based on the title and how to find the important information on the text is the example of this second criterion.

The third criterion of a good strategy user, probably is the most important one, is *a broad of prior knowledge*. Pressley et al. argued that prior knowledge is a base component to make new information restored in the memory. It is also important to promote strategy use and balance for lack strategies. The fourth criterion is what called by Pressley et al. as *action control*. This is where the skilled readers are able to motivate themselves, adjust distractions and allocate their progress to effort. The fifth criterion is that good strategy users achieve all of these criterions *automatically*. It is essential because the automated learners are able to allocate the resources to higher order regulation of learning, they use the resources for constructing meaning and supervising their learning. Conversely, non-automated learners are only allocate their resources to basic regulation of learning such as perception, attention, recalling information from long term memory, and selecting strategies.

Previous Studies

A number of studies have been conducted in metacognitive reading strategies. For instance, Gooden, Carreker, Thornhill, and Joshi (2007) investigated reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students by instructing metacognitive strategies. The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of systematic direct instruction of multiple metacognitive strategies designed to assist students in comprehending text. This study suggested that the metacognitive reading comprehension instruction significantly improved the students' academic achievement in reading comprehension and vocabulary. Another study conducted by Mahdi (2016) which examined the effectiveness of using metacognitive strategies on tenth graders' reading comprehension and attitudes. This study revealed that the building program on the metacognitive strategies has impacted positively and significantly the attitudes of students in the experimental group.

Based on Forrest-Pressley and Walter's study (1984), they concluded that performance on advanced reading skills such as comprehension and strategies expands with level and reading ability, and the ability to monitor comprehension (also to predict efficiency) and to apply appropriate strategy about comprehension develops with level and reading ability. Moreover, Devine (as cited in Imtiaz, 2004) who investigated second language readers' perception about their reading in second language suggested that less skilled readers tend to focus on reading as decoding process. Therefore, novice readers need to be trained to use appropriate strategies since the goal of strategy use is to "affect the learner's motivational or affective state or the way in which the learner selects, acquires, or organizes, or integrates new information" (Imtiaz, 2004, p. 35).

Moreover a study from Alghail and Mahfoodh (2016) who worked on how graduate students in a Malaysian university perceived reading difficulties. The study revealed that there were five academic reading difficulties: "taking brief and relevant notes, using their own words in note taking, working out meaning of the difficult words, identifying supporting ideas/examples, and managing their time for completion of reading academic materials" (p. 369).

METHOD

This study is a descriptive qualitative study, which designed to obtain information on the strategies used in reading comprehension for students' problem. The aim of this study is to describe what problems the students have in comprehending an academic text and to find out the strategies used by either high and low level students to overcome their problems. This study is directed toward determining

the nature of situation as it exists at the time of the study. Therefore, this study only describes what exists with respect to variables or condition in a situation, no control of treatment (Ary, 1979).

The subject of the study was the English Department students of University of Islam Malang who were taking Reading III subject. The participants of this study were 84 students. Furthermore, those students were classified into two categories: high and low level achievement students. This separation was based on the score of the test of reading given on the first meeting. The test was Academic Reading on IELTS.

To collect the data, there were two questionnaires used in this study. The first questionnaire was the Metacognitive Reading Awareness Questionnaire (MRAQ) which is modified from Carrell (1989). It consists of 36 items which is used to know the students' difficulties in reading comprehension, particularly academic English texts. The questionnaire consists of 36 statements, but only 8 statements (items no 21-28) related to make the reading difficult were considered as the result. Moreover, the problems faced by the students in reading comprehension in the questionnaire are (21) the sounds of the individual words, (2) pronunciation of the words, (3) recognizing the words, (4) the grammatical structures, (5) the alphabet, (6) relating the text to what I already know about the topic, (7) getting the overall meaning of a text, and (8) the organization of the text.

The second questionnaire was the Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire (MRSQ) which is taken from Taraban, Rynearson, and Kerr (2004). It consists of 22 questions which categorized into two strategies: Analytic and Pragmatic Strategies. The questionnaire consists of 22 statements were divided into two types of strategy; Analytic, 16 items of strategies and Pragmatic, 6 items of strategies. Furthermore, the Analytic Strategies used by the students in reading comprehension are (1) evaluate, (2) anticipate, (3) draw, (4) back, (5) revise, (6) consider, (7) distinguish, (8) infer, (9) reading goals, (10) search, (11) present later, (12) meaning, (13) current information, (14) strengths, (15) visualize descriptions, and (16) hard. While the Pragmatic Strategies used by the students in reading comprehension are (1) notes, (2) highlight, (3) margin, (4) underline, (5) read more, and (6) re-read. This questionnaire is used to know the metacognitive strategies employed by either high and low level students. The data from the questionnaires were computed using Likert-Scale.

The procedures that were carried out in this study were:

1. The participants were asked to complete one academic Reading Test (taken from an IELTS preparation book) as the test.
2. The tests were graded and ranked the score from the highest to the lowest, and selected the top 10 and the bottom 10.
3. The 20 participants were asked to respond to the MRAQ in order to locate their difficulties in reading comprehension, especially on academic English texts.
4. The MRAQs were evaluated in order to look for the major difficulties of the participants.
5. The 20 participants were asked to respond to the MRSQ in order to assess the use of the metacognitive reading strategies,
6. The MRSQs were evaluated in order to look for the major metacognitive strategies used of the participants.
7. The major difficulties and the major strategies used both by high and low level students were tabulated, compared and explained.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To know the problems faced by the students in reading comprehension academic texts, the researchers distributed the questionnaires to the students of class C and D of third semester of English Department at University of Islam Malang. Then, the results of the questionnaires were analysed item by item and tabulated in scored diagram numerically completed with the percentage. The findings are as follows: (1) the problem faced by the students and (2) the metacognitive strategies applied by the students to overcome their problems in reading academic text.

Reading Problems Faced by the Students

Based on the result of the Metacognitive Reading Awareness Questionnaire (MRAQ), the frequency and the percentage of the problems faced by the students in the reading comprehension especially for English academic texts are presented in the following tables.

Table 1. Reading Problems Faced by High Level Achievement Students

When reading silently in English, things that make reading difficult are

No	Statements	Score	Percentage
21	The sounds of the individual words.	13	52%
12	Pronunciation of the words.	11	44%
33	Recognizing the words.	21	84%
44	The grammatical structures.	18	72%
55	The alphabet.	8	32%
56	Relating the text to what I already know about the topic.	18	72%
77	Getting the overall meaning of the text.	14	56%
88	The organization of the text.	13	52%

It can be seen from the table 1 that the three most difficulties faced by the high level students in reading comprehension especially on academic English texts were (1) *recognizing the words*, 84% of the high students experienced this. Then (2) *the grammatical structures* and (3) *relating the text to what they already know about the topic* were the next two difficulties faced by 72% of the high level students in reading English academic texts. However the results of reading problems were different from low level achievement students (Table 2).

Table 2. Reading Problems Faced by Low Level Achievement Students

When reading silently in English, things that make reading difficult are

No	Statements	Score	Percentage
21	The sounds of the individual words.	21	84%
12	Pronunciation of the words.	21	84%
33	Recognizing the words.	18	72%
44	The grammatical structures.	17	68%
55	The alphabet.	10	40%
56	Relating the text to what I already know about the topic.	19	76%
77	Getting the overall meaning of the text.	19	76%
88	The organization of the text.	20	80%

The numerical data demonstrated the three most reading difficulties faced by the low level achievement students; (1) *the sounds of the individual words* and (2) *pronunciation of the words* were occurred within 84% of the students, and 80% of the students felt difficult in understanding (3) *the organization of the [English academic] text*.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by the Students

Based on the result of the Metacognitive Reading Strategies Questionnaire (MRSQ), the frequency and the percentage of the metacognitive strategies, consisted of Analytical and Pragmatic, used by the students in reading comprehension especially for academic English texts are presented in the following tables.

Table 3. Metacognitive Analytic Reading Strategies Used by the High Level Achievement Students

No.	Statement	Score	Percentage
1	<i>Evaluate.</i> As I am reading, I evaluate the text to determine whether it contributes to my knowledge/ understanding of the subject.	19	76%

2	<i>Anticipate.</i> After I have read a text, I anticipate how I will use the knowledge that I have gained from reading the text.	18	72%
3	<i>Draw.</i> I try to draw on my knowledge of the topic to help me understand what I'm reading.	18	72%
4	Back. While I'm reading, I reconsider and revise my background about the topic, based on the text's content.	21	84%
5	<i>Revise.</i> While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my prior questions about the topic, based on the text's content.	13	52%
6	<i>Consider.</i> After I read a text, I consider other possible interpretations to determine whether I understood the text.	14	56%
7	<i>Distinguish.</i> As I am reading, I distinguish between information that I already know and new information.	16	64%
8	<i>Infer.</i> When information critical to my understanding of the text is not directly stated, I try to infer that information from the text.	18	72%
9	<i>Reading goals.</i> I evaluate whether what I am reading is relevant to my reading goals.	15	60%
10	<i>Search.</i> I search out information relevant to my reading goals.	14	56%
11	<i>Present later.</i> I anticipate information that will be presented later in the text.	12	48%
12	Meaning. While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text.	22	88%
13	<i>Current information.</i> As I read along, I check whether I had anticipated the current information.	15	60%
14	<i>Strengths.</i> While reading, I exploit my personal strengths in order to better understand the text. If I am a good reader, I focus on the text; if I am good with figures and diagrams, I focus on that information.	17	68%
15	Visualize descriptions. While reading, I visualize descriptions in order to better understand the text.	20	80%
16	<i>Hard.</i> I note how hard or easy a text is to read.	11	44%

As shown by the data, the metacognitive analytical reading strategies, employed by the high level students in facing the difficulties in reading comprehension especially on academic English texts were; (1) *Meaning (While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text)*, this strategy was used by 88% of the students, (2) *Back (While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my background about the topic, based on the text's content)* strategy was utilized by 84% of the students, and 80% of the students operated (3) *Visualize descriptions (While I am reading, I visualize descriptions in order to better understand the text)* strategy. Furthermore, the result of the pragmatic reading strategies were described further (Table 4.).

Table 4. Metacognitive Pragmatic Reading Strategies Used by the High Level Achievement Students

No.	Statement	Score	Percentage
17	<i>Notes.</i> I make notes when reading in order to remember the information.	18	72%
18	Highlight. While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on.	20	80%
19	<i>Margin.</i> While reading, I write questions and notes in the margin in order to better understand the text.	13	52%

20	<i>Underline.</i> I try to underline when reading in order to remember the information.	15	60%
21	Read more. I read material more than once in order to remember the information.	21	84%
22	Re-read. When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text.	24	96%

It is clear shown from the table that the three most pragmatic reading strategies used by high level achievement students were (1) *Re-read* (*When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text*), 96% of the students managed this strategy, (2) *Read more* (*I read material more than once in order to remember the information*) was applied by 84% of the students, and (3) *Highlight* (*While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on*) was used by 80% of the students in comprehending academic texts. On the other hand, the results on the metacognitive reading strategies used by the low level achievement students were in some way different. As shown from the following tables (Table 5 and Table 6).

Table 5. Metacognitive Analytic Reading Strategies Used by the Low Level Achievement Students

No.	Statement	Score	Percentage
1	<i>Evaluate.</i> As I am reading, I evaluate the text to determine whether it contributes to my knowledge/ understanding of the subject.	15	60%
2	<i>Anticipate.</i> After I have read a text, I anticipate how I will use the knowledge that I have gained from reading the text.	14	56%
3	<i>Draw.</i> I try to draw on my knowledge of the topic to help me understand what I'm reading.	13	52%
4	<i>Back.</i> While I'm reading, I reconsider and revise my background about the topic, based on the text's content.	13	52%
5	<i>Revise.</i> While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my prior questions about the topic, based on the text's content.	14	56%
6	<i>Consider.</i> After I read a text, I consider other possible interpretations to determine whether I understood the text.	15	60%
7	<i>Distinguish.</i> As I am reading, I distinguish between information that I already know and new information.	14	56%
8	<i>Infer.</i> When information critical to my understanding of the text is not directly stated, I try to infer that information from the text.	12	48%
9	<i>Reading goals.</i> I evaluate whether what I am reading is relevant to my reading goals.	15	60%
10	Search. I search out information relevant to my reading goals.	16	64%
11	<i>Present later.</i> I anticipate information that will be presented later in the text.	12	48%
12	Meaning. While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text.	17	68%
13	<i>Current information.</i> As I read along, I check whether I had anticipated the current information.	13	52%
14	<i>Strengths.</i> While reading, I exploit my personal strengths in order to better understand the text. If I am a good reader, I focus on the text; if I am good with figures and diagrams, I focus on that information.	11	44%

15	<i>Visualize descriptions.</i> While reading, I visualize descriptions in order to better understand the text.	9	36%
16	Hard. I note how hard or easy a text is to read.	19	76%

What table shows overall was the three most of reading analytic strategies employed by the low level students. There were 76% of the students noticed (1) *Hard (I note how hard or easy a text is to read)*, (2) *Meaning (While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text)* was employed by 68% of the students, and 64% of the students did (3) *Search (I search out information relevant to my reading goals)* in reading academic texts. Additionally, the result of the pragmatic reading strategies was described as follow (Table 6.).

Table 6. Metacognitive Pragmatic Reading Strategies Used by the Low Level Achievement Students

No.	Statement	Score	Percentage
17	<i>Notes.</i> I make notes when reading in order to remember the information.	13	52%
18	Highlight. While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on.	19	76%
19	<i>Margin.</i> While reading, I write questions and notes in the margin in order to better understand the text.	8	32%
20	Underline. I try to underline when reading in order to remember the information.	19	76%
21	<i>Read more.</i> I read material more than once in order to remember the information.	16	64%
22	Re-read. When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text.	17	68%

From the table above, the three most reading pragmatic strategies used by low level achievement students were (1) *Highlight (While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on)* was applied by 76% of the students, while 76% of the students (2) *Underline (I try to underline when reading in order to remember the information)* strategy, and (3) *Re-read (When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text)* was done by 68% of the students.

Overall, the students reported to face six problems in reading academic texts. The problems are (1) recognizing the words, (2) the grammatical structures, (3) relating the text to what they already know about the topic, (4) the sounds of the individual words, (5) pronunciation of the words, and (6) the organization of the text. The problems found are related to Young and Schartner (2014), who said that a wide range of academic difficulties can be correlated to academic literacy, language skills [poor English proficiency], and unfamiliar academic settings [the amount of reading the students had at the university]. Also some of the problems in line with Alghail and Mahfoodh (2016), who worked on how graduate students in a Malaysian university perceived reading difficulties. The study revealed that there were five academic reading difficulties: "taking brief and relevant notes, using their own words in note taking, working out meaning of the difficult words, identifying supporting ideas/examples, and managing their time for completion of reading academic materials" (p. 369).

Moreover, the metacognitive reading strategies are divided into two categories, which are used by high and low level achievement students. The MRSQ itself divided into two types of strategies, analytical and pragmatic strategies. The three most metacognitive analytical reading strategies employed by high level students are (1) *Meaning (While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text)*, (2) *Back (While I am reading, I reconsider and revise my background about the topic, based on the text's content)*, and (3) *Visualize descriptions (While I am reading, I visualize descriptions in order to better understand the text)*. However, the three most metacognitive analytical reading strategies employed by low level students are (1) *Hard (I note how hard or easy a text is to read)*, (2) *Meaning (While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text)*, and (3) *Search (I search out information relevant to my reading goals)*. There are two interesting points that can be seen from the analytical strategies used by high and low students. The first is both levels of the students apply *Meaning (While I am reading, I try to determine the meaning of unknown words that seem critical to the meaning of the text)* strategy in

reading academic texts. This strategy seems critical to all levels of the students since they need to know the content or the topic of the text and check whether they have their background knowledge of the text or not. As Pressley et al. (1987, as cited in Bruning et al. 2004) explained that skilled readers need to possess *domain-specific strategy*, where in this case when the students are able to know the content or the topic of the texts and, still according to Pressley et al., the most important criterion is having *a broad of prior knowledge*. Pressley et al. argued that prior knowledge is a base component to make new information rebuilt in the memory. The second appealing point is that the Hard (I note how hard or easy a text is to read) strategy which was in the uppermost strategy used by low level students is apparently was the lowest strategy used by the high level students. It is what Devine (as cited in Imtiaz, 2004) asserted that less skilled non-native English readers tend to focus on reading as decoding process or the process of translating a written word into a sound, while more skilled readers have understood what they have read, what they do not understand, and when to monitor their comprehension (Forrest-Pressley & Waller, 1984).

Furthermore, the top three of pragmatic strategies utilized by the high level of students are (1) Re-read (When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text), (2) Read more (I read material more than once in order to remember the information), and (3) Highlight (While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on). Reversely, the three most reading pragmatic strategies used by low level achievement students are (1) Highlight (While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on), (2) Underline (I try to underline when reading in order to remember the information), and (3) Re-read (When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text). Although the orders of the pragmatic strategies used are not the same, there are two same strategies which were applied by both levels of the students. They are (1) Re-read (When I am having difficulty comprehending a text, I re-read the text) and (2) Highlight (While reading, I underline and highlight important information in order to find it more easily later on). It is in line with Brown (1980) statements that there are several strategies that the students need to achieve in order to be more skilful readers. The activities among others are: (1) clarifying the purposes of reading (i.e., understanding the task demands), (2) identifying the important aspects of the message, (3) allocating attention to relevant information, (4) monitoring activities continuously to determine if comprehension is occurring, and (5) engaging in review and self-testing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Despite the fact that these findings cannot be said to be statistically significant or generalizable, comprehending reading academic texts has become necessity to the students' success in their learning. The students must cope with the myriad challenges presented in academic reading texts process. English language teachers need to develop a better awareness of the possible difficulties which may hinder the students to achieve the goals of their learning especially in comprehending academic texts and what is interesting about the metacognitive strategies is that these strategies are possible to be trained. Teaching students through a reading intensive course which is integrated with strategies training provides them with a more holistic learning experience, prepares them to excel in academic fields, allows them to develop, eventually, their critical thinking skills, and further prepares them to be competent and successful in their future careers.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, M. R., Ismail, H. N., & Abdullah, M. K. K. (2013). The Importance of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension. *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 6: 10 (235-244).
- Alghail, A. A. A. & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2016). Academic reading difficulties encountered by international graduate students in a Malaysian university. *Issues in Educational Research*, 26(3), 369-386
- Ary, D., Jacobs, C. L., & Razavich, A. (1979). *Introduction to research in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Brown, A. L. (1980). *Metacognition development and reading*. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), 1 (pp. 453-481). Hilldale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., Norby, M. M., & Ronning, R. R. (2004). *Cognitive psychology and instruction* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Carrel, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *The Modern Language*

- Forrest-Pressley, D. L., & Wallter, T. G. (1984). *Cognition, metacognition, and reading*. New York: Springer-Verlag. *Journal*, 73(2), 121-134.
- Gooden, R. B., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A., & Joshi R. M. (2007). Instruction of metacognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 70-77
- Imtiaz, S. (2004). Metacognitive strategies of reading among ESL learners. *South Asian Language Review* 14 (1&2), 34-43
- Mahdi, S. A. (2016). *The effectiveness of using metacognitive strategies on tenth graders' reading comprehension and attitudes* (Postgraduate theses, Al-Azhar University, Gaza). Retrieved from http://www.alazhar.edu.ps/Library/aattachedFile.asp?id_no=0048976
- Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 317-345.
- Taraban, R., Rynearson, K., & Kerr, M. S. (2004). Analytic and pragmatic factors in college students' metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology*, 25(2), 67-81
- Vendityaningtyas, V. (2013). Teaching Reading by Using Question-Answer Relationship. *Proceedings of English Education - UNS International TEFL Conference*. English Education Department. Teacher Training and Education Faculty. Sebelas Maret University.
- Wijayanti, A. P. (2013). *A descriptive study of metacognitive strategies in the English language teaching and learning process at SMPN 1 Probolinggo* (Undergraduate theses, Universitas Jember, Indonesia). Retrieved from <http://repository.unej.ac.id/handle/123456789/11284>
- Yin, W. M., & Agnes, C. S. C. (2001). *Knowledge and use of metacognitive strategies*. Retrieved August 22, 2017, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/won01419.html>