

THE DIFFERENCES OF METACOGNITIVE READING AWARENESS BETWEEN SUCCESSFUL AND LESS SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Muhammad Shidqi Alimul Hikam, Alfian Zuhairi, Hamidin.

*English Department of Teacher Training and Education of Undergraduate Program of University
of Islam Malang*

Email: 21801073036@unisma.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Hikam, Muhammad Shidqi Alimul. 2022. *The Differences of Metacognitive Reading Awareness Between Successful and Less Successful Students At Junior High School Students*. Skripsi, English Education Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Islam Malang. Advisor I: Dr. Alfian Zuhairi, M.Pd.; Advisor II: Dr. Hamidin, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Keywords: Successful Students; Less successful Students; Metacognitive Reading Awareness.

This research explains metacognitive reading awareness strategies which are divided into 3 types of strategies (problem-solving strategies, support reading strategies, and global reading strategies) for successful students (SS) and less successful students (LS). The method used in research is quantitative. Researchers involved all 8th-grade middle school students. There were 32 successful students and 21 less successful students. The questionnaire taken by MARSIR 2013 was created by Kouider Mokhtari. Researchers distributed questionnaires in physical form in the form of paper containing student identities and 30 questions about metacognitive reading awareness. Data was analyzed using the SPSS application. The analysis results show PSS (Problem-Solving Strategies) with a total mean of 3.92 for SS and 3.72 for LS, SRS (Support Reading Strategies) with a total mean of 3.44 for SS and 3.08 for LS, and GRS (Global Reading Strategies) with a total mean of 3.45 for SS and 3.26 for LS. The types of metacognitive reading awareness strategies mostly used by successful students and less successful is problem problem-solving, support, and followed by global strategies. Then the next suggestion is aimed at lecturers and English teachers to motivate and stimulate learning using metacognitive reading awareness strategies. The final suggestion is aimed at future researchers to have more participants in the research.

INTRODUCTION

According to (Flavell, 1979) introduced the term “metacognition” as an individual’s knowledge and control of the cognitive learning process. Metacognitive knowledge refers to the acquired knowledge about this cognitive learning process; metacognitive control refers to the knowledge learners bring to orchestrate the cognitive learning process. Metacognition is the ability of an individual to control their own thought processes in order to accomplish their goals. It entails the capacity to create a mode of cognition or thinking

(Asy'ari & Ikhsan, 2019). Also known as cognitive monitoring, metacognition also refers to the activation of reading techniques in relation to literacy (Braga & Busnardo, 2017).

A reader who is conscious of employing his or her own thought process to attain reading comprehension is said to have metacognitive reading awareness. In order to regulate a reader's cognitive or thinking process, which influences his or her reading techniques, the reader must be aware of this (Ahmadi et al., 2013). According to Girli and Oztürk (2017), metacognitive reading awareness refers to people's awareness of how their cognitive processes help them become better readers.

Metacognitive awareness is a clear awareness of reading strategies employed to monitor, regulate and plan comprehension (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). According to Guterman (2003), metacognitive awareness refers to learning awareness and understanding that being aware of knowledge as a means of knowing is a part of awareness. The degree of a learner's comprehension, performance, and achievement will depend on how well-versed they are in the material and how conscious they are of it. As it aids in the transfer of skills, information, and techniques across contexts and circumstances, it has also been recognised as one of the variables that supports self-regulated learning (Schraw, 1998).

Utilizing metacognitive skills in the classroom assists students in becoming better learners. Djudin (2017) claimed that strengthening students' metacognitive skills in all curriculum areas plays a significant part in the learning process to help students become independent and strategic learners. In this instance, the metacognitive strategy step is to regulate and pay attention to reading comprehension in order to expand knowledge. It concludes that metacognitive strategies are certain learning methods employed or chosen, with a particular emphasis on planning, monitoring, and assessing.

According to Sun (2013), one of the most effective metacognitive strategies for enhancing learning is organizing or planning. The readers are considering what their motivations are and how they might achieve those motivations efficiently and effectively as part of their planning process. Planning techniques are metacognitive tactics that readers use to improve their reading comprehension. Prior to reading, preparation techniques are utilized; background knowledge activation is an example of a planning strategy that is used to prepare for reading. In addition, previewing a title, header or subheading, image, or illustration might help readers comprehend the overall of the article. Readers can preview the broad information by examining the text and its organization. They may examine the

reading material for certain text structures, such as question-and-answer, compare-and-contrast, and cause-and-effect. In addition, the reading context is also addressed as a planning technique.

Meanwhile according to Mistar, Zuhairi and Yanti (2016), while cognitive strategies are in the form of deliberate actions the readers take to enhance text comprehension when reading such as utilizing prior knowledge and adjusting reading rate, metacognitive strategies take the form of advanced planning and comprehension monitoring, such as setting purpose for reading and previewing text. On the other hand, s (Mistar, Zuhairi, & Yanti, 2016) support strategies are tools that readers can use to support comprehension, such as: B. Taking notes and using references while reading.

According to Hamiddin and Saukah (2020), The successful readers tend to have self-efficacy, self-motivation, inter-individual characteristics, and interest in improving their English ability, especially reading. Most of the time they are less successful Students are passive, less motivated, and less interested less inter-individual characteristics in improving personal abilities regarding reading ability, only one student had self-motivation, self-efficacy, and interest in improving reading ability. Furthermore, successful readers have a broad understanding of themselves in terms of self-efficacy, motivation, inner personality, and interests, whereas less successful readers do not.

Some early studies related to metacognition in the learning process have been carried out in various contexts. Then, Zahra et al., (2016) assessed 30 high school students about their applied Metacognitive Awareness and Reading Comprehension. Interest the researchers took more focus on metacognitive effects on college students as well. For example, (Anita & Wahyudi, 2021) metacognitive awareness of reading strategy for third semester EFL students at IAIN Bengkulu. From this research, it is proven to be able to improve students' reading ability.

Additionally, (Dardjito, 2019) attempted to make a connection between academic reading comprehension and first-year university students' metacognitive reading awareness in Indonesia. The results of testing 373 EFL students revealed that there is no meaningful relationship between the MRAI participants' scores and their academic reading comprehension of academic materials.

As a result, the researcher is interested in learning more about the students' level of awareness of using metacognitive reading methods in junior high school. On the other side, the researchers describe how university students adopt metacognitive reading strategies using the results of the earlier investigations. In order to better understand the variations in metacognitive reading awareness between successful students and less successful students in Junior High School, this study will look more closely at how metacognitive reading methods are used. GAP from prior research weaknesses: most study focuses on MRA EFL students at the campus level. Even if beginning EFL students in junior high school are also given reading comprehension lessons. Therefore, the present researcher wants to fill the gap by conducting study of MRA by successful and less-successful senior high school students.

METHOD

A descriptive quantitative method was employed in this investigation. The researcher would use a technique for research called a quantitative study. According to Bandari (2020), quantitative design is the process of gathering and evaluating numerical data. Using this technique, ex post facto designs, forecasts, casuality tests, and results generalization to larger populations are all done. Ex-post facto research is now being done to assess how well junior high school kids are reading. This quantitative study's procedures involve gathering sample data, distributing questionnaires, and determining metacognitive reading awareness. The score the researcher gave the sample after they finished the questionnaire served as a parameter in this study.

To gather data for this study, the author conducted a sampling process involving eighth-grade students at a Junior High School. The chosen sampling technique was convenience sampling, as described by Creswell (2012). In convenience sampling, participants are selected because they are readily available and willing to participate in the study. In alignment with the research's objectives, the author decided to include all eighth-grade students in the sample population.

Within the eighth-grade level, there were a total of six classes: 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E, and 8F. The author opted to select 32 students who were categorized as successful students and 21 students from each class who were identified as less successful students. These categorizations were based on the scores obtained by the students in their middle examination. This method of distinguishing between successful and less successful students serves as the basis for the composition of the sample.

Meanwhile, the reason the researcher used grade 8 as a research class was that the students at the school were willing to be invited to work together, and based on the results of observations that had been made. Based on the results of these observations, the researcher used the mid-term scores obtained from the school and the researchers found several problems, especially reading the text on the mid-term questions. Therefore, researchers tried to research to find the strategies that most students use in reading texts.

In Junior High School, grade 8, there are 6 classes with a total of 135 students. Then the researchers asked the English teacher at this junior high school to determine successful and less successful students for the final grade data. Successful students who have scores between 90-100, while less successful students have grades between 60-75. Researchers did not use moderate students with midterm scores of 76-89 because participants did not fulfill the criteria in the research. See on appendix 4 Table 3.2: Score of middle examination in Each Class.

In this phase of the study, data collection was carried out through the utilization of interviews as the primary data collection instrument. An interview guide was developed to systematically address and obtain responses to the research questions, specifically questions one and two. Additionally, the researchers adapted an agreement questionnaire originally developed by Joel (2013) for use in this study.

The author compared the metacognitive reading awareness between successful and less successful students using the questionnaire data. The inquiries centered on the degree of reading awareness of metacognitive processes. The results of the survey were used to calculate the students' reading metacognitive awareness scores. The test included a number of A/D statement questionnaire questions. There are 30 items about reading awareness and metacognition in the survey. The results of the questionnaire that was given to the students were utilised by the author. Problem-solving strategies, support reading strategies, and global reading strategies are the three different types of A/D questionnaires that are included in the survey.

A 30-item survey called the SORS (Survey of Reading Strategies) was used in the study to gauge how frequently certain reading techniques were used. Participants were asked to rate how often they employ each reading approach on a 5-point Likert scale. From 1 (I never or nearly never use this method) to 5 (I usually or almost always use this strategy), the Likert scale was used. The scale was created to determine how frequently

participants use these tactics in response to reading instruction, giving important information about their reading habits.

For data collection, the author used one instrument (A questionnaire) as a medium for collecting data on students' scores on vocabulary. The researcher provide an introduction and describe the aim of the study. Furthermore, the researcher explained how to fill out the questionnaire in the form of a questionnaire using a paper form which already contained personal identity and 30 questions from SORS. Researchers also advise students to convey their feelings on forms. The form has a 20-minute time limit set by the researcher to ensure efficient use of the time. Students are asked to complete the survey honestly and without any pretense.

There are two research problems in this study. What types of metacognitive reading techniques are most frequently employed? Second, do high- and low-proficiency students use different reading techniques in terms of their metacognitive awareness? By giving out questionnaires to participants, the data gathering approach is carried out.

The one sample t-test analysis was employed by the author to answer 2 research problem above. The one sample t-test is a technique for determining if a sample's mean is greater than, equal to, or less than a particular number. In this study, the author made the assumption that metacognitive reading awareness would be present if the statistical test result exceeded or was equivalent to the limit set by the significance level value. On the other hand, metacognitive reading awareness would be present if the statistical test stayed inside the bounds set by the significance level value.

The hypothesis of the research was H_0 and H_1 . H_0 represented metacognitive reading awareness had no differences between successful and less successful student. H_1 represented metacognitive reading awareness had differences between successful and less successful student. The author inputted and analyzed the data obtained from the scores of A/D tests by the SPSS Version 23.0 Program. Then the author calculated the test statistics by calculating the variance, mean, and t-count. After obtaining the t-count value, the author determined the significance level value of 0.05 to determine the t-table. Output displayed directly on the SPSS program. In this study, if the:

- 1) $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$, H_1 is differenceness.
- 2) $t\text{-count} < t\text{-table}$, H_1 is no differenceness.

FINDINGS

Descriptive analysis was carried out to determine the description of the research variables consisting of average value (mean), standard deviation, maximum value and minimum value.

Tabel 4.1 Descriptive analysis

Descriptive Statistics					
	nimum	aximum	Mean	d. Deviation	
Less Successful Students	32	97.00	149.00	120.5909	15.14268
Successful Students	21	73.00	131.00	107.3548	14.20223

In table 4.1 the descriptive analysis above shows that the average metacognitive reading awareness score for successful students is 120.59 with a standard deviation of 15.14, the highest metacognitive reading awareness score for successful students is 149 while the lowest score is 97.

The average score of metacognitive reading awareness for less successful students is 107.35 with a standard deviation of 14.20, the highest score for metacognitive reading awareness for less successful students is 131 while the lowest score is 73.

Results for the 30 individual reading strategies (problem-solving, global, and support) developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) are shown in order of use frequency, from high (3.5 or above), medium (2.5-3.4), and low (2.4 or lower).

The SORS results demonstrated that reported high use ($M = 3.92$) for successful students and ($M = 3.72$) for less successful students of Problem Solving Reading Strategies. As for the Support Reading strategies, reported medium use ($M = 3.44$) for successful students and ($M = 3.08$) for less successful students, and similarly medium use of Global Reading Strategies was reported ($M = 3.45$) for successful students and ($M = 3.26$) for less successful students.

Table 4.2 : Problem solving strategies

strategy	Problem-Solving	Successful Students			Less Successful students		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD
	Read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading.	32	4.13	.056	21	4.14	.793
	Stop to get back on track when I lose concentration.	32	4.32	.871	21	4.19	.873
	Adjust my reading speed according to what I read.	32	4.10	.944	21	3.62	.161
	When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.	32	4.16	.898	21	3.86	.108
	Stop from time to time and think about what I read.	32	3.48	.962	21	3.38	.973
	Use a picture or visualize information to help understand what I read.	32	3.94	.854	21	3.52	.814
	When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to help myself understand.	32	4.00	.033	21	3.76	.889
	When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	32	3.26	.064	21	3.33	.856
Overall Mean			3.92			3.72	

When it comes to Problem Solving Reading Strategies, students appear to encounter minimal challenges in solving them. Both successful and less successful students exhibit similar problem-solving behaviors when faced with difficult text. They actively attempt to re-establish their concentration (Strategy 9, with means of $M = 4.32$ for successful students and $M = 4.19$ for less successful students), demonstrate a heightened level of attentiveness (Strategy 14, with means of $M = 4.16$ for successful students and $M = 3.86$ for less successful students), adopt a slower reading pace (Strategy 7, with means of $M = 4.13$ for successful students and $M = 4.14$ for less successful students), exercise control over their reading speed (Strategy 11, with means of $M = 4.10$ for successful students and $M = 3.62$ for less successful students), and employ visual, guessing, and analytical skills to address reading difficulties (Strategy 19, with means of $M = 3.94$ for successful students and $M = 3.52$ for less successful students). Additionally, both groups indicate that when confronted with challenging text, they resort to re-reading it (Strategy 25, with means of $M = 4.00$ for successful students and $M = 3.76$ for less successful students). All of the aforementioned Problem-Solving Strategies are reported to be used at a high frequency by both groups.

Table 4.3 : Support Reading strategies

Strategy	Support Reading Strategies	Successful Students			Less Successful Students		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD
	Take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.	32	3.23	.055	21	.33	.111
	When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to understand what I read.	32	3.00	.291	21	.38	.396
	Underline or circle information in the text to remember it.	32	3.87	.957	21	.33	.354
	Use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to understand what I read.	32	2.71	.006	21	.33	.197
	Paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to understand what I read.	32	3.74	.999	21	.43	.811
	Go back and forth in the text to find answers among ideas in it.	32	3.81	.946	21	.57	.121
	Ask myself questions I like to have answered	32	3.58	.025	21	.19	.078
	When reading, I translate from English into my language.	32	3.84	.241	21	.67	.111
	When reading, I think about information in English and my mother tongue	32	3.26	.032	21	.57	.028
Overall mean			3.44			.08	

Successful students used these strategies to underline and circle information (Strategy 10, $M = 3.87$), paraphrase or restate ideas in their own words (Strategy 18, $M = 3.74$), go back and forth reading the text (Strategy 22, $M = 3.81$), then ask themselves to find answers to the text (Strategy 22, $M = 3.81$), and also translate. Less successful students used these strategies less frequently. Additionally, less successful students just read the material back and forth (Strategies 22, $M = 3.57$), and they reported having very poor reading skills. Keeping in mind the foregoing Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) claim that proficient readers are those who take notes while they read and highlight significant portions to support their reading. The reported use for all of the aforementioned support reading strategies is medium.

Table 4.4: Global Reading Strategies

Strategy	Global Reading Strategies	Successful Students			Less Successful Students		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD
	Have a purpose in mind when I read	32	4.10	.944	21	3.62	.973
	Think about what I know to help me understand what I read	32	3.90	.012	21	3.81	.928
	Get an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.	32	3.74	.965	21	3.57	.926
	Think about whether the content of the text is relevant to my reading purpose.	32	3.35	.050	21	3.29	.146
	View the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.	32	2.58	.119	21	2.95	.921
	When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	32	3.68	.013	21	3.48	.750
	Look at tables, figures, and pictures in text to help my understanding.	32	2.97	.197	21	2.71	.956
	Look for context clues to help me better understand the text while reading.	32	3.26	.855	21	3.00	.894
	Look at typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.	32	3.16	.293	21	2.62	.117
	Actively analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	32	3.42	.848	21	2.86	.062
	Check my understanding when I come across new information.	32	3.87	.846	21	3.71	.644
	Try to guess what the content of the text is before I read.	32	3.23	.230	21	3.10	.044
	Check to see if my guesses about the text are correct after reading.	32	3.68	.077	21	3.76	.995
Overall Mean			3.45			3.26	

These students frequently reported the utilization of global reading strategies such as reading with a specific purpose, drawing upon their prior knowledge and personal experiences, and reading attentively to discern what to retain and what to disregard. It's noteworthy that these students also reported a moderate degree of usage for certain strategies within this category. For instance, Strategy 24 (M = 3.23 and M = 3.10) involved making informed conjectures about the text's content as they read, and Strategy 27 (M = 3.68 and M = 3.76) encompassed verifying the accuracy of their educated predictions about the text.

Furthermore, within this subcategory, the students indicated a moderate utilization of critical strategies such as Strategy 20 ($M = 3.16$ and $M = 2.62$), Strategy 15 ($M = 2.97$ and $M = 2.71$), and Strategy 21 ($M = 3.42$ and $M = 2.86$). These strategies involved identifying essential information, tables, figures, and illustrations in the text to enhance comprehension. Additionally, they aimed to critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text, leveraging typographical features like boldface and italics.

It's worth mentioning that these students also displayed a moderate level of engagement in text evaluation, taking note of details like text length and structure (Strategy 8, $M = 2.58$ and $M = 2.95$). However, they still struggled to fully grasp the significance of text length and structure, particularly when summarizing academic information.

These findings indicate that students at all proficiency levels recorded high levels of use of metacognitive strategies. In other words, the differences between these students are not that big. Although there are small differences, there are important differences to note in the results. Students across proficiency levels mostly recorded moderate to high strategy use. In problem solving strategies successful students use strategy 11 (I adjust my reading speed according to what I read), strategy 14 (when the text becomes difficult, I pay more attention to what I read), and strategy 25 (when the text becomes difficult, I read it again to increase my understanding) therefore, most of the successful students used these strategies more often when reading English texts than students who were less successful. Further, in supported reading strategies, strategy 29 (when reading, I translate from English into my native language) and strategy 30 (when reading, I think about information in both English and my mother's tongue) were recorded as high by successful students. And the last global reading strategies less successful students use more when reading English texts in strategies 27 (I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong). The conclusion is that

strategies frequently use by successful students problem-solving strategies and support reading strategies more often, whereas strategies frequently use by less successful is global reading strategies. This finding may indicate to researchers that students were explicitly taught these strategies or that students did not find the survey questions explicit enough to select problem solving strategies, support reading strategies, and global reading strategies in their surveys.

The normality test is used to determine whether the distribution of the data studied comes from a normally distributed population or not. There is a technique that can be used to test data normality, namely using Shapiro Wilk (Sugiyono, 2020: 258).

Tabel 4.5 The Normality Test

Tests of Normality		
	Shapiro-Wilk	
	Statistic	Sig.
Successful Students	.956	.414
Unsuccessful Students	.952	.343
.a. Sig. is a lower bound of the true significance.		
.b. Lilliefors Significance Correction		

In table 4.2 the normality test above shows the significance value (sig) in the metacognitive reading awareness score data for successful students and less successful students were 0.414 and 0.343, which means it is >0.05 . Therefore, the decision to accept H_0 was obtained with the conclusion that the metacognitive reading awareness score data for successful students and less successful students was normally distributed.

The homogeneity test is a technique used to determine whether two or more samples come from the same population or not. The homogeneity test was carried out to determine whether the experimental class and control class learning outcomes data had different

variants or not. The homogeneity test in this study used the Levene Test with the help of the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 23 application.

Tabel 4.6 The Homogeneity Test

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances					
		vene Statistic	L	lf2	g.
ognitive Reading	on Mean	.408	1	51	.526
	on Median	.470	1	51	.496
	on Median and with adjusted df	.470	1	50.027	.496
	on trimmed mean	.426	1	51	.517

In table 4.6, the homogeneity test above shows a significance value based on mean (sig) of 0.526 which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the decision to accept H0 was obtained with the conclusion that the variation in metacognitive reading awareness score data on successful students and less successful students was homogeneous.

The results shows that the results are normally distributed and the results are homogeneous. Therefore, that the one sample t-test analysis can be used because the results are normal, then the analysis is continued with the one sample t-test.

The author used Independent sample t-test analysis to answer the 2 research problems above. A one-sample t-test is a technique for determining whether a sample mean is greater than, equal to, or less than a certain number. In this study, the authors assume that metacognitive reading awareness will arise if the statistical test results exceed or equal the limit determined by the significance level value. Conversely, metacognitive reading awareness will emerge if the statistical test remains within the limits determined by the significance level value.

H0 and H1 are the research hypothesis. Between successful and less successful students, there is no difference in H0, which measures metacognitive reading awareness. Between successful and less successful students, there is a difference in H1, which stands for metacognitive reading awareness. Using the SPSS Version 23.0 application, the author entered and evaluated the data gleaned from the results of the questionnaire test. The variance, mean, and t-count are then calculated, followed by the test statistics. The significance level value of 0.05 is chosen by the author after determining the t value in order to create the t table. The SPSS application displays the results right away. In this study, if:

- 1) $t_{count} > t_{table}$, H1 is the difference.
- 2) $t_{count} < t_{table}$, H1 there is no difference.

Tabel 4.7 Hypothesis Test

Independent Samples Test										
Levene's Test										
Equality of variances										
t-test for Equality of Means										
Confidence Interval										
t (2-tailed)										
Difference										
Lower										
Upper										
metacognitive	variances	.408	.526	3.253	51	.002	13.23607	4.06915	5.06691	21.40523
reading awareness										
	variances			3.217	43.529	.002	13.23607	4.11453	4.94125	21.53089

In table 4, the hypothesis test using the independent t test above obtained a significance value (sig) of 0.002, which is smaller than 0.05. Therefore, the decision to reject H0 was obtained with the conclusion that there were significant differences into the metacognitive reading awareness score data for successful students and less successful

students. This means that the difference in the status of successful students and less successful students has a significant effect on metacognitive reading awareness.

DISCUSSION

After completing research at Junior High School, the data was then examined by researchers using SPSS 23. This research aims to find out whether there are differences in the strategies used and also whether there are differences between successful and less successful students regarding metacognitive reading awareness. To obtain the criteria for successful and less successful students, researchers determined students' midterm scores to categorize them into variables. Data collection was carried out using tests, namely using questionnaires. Successful and less successful students use the same questionnaire questions, which refer to their habits in reading English texts in English lessons.

This study's initial objective is to respond to the research question, "What types of metacognitive reading strategies are frequently used by successful and less successful students?" These findings were in line with those of Yuksel's (2012) study, which found that non-native readers frequently used reading strategies, resulting in a high level of metacognitive awareness. Problem-solving was the reading strategy that EFL students most frequently used, followed by support reading and global reading. These variances are probably the consequence of a number of factors, such as different research contexts, readers' language proficiency, the difficulty of the material, and learning preferences. Furthermore, the findings demonstrating that problem-solving methods were most frequently used in the current study were reliable. According to Mokhtari and Reichard (2004) and Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) in Yuksel (2012), non-native readers employed problem-solving procedures the most because they were so important for comprehension. Students like to use a few strategies in particular when they encounter comprehension issues while reading academic material, including "trying to refocus when losing concentration while reading," "reading slowly," "adjusting the reading speed," and "paying

attention to the reading.". When reading a material, successful readers typically use a certain reading strategy. In order to determine relationships between certain reading techniques and successful or successful second language reading, Hosenfeld (1977) employed a think-aloud procedure. The successful students, for instance, read in broad sentences, skipped unimportant or unimportant terms, and had a good self-concept as readers. They also maintained the meaning of the piece in mind while reading. The less successful students, on the other hand, frequently missed words as irrelevant, read in short phrases, lost the sense of the sentences when decoded, and had a poor self-concept.

Furthermore, can extend our discussion to address the second research question: Does metacognitive awareness of reading strategies differ between successful and less successful students? Gebhard (2009) as cited in Leonardus (2020) identified a set of techniques frequently employed by successful readers, which include strategies such as skipping unfamiliar words, predicting meanings, making inferences about unfamiliar words based on context, avoiding constant translation, seeking out cognates, possessing subject knowledge, drawing conclusions from the text's content, selecting texts aligned with their interests, closely examining illustrations and pictures, and purposefully revisiting content to ensure comprehension.

Phakiti (2003) pointed out that individual characteristics can impact a reader's ability to comprehend text. This is because readers from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds may interpret the same text differently based on their objectives, attitudes, interests, and prior knowledge. Therefore, future research should explore how factors like educational background, language proficiency, learning preferences, and individual differences may influence the utilization of reading strategies.

Nevertheless, as advocated by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001), we emphasize the importance of integrating metacognitive reading strategy instruction into the overall reading curriculum. This integration is crucial for enhancing students' metacognitive understanding of the reading process.

To investigate the relationships between specific reading techniques and successful or unsuccessful second language reading, Hosenfeld (1977) employed a think-aloud procedure. Successful students, for instance, read in broader sentences, skipped unimportant or redundant terms, maintained a strong self-concept as readers, and kept the overall meaning of the text in mind while reading. In contrast, less successful students often overlooked words they deemed irrelevant, read in shorter phrases, lost sentence meaning when decoding, and had a less favorable self-concept as readers.

CONCLUSION

In short, out of a total of 135 students, 32 were categorized as successful students while there were 21 students who were categorized as less successful students, which three types of A/D questionnaires that are problem-solving strategies, support reading strategies and global reading strategies. After research using an adopted questionnaire that has been validated and has calculated, it is concluded that the problem-solving strategies has high overall mean, and the support and global reading strategies has medium overall mean. In short, students use more problem-solving reading strategies to increase their reading awareness

The study's findings led the researchers to the conclusion that successful students and less successful students had significantly different metacognitive reading awareness scores. As a results, significance value (sig) of $0.002 < 0.05$ is in accordance with the hypothesis that H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected. This means that the difference in the status of

successful students and less successful students has a significant differences on metacognitive reading awareness. The type of metacognitive reading awareness strategies mostly used by successful students and less successful is problem solving, support, and followed by global strategies. Successful and less successful students differ in all metacognitive reading awareness strategies. Problem solving, support, and global strategies are the categories of metacognitive reading awareness methods that both successful and less successful students utilize most frequently.

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*, 6(10), 235-244. doi: 10.5539/elt.v6n10p235.
- Anita & Wahyudi, (2021). *The metacognitive awareness of reading strategy used by college learners*. IAIN Bengkulu, DOI: 10.29300/ling.v7i2.4371
- Asy'ari, M., & Ikhsan, M. (2019). The effectiveness of inquiry learning model in improving prospective teachers' metacognition knowledge an metacognition awareness. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 455-470. doi: 10.29333/iji.2019.12229a.
- Berkowitz, E. & T. Cicchelli. (2004). "Metacognitive Strategy Use in Reading of Gifted High Achieving and Gifted Underachieving Middle School" in *Education and Urban Society*, 37(1), pp.37-57.
- Braga, D. B., & Busnardo, J. (2017). *Metacognition and foreign language reading: fostering awareness of linguistic form and cognitive process in the teaching of language through text*. *Lenguas Modernas*, 20, 129-149.
- Brown, A. L. (1978). *Knowing when, where, and how to remember: A problem of metacognition*. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology*, Hillsdale: Erlbaum, Vol. 1 (pp. 77–165).
- Carell, P. L. 1989. *Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading*. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 120-134.
- Collins, A. N. (2015). *Summer reading program: Comparing outcomes for struggling readers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from core.ac.uk › download › pdf.

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Cromley, J. G. & Azevedo, R. (2006). *Self-report of reading comprehension strategies: What are we measuring? Metacognition and Learning*, 1(3), 229-247.
- Dardjito, H. (2019). Students' metacognitive reading awareness and academic English reading comprehension in EFL context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 611-624.
- Djudin, T. (2017). Using metacognitive strategies to improve reading comprehension and solve a word problem. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 124–129. <https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v2i1.151>
- Dohra, Kong-en, and Nisrina (2015). *Investigating Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies to Strengthen Students' Performance in Reading Comprehension*, Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education, Vol. 30, 15–30, 2015
- Dreyer, C. & Nel, C. 2003. *Teaching reading strategies and reading comprehension within a technology-enhanced learning environment*. System, 31, 349-365.
- Flavell, J. H., (1979). *Metacognition and cognitive monitoring*. American Psychologist, 34, 906-911. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- Hamiddin, & Saukah, A. (2020). Investigating metacognitive knowledge in reading comprehension: The case of Indonesian undergraduate students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 608-615. doi:doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23211
- Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and nonsuccessful second language learners. *System*, 5 (2), 110–123.
- Hamiddin, & A, S. (2020). Investigating metacognitive knowledge in reading comprehension: The case of Indonesian undergraduate students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 608-615. doi:doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23211

- Mistar, J., Zuhairi, A., & Yanti, N. (2016). Strategies Training in the Teaching of Reading Comprehension for EFL Learners in Indonesia. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 9 no. 2, 49-56. doi:dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n2p49
- Kanik Uysal, P. and Akyol, H. (2019). Reading Disabilities and Intervention: An Action Research. *Education and Science*, 44(198), 17-35.
- Kuruyer, H. G. (2014). *The effect of enrichment reading program on cognitive process and neural structure of students having reading difficulty*. Doctoral dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Lassiter, S. M. (2019). *The perceptions and beliefs of high-performing teachers who teach struggling readers in low-performing schools* (Doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University, North Carolina.
- Magogwe, J., 2005, 'Language Learning Strategies of Botswana Students: An Exploratory Study', *unpublished PhD Thesis*, Faculty of Education, Edith Cowan University.
- Mokhtari, K. & Sheorey, R., 2002, 'Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies', *Journal of Development Education* 25(3), 2–10.
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (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 Developmental Education*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 2-10.
- Nelson, T. O. (1996). *Consciousness and metacognition*. *American Psychologist*, 51, 102–116.
- Nyssen, S. (2019). *Effects of fountas and pinnell's leveled literacy interventions on student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/a58a57fcce379dccdd78c9e65881e72e/1?pqorigsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

- Phakiti, A. 2003. A closer look at gender and strategy use in L2 reading. *Language Learning* 53: 649-702.
- Seçkin, Ş. (2012). *Reading fluency of elementary students? with and without reading disability*. Master dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Sheorey, R. & Mokhtari, K. 2001. Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*, Vol. 29, 431-449.
- Sidekli, S. (2010). An action research: correcting the fourth-grade students' reading and comprehension problems. *TÜBAR*, 27, 563-580.
- Stump, T. (2018). *The effectiveness of scripted reading programs for struggling readers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED584717>
- Sun, L. (2013). The effect of metacognitive learning strategies on English learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2004-2009.
- Wexler, J. A. P. (2007). *The relative effects of repeated reading, wide reading, and a typical instruction comparison group on the comprehension, fluency, and word reading of adolescents with reading disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/3717>
- Wilson, N. S. & Bai, H. 2010. *The relationships and impact of teachers' metacognitive knowledge and pedagogical understandings of metacognition*. DOI 10.1007/s11409-010-9062-4.
- Yıldız, M. (2010). *The relationship between 5th graders' reading comprehension, reading motivation and reading habits*. Doctoral dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Yuksel, I., & Yuksel, I. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 894-898.
- Zhang, L. & Seepho, S. 2013. Metacognitive Strategy Use and Academic Reading Achievement: Insights from a Chinese Context. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, Vol. 10 No. 1, 54-69.

Malang, 15th of November 2023

Advisor I,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Dr. Alfian Zuhairi', written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Alfian Zuhairi, M.Pd.

NPP.192020001