

INVESTIGATING METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS OF READING STRATEGIES OF THE SECOND YEAR ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STUDENTS

Ayunda Puty Sekarani

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, English Education Department,
University of Islam Malang
ayundaputy.ap@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study was to find out the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies which the students mostly used and could give best comprehension in their daily reading. The subject of this study was 31 second year English education students from University of Islam Malang. The instruments were Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies (MARSI) questionnaire and reading comprehension test. The result showed that the metacognitive reading strategies students most familiar with was global reading strategies (Mean=45.03), secondly followed by support reading strategies (Mean=30.38) and lastly subject (Mean=28.83). The second findings of the study were that the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies that gives the best comprehension for the students are global reading strategies. Thus, the calculation using IBM Statistical for Social Science (SPSS) showed that the uses of global reading strategies by above average students are higher than other strategies.

Keywords: Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, reading comprehension

INTRODUCTION

One of the main important abilities of English language learning is Reading comprehension. Comprehend text properly is necessary in order to achieve a better understanding in the learning process. Zhang (2001) believed that reading is a cognitive interaction between students and text. Therefore, in the reading process, readers are continuously making hypotheses, predicting the text, and they are using their language and vocabulary understanding to arrange text meaning.

Reading is a process of connecting new information with background knowledge to achieve comprehension. Reading is very important because reading act as the bridge so that the students could obtain new knowledge to learn. It is a foundation of learning, and this skill could be obtained by practice. This statement also supported by Emisari (2016), mentioned that reading comprehension is an ability to process information, derive sentences, and discoursing interpretation from the text. This way the students could obtain more meaningful ideas from the reading process.

Reading comprehension is necessary ability in reading. Becker, Frankel, Rowe, and Pearson (2016) argued that comprehension associate with the interaction made between information from a text and reader's knowledge about the world, as well as the context in and through the reading occur. The reader can not withdraw new information without comprehending the content of a text. Abdullah et al. (2015) said that reading comprehension is a complex process involving a combination of text and readers.

Comprehension can be obtained by connecting background knowledge and new information from a text. Carretti, Meneghetti, and De Beni (2006) stated that reading comprehension is a complex ability requiring the capacity to integrate text information with knowledge of the reader and resulting in the elaboration of a mental representation. Therefore comprehending a text is a main goal of reading. By comprehending a text the students could obtain new knowledge and information.

Hou (2012) mentioned that the key element in enhancing comprehension is metacognition which is an individual's awareness in organizing and keep track of the cognition process. Involving thinking ability in the reading comprehension process is Metacognitive strategic knowledge, which means students using metacognitive strategies are having better awareness in processing information in the reading process.

Reading strategies are deliberate, goal-directed action to understand and construct meanings of a text (Pinniti, 2016). The use of metacognitive awareness strategies on reading skills is crucial. Reading strategies could give additional

support to connect what learners are reading to how they are making sense of that text in their minds (Abdullah, Ahmadi, & Ismail 2013). The strategies of metacognitive awareness might vary depending on an individual's preference in comprehending using their self-awareness. Reading strategies could give additional support to connect what learners are reading to how they are making sense of the text in their minds (Abdullah, Ahmadi, & Ismail 2013).

Miller (2017) stated that metacognitive reading strategies and conscious attention in reading are aspects that contribute to learners' comprehension for the students could be independent when they are aware of which strategy works for them to reach their goals faster. The use of metacognitive reading strategies could involve the students in cognitively learning. 3 strategies can be used; global reading strategies, problem-solving strategies; and support reading strategies. A skilled reader uses more metacognitive reading strategies compared to those with less proficiency. So we can assume that the main problem of reading comprehension is in the lack of awareness in metacognitive strategies. Emisari (2016) mentioned that students may separately understand each word, but linking the word together into meaningful ideas often does not happen as it should. The students could decode the words, yet have not the skills to underlying the deeper meaning of a text. An Indonesian student not only has difficulties in comprehending English text but also in decoding the meaning of each word or sentences for English is considered as a foreign language. This could be a problem because Reading strategies could give additional support to connect what learners are reading to how they are making sense of that text in their minds (Abdullah, Ahmadi, & Ismail 2013).

In this study, finding out which metacognitive strategies are most effective and mostly used by the students is essential. Therefore, the researcher conducts research with the title "Investigating Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies of the Second Year English Education Department Students of Unisma".

METHOD

Design

This study was conducted using a quantitative research design. By using the quantitative research method, the researcher wanted to analyze the metacognitive strategy preferred by second-year English students in Unisma. This research was using survey research design to investigate whether the second-year English education department students of Unisma using metacognitive reading strategies in their academic reading, which metacognitive strategy most used, also to find out which metacognitive reading strategy gives the best comprehension. The data will be collected from reading comprehension test and the MARSI questionnaire.

Subject of the Study

The population of this study is from fourth semester of English education department program in University of Islam Malang. The sample of this study was taken using cluster random sampling of 31 fourth semester of English education department program in University of Islam Malang from class D and E.

The procedure of data collection of this study, the researcher converts the test to Google form and sends the test to participants. The participants fill out the online form and the data collected were measured using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS).

FINDINGS

The metacognitive reading strategy the students mostly used in their reading is measured by using the MARSI questionnaire. The data were analyzed by using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) Version 25.0. The sample of this study was 31 second-year students of the English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Unisma.

The sampling technique used in this study is Cluster random sampling. The researcher used class D and E as the sample of this research because both classes voluntary in helping the study and have the same lecturer. The data obtained by the researcher from the lecturer, the questionnaire about

metacognitive reading strategies was adopted from Mokhtari and Reichard (2002). The questionnaire contains 30 statements to measure the students' metacognitive reading strategies. In this research the researcher Translate the questionnaire into Bahasa Indonesia for better participants' understanding.

The second-year students are considered as an advanced reader for they have completed the Reading 3 course from the University of Islam Malang. The researcher found out that all of the students are familiar with or have used all of the metacognitive strategies in their reading. The result from the questionnaire the students are all of the strategies, but out of the three strategies, there is always one dominant strategy being used by students in their daily reading. The data overviews based on the identification of metacognitive strategy used by the students are as follows:

Table. 1 The Mean of Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Reading Strategies	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Maximum
PROB	31	28.839	4.5978	40.0
SUP	31	30.387	4.5729	39.0
GLOB	31	45.032	7.1995	60.0

The descriptive statistic computation on Metacognition awareness of reading strategies above showed that the participants in this study are 31 college students (N=31) and the mean of the students' metacognitive awareness strategies are 28.839 for the problem-solving strategies, 30.387 for the support strategies, and 45.032 for the global strategies. The table of means above reported that the highest mean score is for global reading strategies.

According to the result, the calculation indicates that global reading strategies has the higher score, followed by support reading strategies and problem solving strategies. Therefore, the reading strategies mostly used by second-year students of English Education Department at UNISMA are global reading strategies.

To answer the second research question, the data were obtained by using MARSI questionnaire and reading comprehension test. This research used

31 second-year students from class D and E of English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education UNISMA as the sample. The results are as follows.

Table 2 Mean Score of Students' Reading Comprehension Test.

N	Mean	Std. Deviation
31	45,26	13,959

The table above presented the mean of students' reading comprehension score. The table showed that the reading comprehension mean of all the students were 45.26, which mean there were 11 students with the score above the average of other participants.

Table 3 Mean Score of Above Average Students

No	Students' code name	Glob score	Prob score	Sup score	Test score
1.	AR	50	32	36	50
2.	AZ	39	24	26	66
3.	DL	35	25	22	61
4.	FD	49	29	34	47
5.	LI	45	32	29	65
6.	LF	37	24	27	46
7.	MSA	47	32	28	54
8.	NK	55	36	25	47
9.	SA	43	27	30	61
10.	SNH	60	40	36	100
11.	SAA	45	33	32	49
Mean		46	30.4	29.5	58.7

The table above described the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies score and reading comprehension score of above the average students. The calculation of table above were using IBM SPSS version 25. From the table the mean score (N=11) of global reading strategies was 46, this score was higher than problem-solving strategies with 30.4 and support strategies with 29.5. In meaning, the strategies that could give best comprehension are global reading strategies.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to discover which specific metacognitive strategies mostly used and which strategies could improve the reading comprehension of the students in second-year students of English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Islam Malang.

The result from the question “Which metacognitive reading strategy is mostly used by the second year English education department students of Unisma?” implied that the students most commonly used global reading strategies, then followed by support and problem-solving reading strategies. From the result of IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) mean analysis, out of 31 students the mean of global reading strategies score was 45.032; support reading strategies was 30.387; and problem-solving reading strategies was 28.839.

These results showed that the students are more familiar with global reading strategies where Ihrom, Maryam, and Nurlaelawati (2018) stated that the students are accustomed to employ a variety of techniques. The techniques are such as planning how to read and manage comprehension on a text, previewing the text as to its length and organization, etc. This general outcome is alike to previous study by Al-Mekhlafi (2017) where there are no significant differences in the use of metacognitive reading strategies of the students. Collectively the result of this study showed that all of the students are familiar with metacognitive reading strategies, only one strategies are used a little bit more than the other.

The result for the second research question “Which metacognitive reading strategy gives the best comprehension on the second year English education department students of Unisma?” showed that out of the 11 students (N=11) with above the average score has 46 as the mean of global reading strategies, 30.4 as the mean of problem-solving reading strategies, and 29.5 for the mean of support reading strategies. From the data from previous calculation, the mean score showed that the students with higher score tend to use global reading strategies in their reading. Therefore, the data implied that metacognitive

awareness of reading strategies which could give the best comprehension for the students is global reading strategies.

This study also found that the use of metacognitive reading strategies provides some advantages for students' reading comprehension, it means that the reading proficiency of the students are better if the students use the metacognitive reading strategies as a whole in their reading. However, this result did not determine that reading strategies only rely on the use of specific metacognitive reading strategies Fitriasia, Tan, and Yusuf (2015) state in their research that there were no notable differences in the mean level of MARSII between good and poor reader.

The use of metacognitive awareness strategies depend on individual's awareness and Flavell (1979) stated that individuals could find out and process their own cognitive product and anything related to their learning. The score of metacognitive reading strategies are high yet the score for the students reading comprehension test mostly low. As the case may be the same as the previous study of Fitriasia, Tan, and Yusuf (2015) where the sample of the study are aware of metacognitive reading strategies, yet did not supervise or implement them in improving the comprehension. Therefore, the students need to understand how to implement the use of reading strategies to aid their comprehension.

This study also finds that there are no significant correlation between specific metacognitive reading strategies and reading strategies. The students had good score on their MARSII questionnaire but mostly low score on their reading comprehension test. This implied that the students can be familiar with the strategies of metacognitive reading but did not know how to aid or implement them in their daily reading. Mokhtari and Reichard 2002 said that it is not enough for students to know the proper reading strategies; they have to be able to apply and use the strategies for their reading comprehension progress. As EFL students in Indonesia the use of these reading strategies are not entirely taught properly, thus the students do not know when to assist themselves with the proper metacognitive strategies in reading a text. This situation also connected with the fact that English is taught as a foreign language in Indonesia. The exposure of

English language is still unfamiliar to the students. Students should be trained to be aware of various range of reading strategies so they could appropriately aid the correct strategies to achieve comprehension (Anderson, 2004).

To sum up, global reading strategies were the most frequently used strategies. These strategies are a well-managed strategy where the reader is having goals in mind and previewing the text as to its length and organization, or using typographical aids and tables and figures. Furthermore, the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies which could give the best comprehension is global reading strategies.

CONCLUSION

The first data described in the previous chapter showed that the mean of students metacognitive awareness of reading strategies Global reading strategies mean was 45.032; Support reading strategies mean was 30.387; Problem-solving strategies mean was 28.839. This data result could answer the stated research question from the first chapter that the metacognitive reading strategies mostly used by the students are global reading strategies.

The second data collected from 11 students with above average reading comprehension test score. The calculation showed that global reading strategies have the highest mean followed by problem-solving reading strategies and support reading strategies. Therefore, these results could answer the second research question which the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies that could give the best comprehensions global reading strategies. The result of high MARSII score yet averagely low reading comprehension score showed that the students are aware and familiar with the strategies in metacognitive reading strategies, yet could not implement them in their daily reading.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. K., Ahmadi, M. R., & Ismail, H. N. (2013). English language teaching. *The Importance of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension*, 6(10), 235-244. doi: 10.5539/elt.v6n10p235
- Al-Mekhlafi, A. M.(2018). EFL learners metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 297-308. e-ISSN: 1308-1470
- Anderson, N. J. (2004). Metacognitive reading strategies awareness of ESL and EFL learners. *The Catesol Journal*, 16(1), 11-27. retrieved from http://www.catesoljournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CJ16_anderson.pdf
- Anderson, R. C., Beck, I., Brophy, J., Chall, J. S., Glaser, R., Ringler, L.,... Talbot, S. (1985). *Becoming a nation readers: the report of the commission on reading*. Washington, DC: National Inst. Of Education, Washington, DC.
- Becker, B., Frankel, K., Pearson, P. D., & Rowe, M. (2016). From “what is reading?” to what is literacy. *Becoming a Nation of Readers: Retrospectives and Visions*, 196(3), 7-17. doi: 10.1177/002205741619600303
- Banerjee, A., Chaudhury, S. (2020). Statistics without tears: population and samples. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 19(1), 60-65. doi: 10.4103/0972-6748.77642
- Carretti, B., De Beni, R., & Meneghetti, C. (2006). Components of reading comprehension and scholastic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 16, 291-301. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2006.11.001
- Emisari. (2016). *Metacognitive reading strategy training for high school students at SMAN 1 Metro*. University Bandar Lampung
- Fitrisia, D., Tan, K. E., Yusuf, Y. Q. (2015). Investigating metacognitive awareness of reading strategies to strengthen students’ performance in reading comprehension. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education*, 30, 15-30. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/294086146_Investigating_Metacognitive_Awareness_of_Reading_Strategies_to_Strengthen_Students'_Performance_in_Reading_Comprehension
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: a new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>

- Hou, Y. J. (2012). International journal of arts & sciences. *Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies and multiple intelligences in prediction of English reading comprehension with medical junior college students*, 6(4), 9-18. ISSN: 1944.6934
- Ihrom, S. M., Maryam, I. S., Nurlaelawati, I. (2018). The correlation between metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension among 1st year EFL students at a public university in West Java. *Education and Humanities Research*, 254, 436-446. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-18.2019.298>
- Miller, Gulhan. (2017). *Metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use: investigating the intermediate level ESL students' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies*. St. Clous State University.
- Mokhtari, K., Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259. DOI: 10.1037//0022-0663.94.2.249
- Pinninti, L. R. (2016). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies: an Indian context. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 16(1), 179-193. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2801610>
- Yuksel, I., Yuksel, I. (2011). Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31(2012), 894-898. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.164
- Zhang, L. J. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. *Language Awareness*, 10(4), 268-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410108667039>

Advisor I,



Dr. Muhammad Yunusi, S.PD., M.Pd.
NPP. 2090200002