Research Paper

Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 13, Number 4, 2023, (pp.111-122)

Implicit and Explicit Instruction of Reading Strategies and the Application of Metacognitive Strategies by Iranian EFL Freshmen Students

Marjan Mehrpour[1], Mostafa Zamaniyan[2]*, Firooz Sadighi[3] , Ehsan Hadipour Fard[4]
[1]PhD candidate in TEFL, Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
[2*]Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
[3]Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
[4]Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

Received: February 01, 2022 Accepted: May 21, 2022

Abstract
This quantitative research explores the implicit and explicit instruction of reading strategies and their connection through the application of metacognitive strategies by Iranian EFL students. To this purpose, 100 Iranian university freshmen, aged 20-35, studying at the Marwdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, were selected as participants through a convenient sampling method, from a pool of 117 students. Then, the Key English Test (KET) was used to check their homogeneity. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was also used as a pre-test and post-test to specify the kind and occurrence sequence of learning strategies applied by the participants before and after the treatment. So, the participants were allotted to two experimental groups and received implicit and explicit instruction on reading strategies respectively. The results obtained from statistical data analysis showed that affective strategies were the very frequently applied strategies, while memory strategies were the least frequently applied strategies in the explicit group. It was also found that in the implicit group, cognitive strategies were the most frequently applied strategies, while social strategies were the least frequently applied strategies. These results have pedagogical implications for EFL teachers to use appropriate approaches in teaching reading strategies, that will ultimately help the students to develop more awareness and competence in reading comprehension.

Keywords: Explicit strategy, implicit strategy, Iranian EFL learners, metacognitive strategies, reading strategies

INTRODUCTION

Cognitive resources comprise a wide variety of learning strategies, which Cohen (1998) describes as "deliberately selected learning procedures by learners" (p. 4) that smooth the learning development. The soundness of 'choice' as an idiosyncratic characteristic of learning strategies, however, was interrogated by Dornie (2005), who appropriately clarified its incapability to differentiate strategies from strategic procedures. Because students make many selections regarding their learning development, they are not planned ... and do not need to have fitting and careful behavior to improve the learning outcome "(p. 165) yet, Riding and Rainer (1998) emphasized deliberate choice and strategic approach. The importance of application and the strategic activities that

*****Corresponding Author's Email: *mostafazamanian03@gmail.com*

learners deliberately select and use for their practice is defined in terms of 'appropriateness' used strictly to promote the impact of experiences.

A central part of a language learning program is strategic teaching. Strategic teaching has an impact on student learning. Strategies are demarcated as "a set of activities that an individual deliberately pursues to achieve the favorite goal" (Graham, Harris, & Santangelo, 2008, p. 81). Reid & Lienemann (2006) point out that we practice strategies to make things simpler. Oxford (1990) contends that strategies are vital for L2 learning because they are means for dynamic, self-reliant participation, which are crucial for improving communicative skills. Language acquisition and language practice strategies are absorbing attention in the arenas of foreign language teaching and learning (Oxford 1990; O'Malley and Chamot 1990). Oxford (1990) stated that L2 learners are permitted strategies to take obligation for their own language learning and to resolve learning difficulties. Evolving metacognition mindfulness is important for speculative accomplishment. Anderson (2008) well-defined metacognition as pondering about thought. It is "the capacity to thin on what is acknowledged. Metacognition brings about a difficult but vigorous echo and valuation of thought, leading to precise fluctuations in how practice is directed and the strategies preferred for this goal." Can "(p. 99).

In the past twenty years, there have been numerous studies on the use of metacognitive strategies in language learning. Learners face two central problems in their endeavors to learn the target language of their choice or due to personal situations. In foreign language learning, as in L1 and L2 learning, it is hard to acquire satisfactory language involvement inside and outside educational organizations. This shortcoming results in the necessity to create a scheme that assists learners to improve their language ability in the most effective way, allowing them to promote the gaining and retaining of practical language. Most studies about classroom intercessions that comprise metacognition as a portion of their plans reflect the influence of metacognitive exercise on the theoretical achievement of L2 learners (Kasaian & Gadiri, 2011; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Zhang and Wu, 2009). Innumerable pieces of research have shown that L2 learners grow meta-cognitive cognizance in response to intercessions.

As mentioned, the present study focuses on the bearing of two different strategies on learners' perceptual ability to read by applying metacognitive strategies and attempts to find differences between this recent research and recent studies in some other areas. For this, some conclusions are presented here. Findings from several studies (Shokrpur and Fotovatian, 2009; Alhaqbani and Riazi, 2012; Jaffrey and Madhumati and Ghosh, 2012; Suleimani and Hajghani, 2013) help students improve their reading comprehension. Appeared for. Although some encourage students to use strategies, reading strategy instruction does not statistically augment students' reading achievement.

Shokrpour and Fotovatian (2009) in their research studied the impacts of metacognitive strategies on EFL reader perception. The outcomes showed a substantial development in the experimental group skilled to determinedly apply metacognitive strategies in their reading tasks likened to the control group.

Jafary and Shokrpour (2012) concluded in their study that Iranian ESP students inspect their reading strategies while reading reliable expressive texts in English. Their research showed that participants had a modest knowledge of reading strategies and the strategies they frequently applied were backing strategies, then general strategies, and then strategies that remove problems. Zare (2013) in his research of 80 Iranian EFL learners discovered that learners could be regarded as moderate strategic users and that there was no substantial variance in the application of reading strategies between language learners of a different gender. They likewise distinguished that the application of reading strategies has a robust constructive association with reading comprehension accomplishment.

The current study aims to develop ways in which learners can promote the application of metacognitive strategies to improve their reading comprehension strategies through clear and implicit instructions. This research additionally

shows how teachers can help improve attitudes toward students.

Metacognitive strategies by the specified instructions increase not only the frequency but also the quality of the metacognitive strategy. This study aims to close the major research gap by introducing metacognitive strategies to improve learners' reading comprehension strategies by implementing implicit and explicit instructions in the classroom. To achieve the objectives of the study, the research questions stated below were designed:

Q1. *Does explicit teaching of reading strategies have any significant bearing on metacognitive use by Iranian EFL learners?*

Q2. *Does the implicit teaching of reading strategies have any significant bearing on metacognitive use by Iranian EFL learners*?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Teaching Reading Comprehension is about teaching students many strategies to use when trying to understand the focal point of a lesson and combining these two principles in a public discussion while students read the lesson. This requires the identification of operative strategies that strengthen awareness. In line with these recent changes to focus on operating L2, more experienced practitioners will try to understand what they are learning, what strategies they are using, and how, why, and when they have a strong focus on implementing strategies (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). To improve this, language learning and language strategies have always been focused on areas of L2 teaching and learning (Cohen and Macaro, 2007). Numerous studies have supported the idea that the practice of proper learning strategies empowers students to take charge of their own learning by developing their unconventionality and self-control (Oxford and Nikos, 1989). O'Malley et al. (1985) recommended that effective language learning strategies for learners, once acknowledged and efficaciously taught, should have the power to promote language progress. Oxford (1990) provides an inclusive outline of language learning strategies, "Language learning strategies assist the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information. Definite steps are taken to make learning quicker, more agreeable, autonomous, functional, and further transported to future circumstances." (p. 8).

Oxford's language learning strategies model entails six sections: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, cognitive strategies, emotional strategies, and social strategies. In language learning strategies, comprehension strategies are considered to be sophisticated skills that utilize cognitive processes and attempt to control individual learning through planning, monitoring, and evaluation. When used in practice, metacognitive strategies are self-monitoring and self-regulatory actions that focus on both the learning process and production. Students' perceptions of whether or not they can understand what they are reading, their ability to determine the psychological needs of the learning task, and the context of the textual complexity, specific reading comprehension strategy are relevant. Have knowledge of when and how to apply. Obstacles and Students' Cognitive Skills (Baker & Brown, 1984). Students who do not have the basics to comprehend knowledge are basically referred to as students who do not have the guidance or prospect to assess their advancement, achievements, and future learning orientations (O'Malley et al., 1985). The practice of metacognitive strategies in the learning process often provides an important complement to its cognitive, social, and linguistic benefits.

According to Chamot (2001), learning strategies are central for acquiring an L2 for two important reasons. First, better recognition of comprehension, socialization, and language learning processes can be achieved by probing the strategies used by L2 learners in the learning process. Second, it is possible to teach less efficacious language learners to apply the strategies used by positive learners to become better language learners. He also emphasized that the two main objectives of language learning strategies are to detect and compare the strategies applied by less successful students, and then to help those with less success to learn foreign and other languages

successfully. Furthermore, strategic learning is a simple and clear learning strategy that helps L2 students grow the capacity to use operative strategies to broaden their recognition. In many research studies, strategists consider language learning important because of the importance of strategic teaching. As strategic learning benefits L2 students and improves their L2 learning, priority is given to strategic learning and teaching methods.

There have been some empirical studies on reading strategies. They specifically examined the practice of metacognitive strategies and their use in developing students' reading comprehension (e.g., Al-Haqbani and Riazi, 2012; Al-Khatib). Accordingly, over the past two decades, Comprehension Instruction and Reading-Strategy Instruction have joined. Furthermore, much research on classroom interventions that include metacognition as a portion of their plans examines the effect of metacognitive teaching on the academic accomplishment of L2 learners (Kasaian & Ghadiri, 2011; Sheorey et al., 2011). 2001; Zhang and Wu, 2009). Various studies have revealed that L2 practitioners develop a meta-cognitive perception in reaction to interferences. For instance, Everson and Tobias (1998) examined the relationship between the vocabulary measured by grade and the metacognitive perception of L2 learners on academic performance. All participants developed both lexical information and an understanding of their terminology knowledge. In another research, Burchard and Svardzewski (2009) examined strategic learning curricula involving students with and without debilities. The results showed that the participating students benefited from metacognition from the outset of the semester to its end. In addition, Hong-Nam and Leavell (2011) conducted a study at the University of Texas to look at the impact of Reading Strategy Instruction on metacognition for university readers. The teaching emphasizes the meaning of the word, understanding the focal notions and supportive details, finding the author's purpose, and exploiting strategies for serious analysis of the passage. Study results have shown that reading strategy teaching has a constructive effect on students' metacognitive strategic reading.

Many studies have been conducted by different researchers in the area of metacognition regarding different skills, and their results have provided a new perspective and insight for other researchers to broaden their perceptual strategies. McLoughlin, et al. (2000) have shown that in order to develop student awareness educators need to teach students cognitive skills through modeling. By learning metacognitive skills, students can monitor their problem-solving skills. Similarly, Salataci and Akyel (2002) demonstrated the importance of applying training instructions to cognitive strategies among Turkish students. The authors have attempted to demonstrate that metacognitive training strategies clearly, affect the cognitive functioning of EFL students. The study involved 20 EFL students selected by a Turkish university. In addition to pre-test and post-test in Turkish and English, the authors used observational techniques, interviews, and thought processes among eight students. Participants were taught metacognitive strategies including, how to monitor their learning, and how to apply their background information for four weeks, each three-hour week. The findings revealed that before and after the training there were differences in learning strategies. After the training program, both Turkish and English used local techniques such as “dictionary usage and focus on grammar or vocabulary,” and after the internship training process such as “prediction, investigating key ideas, and summarizing”. Therefore, the findings showed that explicit training of metacognitive strategies has a positive impact on the use of global strategies among EFL students.

The results of Al-Melhi's (2000) study on learning strategies and metacognitive awareness of a random sample of fourth-year Saudi college students studying English as a foreign language showed that there was a difference among skilled and unskilled students about real and informed learning strategies, their use of general and specific strategies, their metacognitive awareness, their awareness of a

good student, and their self-confidence as students. The second phase of the course was done to examine the bearing of the learning strategy teaching on student performance. Based on a detailed analysis of general strategies for elementary and middle school students in the United States, it was concluded that instructional application of reading strategies has an encouraging bearing on student achievement in Grades 4-8.

Wright and Brown (2006) explore the potential of teaching strategies for developing learners' knowledge of reading strategies, expanding the variety of strategies they have used, and inspiring students to be more careful and reflective in their learning. The findings showed that strategic training could encourage students to think about how they use the strategy and seemed to increase their self-confidence in their learning skills. Salataci and Akyel (2002) are investigating the potential implications of education for learning in Turkish and English. The results showed that teaching strategies had a constructive impact on both Turkish and English learning strategies and learning comprehension in English.

Roohani, Hashemian, (2016) evaluated the effectiveness of the guidelines for developing a self-regulatory strategy in developing Iranian students' metacognition, to see if education could improve the recognition of EFL students, and to liken the efficacy of strategic with non-strategic (i.e., outdated) instructions. To realize the research objective, 70 Iranian L2 students in two medium-level language proficiency groups were allotted to the control and evaluation team. Both groups received instruction during a one-month teaching period. *T*-test data analysis showed that explicit strategic instructions had an encouraging effect on the perception of participants' metacognition in the experimental group.

A consideration of the studies stated above reveals that there is still an absence of research to explore the probable rapport between metacognitive learning strategies and students' growth of reading comprehension within the Iranian setting. The research cited above proves that the metacognitive training strategy is important and many researchers have emphasized that, in order to help students, improve their reading skills, providing clear instructions on how to use mindfulness techniques is needed.

METHOD

Design

In the current study, a quantitative method was employed study to address the posed research questions. Due to the university regulations that imposed restrictions on the selection of participants, they were chosen on the basis of a favorable model approach, and since the number of students in each class was insufficient, two classes were allocated as treatment groups to accommodate a sufficient number of participants for the study.

Participants

Among the participants in the current study were 20 male/female students aged 20-35, studying at the Marwdasht Branch of the Iranian University Freshmen, Islamic Azad University. They were selected by purposive sampling from a pool of 117 students. They were majors in Mechanical Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Management and were taking a three-credit course in General English prior to the English for Special Purpose (ESP) course. Since the participants belonged to two intact classes, a random sample was not possible. To remove this restraint, a Key English Test (KET) was conducted at the beginning of the study to confirm the initial homogeneity of the participants.

Instrumentation

Two research tools were exploited for the objectives of the present study, 1) the Key English Test (KET, 2005), and 2) the metacognitive component of Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (1990). The Key English Test is a standard first-level Cambridge English test for speakers of other languages (ESOL), designed to homogenize participants in the current study. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) consists of six broad disciplines with 50 items that measure language learners' memory, cognitive and remedial direct strate-

gies, and concepts of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Part A of the SILL Questionnaire measures memory strategies (ie, effective memorization) with grouping, imagery, and rhyme. Part B consists of 14 elements to gauge cognitive strategies (i.e., intellectual procedures such as reasoning, analysis, and summary). Part C issues reimbursement strategies (i.e., reimbursement for sufficient information), for example, guessing meaning, using synonyms, and switching to the mother tongue. Metacognitive strategies (i.e., maintaining and evaluating) are gauged in Part D, which consists of 8 elements. Part D comprises metacognitive strategies that include focusing, managing, delaying speech, trying to find exercises, and tracking errors. In addition to affective strategies (i.e. dealing with emotions), there are stress reduction, self-motivation, and self-reward strategies here. Part E consists of six elements (39–44). Social strategies (i.e., learning with others) are gauged in Part F (last six elements, 45 to 50). Asking questions, collaborating with others, and cultivating cultural awareness are instances of factors that measure social strategies for language learners. To summarize the integration rating of the whole and each component of SILL, Oxford (1990) created a 3-level profile scale that suggests using the following: 1 (3.5 - 5.0 = high, normal or almost normally used), 2 (2.5 - 3.4 = moderate), occasionally used) and 3 (1.0 - 2.4 = less commonly, no longer used).

Data Collection Process

To collect the needed data, the Key English Test was run at the onset of the research, and the scores were scrutinized to denote the homogeneity of the groups before the treatment. Two groups consisting of 100 students served as the experimental groups (50 participants in each group). It is to be noted that on the basis of the standard deviation (see Table 1), the students whose scores oscillated between 62 and 74, were selected as the chief participants (N=100). The researcher first demonstrated the strategies to the students and provided them with adequate practice on how to apply them when reading. Then, before the treatment, to make sure that there was no substantial variance in reading comprehension capability between the two groups, the reading comprehension pre-test was run to the two experimental groups. It is worth stating that the Metacognitive part of Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (1990) was used twice during the semester, after the pre-test and when treatment ended. Also, the focal concentration of the current study was teaching reading strategies through explicit and explicit instruction to examine the bearing of the mentioned instructions on metacognitive strategies. The reading strategies that were instructed were, 1) using context clues, 2) understanding words with more than one meaning, 3) previewing, 4) making inferences, 5) scanning, 6) understanding the difference between facts and opinions, 7) summarizing, 8) identifying the topic and main idea, 9) making predictions, 10) using context clues, 11) reading words in chunks, and 12) asking yourself questions while you read during the 12-session semester. Explicit and implicit groups were both subjected to the same materials; only the instruction was done in a different manner. The students in the implicit group were requested to discover the strategies by themselves, respond to each question, and produce their own devices for discerning the language. These strategies were highlighted by Sill's Likert-scale Survey, as well as a list of other strategies that researchers consider useful in understanding reading paths together, previously developed and practiced by researchers.

Data Analysis Procedure

To guarantee the reliability of the KET used in the research, inter-rater reliability between test content reliability statistics and KET scores was demonstrated. Then, an independent sample T-test was performed to see if the groups were homozygous before treatment. After that, an independent sample *t*-test was applied to find out if the groups acted contrarily in the Reading Comprehension Pre-Test. Frequency analysis was performed to find out what strategies students used and whether strategic use changes over time with the progress of treatment.

RESULTS

In order to check the homogeneity of implicit and explicit groups before the treatment, independent samples *t-test* was run. The percentage of the test scores is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Independent Samples T-test of Homogeneity Test Scores in Implicit and Explicit Groups (N=100)

		Levene's Test for Equality ofVariances		T-Test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Variables	Equal Variances Assumed	.919	.340	.426	98	. 671	-.46000	1.07882	2.60089	1.68089
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			.426	97.586		.46000	1.07882	2.60100	1.68100

As shown in Table 1 above, the sig. level (Sig=.671) designates that the two groups were homogeneous and the sig. level is higher than the p-value (p > .05). Additionally, before the treatment and to ensure that no significant change in reading comprehension capacity existed between the two experimental groups, implicit and explicit, the reading comprehension pre-test was administered. The descriptive statistics of the means of the reading comprehension pre-test are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Means Pre-test (N=100)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Implicit pre-test	50	44.00	66.00	55.1200	6.08323
Explicit pre-test	50	46.00	66.00	55.9200	5.58365
Valid N (listwise)	50				

As illustrated in Table 2, the mean scores of the experimental groups, implicit and explicit, were 55.12 and 55.92, respectively, before implementing the treatment. Independent Samples t-test of reading comprehension pre-test scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100) is illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Independent Samples T-test of Reading Comprehension Pre-test Scores in Explicit and Implicit Groups (N=100)

		Levene's Test for Equality ofVariances		T-Test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Variables	Equal Variances Assumed	.326	.569	-.685	98	.495	-.80000	1.16776	-3.11738	1.51738
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			-.685	97.289	.495	-.80000	1.16776	-3.11759	1.51759

Table 3 (the sig. level (Sig=.495) shows that the two groups were homogeneous before the treatment, as the sig. level is higher than the p-value (p > .05).

The metacognitive strategies were emphasized by the Likert-scaled investigation and a list of other strategies presumed to be valuable in realizing the reading passages were first modeled and practiced by the researchers. The objective of this segment of the research was to make the students practice a wider variety of strategies from the simple appreciation of words to discerning the overall and thorough meaning of lengthier texts, but metacognitive strategies were not taught by the researcher. Descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the implicit group in the pre-test (N=50) are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of Means of Metacognitive Strategies in Implicit Group in Pre-test (N=50)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Metacognitive Strategies	27	1.26	3.05	2.1448	.49822
Compensation Strategies	18	1.00	2.81	1.9044	.47761
Affective Strategies	18	1.26	2.68	1.8161	.45295
Cognitive Strategies	42	1.00	3.00	1.7955	.43756
Social Strategies	18	1.00	2.31	1.7083	.32037
Memory Strategies	27	1.00	3.00	1.6552	.44843

Table 4 above represents descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the implicit group in the pre-test. As shown in Table 4, metacognitive strategies with a mean score of 2.14 and standard deviation of .498 were found to be the most frequently-applied strategies by Iranian EFL learners while memory strategies with a mean score of 1.65 and standard deviation of .448 were found as the least frequently-applied strategies in implicit instruction group in the pre-test. Compensation strategy was followed by metacognitive strategy (M=1.90, SD=.477), affective strategy (M= 1.81, SD= .453), cognitive strategy (M=1.79, SD=.437), and social strategies (M=1.70, SD=.320). The descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the explicit group in the pre-test are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics of Means of Metacognitive Strategies in Explicit Group in Pre-test (N=50)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Metacognitive Strategies	27	1.27	3.09	2.1489	.54527
Compensation Strategies	18	1.00	2.72	1.9939	.47476
Cognitive Strategies	42	1.00	2.66	1.9157	.38707
Affective Strategies	18	1.42	2.88	1.8972	.34207
Memory Strategies	27	1.00	2.76	1.7826	.48852
Social Strategies	18	1.00	2.66	1.7078	.40206

Table 5 shows descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the explicit group in the pre-test. As revealed in Table 5, metacognitive strategies with a mean score of 2.14 and standard deviation of .545 were found to be the most frequently used strategies by Iranian EFL learners while social strategies with a mean score of 1.70 and standard deviation of .402 were found as the slightest frequently applied strategy in explicit instruction group in the pre-test. Metacognitive strategy was followed by compensation strategy (M=1.99, SD=.474), cognitive strategy (M= 1.91, SD= .387), affective strategy (M=1.89, SD=.342), and memory strategies (M=1.78, SD=.488). The descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the implicit group in the post-test are illustrated in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Means of Metacognitive Strategies in Implicit Group in Post-test (N=50)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cognitive Strategies	42	2.69	5.00	3.8648	.54848
Compensation Strategies	18	3.00	5.86	3.8050	.65648
Memory Strategies	27	2.76	4.60	3.7789	.51017
Affective Strategies	18	2.28	3.86	3.4111	.34592
Metacognitive Strategies	27	2.61	5.13	3.3144	.46990
Social Strategies	18	2.53	3.40	3.0122	.21613

Table 6 displays descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the implicit group in the post-test. As revealed in Table 6, cognitive strategies with a mean score of 3.86 and a standard deviation of .548 were found to be the most frequently used strategies by Iranian EFL learners while social strategies with a mean score of 3.01 and standard deviation of .216 were found as the least frequently used strategy in the implicit instruction group in the post-test. Compensation strategy was tracked by cognitive strategy (M=3.80, SD=.656), memory strategy (M= 3.77, SD= .510), affective strategy (M=3.41, SD=.345), and metacognitive strategies (M=3.31, SD=.469). The descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the explicit group in post-test are shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of Means of Metacognitive Strategies in Explicit Group in Post-test (N=50)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Affective Strategies	18	3.44	4.92	4.1983	.43165
Metacognitive Strategies	27	3.08	4.78	4.0078	.49792
Social Strategies	18	3.04	4.92	3.9661	.39354
Compensation Strategies	18	2.58	4.00	3.0872	.42194
Cognitive Strategies	42	2.30	3.83	2.9917	.33108
Memory Strategies	27	2.00	3.70	2.7048	.46687

Table 7 shows descriptive statistics of means of metacognitive strategies in the explicit group in the post-test. As shown in Table 7, affective strategies with a mean score of 4.19 and standard deviation of .431 were found to be the most frequently used strategies by Iranian EFL learners while memory strategies with a mean score of 2.70 and standard deviation of .466 were found as the least frequently used strategy in the explicit instruction group in post-test. Metacognitive strategy was followed by affective strategy (M=4.00, SD=.497), social strategy (M= 3.96, SD= .393), compensation strategy (M=3.08, SD=.421), and cognitive strategies (M=2.99, SD=.331).

DISCUSSION

The present study provides a clear indication of reading strategies affecting the metacognitive strategies of Iranian EFL practitioners. Metacognitive strategies with average scores,

with standard deviations of 2.14 and .545, respectively, as shown in Table 5, are considered the most commonly used strategies by Iranian EFL practitioners in the explicit group, although there are standard differences of 1.70 social strategies with .402. And on average .402 are used less in the explicit group. In the same group, after the test, effective strategies with a standard deviation of 4.19 and 431 on average were strategies commonly used by Iranian EFL practitioners, while standard strategies with a standard deviation of 2.70 and .466 on average were minimal. Is the strategy used? As presented in Table 4, metacognitive strategies with a standard deviation of 2.14 and .498 are the most commonly used strategies by Iranian EFL practitioners, while average scores of 1.65 and a standard deviation of 448 are the most frequent. The instructions in the pre-test are used in the group. Cognitive strategies with an average score of 3.86 and a standard deviation of .548 are considered the most commonly used strategies by Iranian EFL practitioners, while social strategies with a standard deviation of 3.01 and .216 are considered. The instructions in the post-test are the least used tactics in the group. Furthermore, effective strategies with a standard deviation of 4.19 and .431, as presented in Table 7, are the most commonly used strategies by Iranian EFL practitioners, while the average score is 2.70 and a standard deviation. 466. Memory strategies with a standard deviation of. Clear instructions in the post-test group were identified as the least used strategy. The results of current research are consistent with examining the wide range of classroom intrusions that integrate metacognition as part of their plans and to see the impact of metacognitive exercise on the theoretical practice of second language learners (Kasaian & Ghadiri, 2011; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Zhang and Wu, 2009).

CONCLUSION

In connection with the research questions raised in the current study, the findings lend support to metacognitive strategies research conducted by Zhang and Wu (2009), Kasaian, and Ghadiri (2011). Sheorey & Mokhtari's (2001) study emphasizes the use of metacognitive strategies to enhance students' reading scores and improve their reading comprehension. Furthermore, the outcomes of the current research reinforce the impression that the increase in the application of metacognitive strategies improves the participants' reading comprehension performance. In fact, the participants in the present study deliberately applied metacognitive strategies to plan, monitor, and fine-tune their reading comprehension. In addition, the use of metacognitive strategies is operative in resolving their reading difficulties. This research offers a convincing suggestion that metacognitive strategies are important and that further studies are needed to reconfirm its results. However, the results are adequate enough to indicate that metacognitive strategies are important and explicit teaching of them should provide the teachers with insight to reconsider their classroom instruction.

As a final word, it should be stated that since there was a noteworthy alteration between the two types of instruction of reading strategies and the participants' use of metacognitive strategies, it would be prudent for educators, coursebook creators, and material designers to attend to this fact and use thoughtful procedures in applying metacognitive strategies to enhance learners' knowledge of reading comprehension strategies. Also, with regard to the instructive suggestions, the findings of the current research assist teachers to use appropriate approaches in teaching reading strategies that will ultimately help the students to develop more awareness and competence in reading comprehension. At the same time, the students who use metacognitive awareness while reading will be able to understand what material they understand and what they need to study further.

References

Alhaqbani, A., & Riazi, M. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use in Arabic as a second language. Reading in a Foreign Language, 24(2).

Al-Khateeb, O. S. M. (2011). The impact of using metacognitive learning strategies on Al-Hussain Bin Talal university students‟ achievement in and attitudes towards health concepts in „Tenet of Worship‟ course. Asian Social Science, 7(3), 165–186.

Al Melhi, A. M. (2000). Analysis of Saudi college students' reported and actual reading strategies along with their metacognitive awareness as they read in English as a foreign language. Dissertation Abstracts International, 60 (7).

Anderson, N. (2008). Metacognition and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), Lessons from good language learners (pp. 99-109). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Chamot, A.U. (2001) The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition. In M.P. Breen, Learner contributions to language learning. Harlow, England: Longman. 25–43

Cohen, A. D. (1998). Strategies in learning and using a second language. Harlow: Longman.

Cohen, A., & Macaro, E. (2007). Learner strategies.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dornei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Santangelo, T. (2008). Using self-regulated strategy development to support students who have “trubolgiting things into words”. Remedial and Special Education, 29(2), 78-89.

Hong-Nam, K. & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. System, 34, 399-415.

Jafari, S. M., & Shokrpour, N. (2012). The reading strategies used by Iranian ESP students to comprehend authentic expository texts in English. International Journal of Applied Linguistics& English Literature, 1(4), 102-113.

Jaffrey, Madhumati & Ghosh (2012). The reading strategies used by Iranian ESP students to comprehend authentic expository texts in English. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 1(4).

Kasaian, Z., & Ghadiri, M. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between motivation, and metacognitive awareness strategies in listening comprehension: The case of Iranian EFL learners. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2(5), 1069-1079.

Madhumathi, P., & Ghosh, A. (2012). Awareness of reading strategy use of Indian ESL students and the relationship with reading comprehension achievement. English Language Teaching, 5(12).

O’Malley, J. et al. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning, 35, 21-46.

O’malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies and beyond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), Shifting the instructional focus to the learner (35-55). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (1989) Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. Modern Language Journal, 73, 291-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06367.x.

Reid, R., & Lienemann, T. O. (2006). Strategy instruction for students with learning disabilities. Teacher Education and Special Education, 29(1), 3-11.

Riding, R., & Rayner, S. G. (1998). Cognitive styles and learning strategies: Understanding style difference in learning and behavior. London: David Fulton.

Salataci, R., & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. Reading in a Foreign Language, 14.1, 1-17.

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. System, 29, 431-449.

Shokrpur, N. & Fotovatian, S. (2009). Effects of consciousness-raising of metacognitive strategies on EFL students‟ reading comprehension. ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 157, 75-92.

Soleimani, H & Hajghaniz, S. The Effect of Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies on Iranian EFLPre-University Students' Reading Comprehension Ability. International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Science. ISSN 2251-838X/Vol,5(5). 2013.

Wright, M. and Brown, P. (2006). Reading in a modern foreign language: exploring the potential benefits of reading strategy instruction. Language Learning Journal, 33, 22-33.

Zhang, L. J., & Wu, A. (2009). Chinese senior high school EFL students‟ metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use. Reading in a Foreign Language, 21(1), 37-59.

Biodata

Ms. Marjan Mehrpour is a Ph.D. candidate in TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Shiraz branch. Her research interests are foreign language teaching, first/second language acquisition, foreign language education, and psychology of language learning.
Email: *mehrmarjanmehrmarjan@gmail.com*

Dr. Mostafa Zamanian is an assistant professor of teaching English at Islamic Azad University, Shiraz branch. He received his Ph.D. from the University of New Mexico (U.S.A.). His teaching and research areas include curriculum development, second-language education, and second-language instruction.
Email: *mostafazamanian03@gmail.com*

Dr. Firooz Sadighi is a professor of applied linguistics. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois. His research areas include first/second language acquisition, second language education, and syntax studies.
Email: *firoozsadighi@yahoo.com*

Dr. Ehsan Hadipour Fard is an assistant professor of applied linguistics at Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch. His areas of research are technology-assisted language learning, assessment, and computer-assisted language learning.
Email: *e.ehadipour@gmail.com*