The role of text type on the use of metacognitive reading strategies: Iranian EFL learners' perceptions in focus

Authors:

Somayeh Nilforoushan [1]
Mojgan Rashtchi [2]
Gholam-Reza Abbasian [3]

Abstract

The current study used a qualitative methodology to examine how Iranian EFL learners practically applied Metacognitive Reading Strategies (MRs) when reading narrative and expository English texts. The study also investigated the participants' perceptions of the impact of text type on using MRs while reading narrative and expository English passages. The researchers selected 40 intermediate EFL learners studying TEFL at Islamic Azad University and Farhangyan University using purposive sampling as focused participants. The instruments employed included the Oxford Placement Test, semi-structured interviews, and think-aloud protocols. The data analysis involved theme-based analysis. The think-aloud protocol analysis indicated that participants employed multiple strategies when engaging with the expository text compared to the narrative text. The finding suggested that text types affected readers` overall performance. The semi-structured interviews revealed that learner's perceptions of text type played a vital role in reading different text types. The practical implications of the study were also discussed.

---

1. Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Department of English Language, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran (Corresponding Author). mojgan.rashtchi@gmail.com
3. Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Imam Ali University, Tehran, Iran.

1. Introduction

Reading is a fundamental issue in L2 education. Acquiring reading skills in a second language is a priority for millions of learners worldwide. Most EFL learners have practical requirements for language use in their day-to-day activities. However, access to knowledge and sources of information need competence in reading (Kung, 2019). EFL/ESL learners must foster their reading ability to become academically efficacious, which requires learners to possess a repertoire of Metacognitive Reading Strategies (MRs) to facilitate their understanding of a passage. Reading Strategies (Rs) can foster learners' comprehension when encountering problems decoding a text (Feller et al., 2020).

L2 learners might lack adequate MRs to handle their reading effectively; they might be unsure about them and how they should be employed. Poor readers do not know how to process academic texts or how to promote the skill. Noticeably, learners who neglect such strategies in comprehending academic materials are bewildered by using appropriate MRs (Yoshikawa & Leung, 2020) to monitor, regulate, and evaluate their reading correctly, necessitating employing MRs in L2 reading.

Within the field of L2 reading research, numerous researchers have asserted that text type is a variable that requires investigation. Several scholars have focused on examining the impact of text type on reading comprehension (Behzadi, 2013; Saadatnia et al., 2017; Zhou & Siriyothin, 2011). Empirical studies in L1 and L2 reading have shown how readers' knowledge of the structure and tone of texts are decisive in guiding them to recognize, arrange, extract, and ultimately remember details in the text. Narrative and expository writings have primarily attracted the attention of researchers interested in studying how text structures might affect readers' comprehension. Comprehension of texts depends on the level of readers' awareness of the structure of texts (Nilforoushan et al., 2023). Besides, raising readers' attention to the structural characteristics facilitates their comprehension. However, no study has investigated the impact of different types of text on the use of MRs and compared their actual usage in narrative and expository texts. Furthermore, how EFL students perceive and respond to various types of texts can significantly impact the interaction between the reader and the author, thus influencing their reading strategies. Therefore, it was valuable to examine how EFL learners'

perceptions of text types influence their choices in metacognitive reading strategies.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Reading Strategies

Reading comprehension strategies are purposeful arrangements that readers use to help themselves comprehend a text. They are adaptable and can be adjusted to fulfill the needs of reading tasks (Booth & Swartz, 2004). The use of such strategies reflects reading performance. Successful readers are considered good strategy users because they can use appropriate strategies while involved in reading comprehension (Pei, 2014).

MRs are thoughts through which readers associate with composed materials from multiple points of view and provide the reason for the reading, choose what to read before reading, check comprehension during reading, and assess the understanding experience (Meniado, 2016). Proficient readers who know about the various abilities included in MRs are often ready to control their reading, select appropriate strategies, and determine when to use specific strategies while reading (Lee et al., 2022). Elleman et al. (2019) argued that proficient readers are well aware that reading tasks have an undeniable role in comprehension. They additionally realized how to anticipate the content of the reading and how to summarize the knowledge they had gained. Thus, MRs foster self-management while reading a passage. However, instructors should pay attention to the fact that reading and using strategies is a cyclical activity, and proficient readers can use them unconsciously, intelligently, and regularly (Thiede et al., 2003). Understanding MRs and using them successfully lets readers increase their comprehension. Control over such strategies enables them to perform an extraordinary perception arrangement when reading a text (Karbalaei, 2010).

The capability to apply suitable MRs is synonymous with success in reading comprehension because such strategies permit ESL/EFL learners to improve their positions in the future as they pursue their studies (Singhal, 2001). More precisely, employing such strategies gives them a better chance to connect with composed materials effectively and achieve the ultimate reading goals. In line with Grabe and Stroller (2002), the current study researchers believe that MRs are significant in investigating reading since they uncover information about the mental processes involved

in decoding a text. However, it is worth noticing that readers are the unique agents in selecting the most appropriate strategies considering their particular needs, which will be accomplished when engaged in the skill (Oxford, 2017).

On the other hand, Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) introduced metacognitive, cognitive, and supportive strategies. MRs are part of the global reading strategies, while cognitive reading strategies are equivalent to problem-solving strategies. Each category was defined as follows:

1. Global Reading Strategies (GLOBs), typically employed during the pre-reading phase, refer to learners' intentional and meticulous strategies. Examples are establishing a specific objective, overviewing the content's structure and length, and using typographical elements, tables, and figures.

2. Problem-Solving Reading Strategies (PROBs) are methods and techniques learners employ when interpreting texts. They may include reading at a slower pace and engaging in the process of inferring the meaning of unfamiliar or ambiguous language.

3. Support Reading Strategies (SUPs) are indispensable aids designed to facilitate readers` comprehension of different texts, such as note-taking and highlighting information.

Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) developed the Survey of Reading Strategies Questionnaire (SORS) to explain how often students used different Rs. Following Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001), the present study used the same category to investigate the real MRs used by participants in narrative and expository texts.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Sun and Zhang (2022) stated that MRs are organized, deliberate, goal-driven, and forward-looking mental processes that help readers improve their cognitive tasks. By employing metacognition, a learner engages in the process of planning and initiating a task, subsequently monitoring, controlling, responding, and reflecting on their progress (Rashtchi & Khani, 2010). To Meniado (2016), MRs are practices that make learners conscious of their thoughts as they do the reading tasks.

A direct and positive correlation exists between acquiring and applying MRs and reading comprehension achievement; therefore, understanding them is essential for developing reading comprehension skills and facilitating the educational process (Nash-

Ditzel, 2010; Mytkowicz et al., 2014). Research findings show that students who employ such strategies demonstrate enhanced performance in reading proficiency assessments (Ahmadi et al., 2013; Al-Sobhani, 2013; Hong-Nam & Page, 2014; Kummin & Rahman, 2010; Zhang & Seepho, 2013), indicating the necessity of their acquisition as a potential remedy for inadequate reading comprehension. Thus, boosting and prioritizing MRs in the instruction and acquisition of EFL is imperative. Through rehearsing and applying MRs, English learners can become more competent readers. For instance, the metacognitive tool may help them find ways to use specific strategies to understand reading contexts better. Equally, learners should use MRs to acquire information, track the use of these strategies during reading, and then analyze effective strategies to correct the problem (Teng & Zhang, 2016).

Text type

A text type is a form of communication designed to achieve specific rhetorical and communicative purposes. No matter the genre, text type identifies texts based on linguistic form and pattern similarities. Therefore, "text type" is "sometimes used interchangeably with discourse structure, discourse pattern, text structure, rhetorical organization, and top-level structure" (Jiang & Grabe, 2007, p.38). According to Tsiplakou and Floros (2013), text types are classified into genres based on their structural, functional, and conventional characteristics. They argued that higher classes are "text categories, text prototypes, deep structure genres, and text types" (p.125). The necessity for a superior category beyond genre derives from the notion that several genres may possess common language and structural characteristics and practical attributes in corpus studies, ESP, and other educational viewpoints.

Despite several studies examining the influence of text structure on reading comprehension and retention (e.g., Chu et al., 2002; Koda, 2005), there is a lack of research examining reading strategies employed in different types of texts. In this regard, two issues are worthy of attention. One is that text complexity affects strategy use and that various types of texts present varying difficulty levels (Ellis, 2009). Furthermore, as Duke and Pearson (2008) postulate, using MRs while reading depends on the text type, a theory few studies offer empirical evidence to support (Barrot, 2016). Recognition of different rhetorical text type patterns may contribute to effective reading. For example,

Chu et al. (2002) investigated Chinese EFL students' understanding of Chinese and English rhetorical patterns when reading different types of texts. They found that differing rhetorical conventions were decisive factors in Chinese students' reading comprehension. They also found that L2 readers remembered the rhetorical patterns from the text using their first language.

Many other studies on text types have concentrated on variations between expository and narrative texts. Expository texts use different organizational patterns such as compare and contrast and description to pass on details. Narrative texts, however, use the organizational pattern of sequence (Alderson, 2000; Shin, 2002). Therefore, as opposed to narrative text, L2 readers have more significant difficulties reading expository texts. Zhou and Siriyothin (2011) reported that when reading narrative texts, readers employed visualizing strategies. Most readers continue to create a mental representation of what they are reading.

Moreover, the visualizing strategy makes readers remember narrative texts more quickly and accurately than expository texts. The narrative text can be well understood because it has a hierarchical structure that can ease the comprehension and recall of the readers. Feng and Mokhtari (2008), in their study regarding Rs and text types, found that text type is an indicator of the type of Rs readers use. Thus, different text types need different Rs. Barrot (2016) investigated the relationship between the use of Rs by ESL learners and the type of texts they read. A group of twenty-one ESL learners were presented with twenty distinct types of texts prior to completing the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002). The findings revealed that the participants employed varied Rs based on the type of text.

The related studies (Abdualameer, 2016; Barrot, 2016; Schmitz & Dannecker, 2023) showed that text type impacts reading comprehension and strategy use to some extent. Specifically, readers could understand the narrative text better than the expository text, which is attributable to narrative rhetorical patterns. However, such findings could not be applied to all L2 reading research because different variables, such as participants` proficiency, could change the outcomes. The researchers of the present qualitative study assumed that studying the strategies used by Iranian EFL students when reading different text types would add new insights into aspects that are absent in the literature. Hence, to

serve the purpose of the study, the following research questions were proposed:

1. What metacognitive reading strategies do Iranian EFL learners practically use while reading English narrative and expository texts?

2. How do Iranian EFL learners perceive the impact of text type on their metacognitive reading strategies use when reading narrative and expository English passages?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

Forty Intermediate Iranian EFL learners enrolled in Bachelor's TEFL programs participated in the study. They were students of Islamic Azad and Farhangyan Universities who had taken Reading I, Reading II, or Reading III courses, typically offered during their first, second, or third semester of academic program. They participated in weekly reading classes lasting four hours per session during the semester. The researchers' objective was to choose a cohort of students with an intermediate English competency level. Oxford Placement Test was administered to 400 students to achieve the purpose. Test-takers who scored between 120 and 149 on the Oxford Placement Test were assessed to possess an intermediate level of English proficiency. Hence, the target participants were employed based on the purposive sampling method.

3.2. Instruments

Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

The OPT was used to select participants with an intermediate English language ability during the first selection process. As a standard test, OPT is used for placement in language-related research on a global scale due to its cost-effectiveness and simplicity of administration. The OPT used in this study was Allen's (2004) version with two main sections (Grammar and Listening), each comprising 100 items. The two sections of the test examine test takers' reading, listening, vocabulary size, and grammar, producing a total score of 200. OPTs have been standardized via several major international language examinations and are frequently used for education and assessment. Following OPT's range score, students whose scores fell within 120-149 were selected as intermediate level (Allen, 2004).

Semi-structured Interviews

The researchers employed semi-structured interviews to delve into participants' perspectives on the role of text types in their choice of MRS use. The interview questions were open-ended to obtain detailed information. The learners were asked about each text type's characteristics, their attitudes to different text types, and their experience dealing with text types. Interviews were vital because they allowed the researchers to get at the participants' narratives regarding the strategies they used. The instrument was validated by examining four key concepts: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. To ensure credibility, the researchers spent enough time with the participants to establish trust and rapport and gain an authentic picture of their past experiences in reading activities.

Furthermore, the researchers asked two proficient evaluators to verify the data and interpretations. Member checks were also conducted by asking the participants to verify the data and their interpretations. To guarantee transferability, the researchers used purposive sampling. Such a sampling method enabled the researchers to determine the participants' characteristics, which could result in gathering a wide range of information and add to the robustness of the study. Two language experts also scrutinized the transcribed content to warrant reliability, verifying the discovered themes and descriptors. Finally, the researchers used a reflective notebook during the research process to ensure confirmability. The journal was used to record daily notes and document relevant and useful introspections for the study.

Think-aloud Protocol

The think-aloud approach, often known as a "verbal report," involves participants expressing their thoughts and activities. This method is widely used in several fields to study individuals' cognitive processes (Block, 1986). The participants engaged in the think-aloud procedure simultaneously while reading the English texts. The think-aloud protocols investigated how students used strategies while engaging in the act of reading. The think-aloud protocol procedure was piloted with five students who shared qualities comparable to the participants. The purpose was to identify and overcome practical challenges in implementing the think-aloud protocol. Subsequent interviews were undertaken to gather additional information from each participant regarding their think-

aloud processes. The participants conveyed their opinions regarding the passages, including their assessment of their level of complexity and the reasons behind their ease or difficulty. The optimal duration for the think-aloud procedure was determined to be fifteen seconds. An issue to consider regarding think-aloud as a data-gathering instrument is the validity and accuracy of the data. One problem is participants' forgetting, which questions the validity of think-aloud. Delayed think-alouds are prone to forgetting, which endangers the recalled memory via deviation from the original text (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Therefore, Polio et al. (2006) insisted that time-lapse threatens the accuracy of think-aloud. Therefore, the think-alouds were conducted at a short interval from the original event.

English Texts Used for the Think-aloud Protocol

Two expository and narrative English text types were selected for the intermediate level of English proficiency. The reading passages were taken from the Mosaic I (Wegmann & Knezevic, 2001) Reading Textbook. They were selected because they were suitable for intermediate language skill levels. The book covers captivating subjects and has been specifically tailored for RS. The topic of the expository text was "Hybrid Cars," while the narrative fiction was titled "Name of the Story" by William Somerset Maugham (1995), a very skilled writer of short stories. The English expository text had a length of 950 words, and the narrative text had a length of 1050 words. The Flesch-Kincaid readability scales, found at http://www.readabilityformulas.com/, were used to determine the text readability index. The narrative text's readability score was 70.4, while the expository text's readability was 80. The readability scores indicated that the texts were appropriate for individuals with an intermediate English language proficiency level.

3.3. Procedure

Forty students with intermediate reading ability (based on the results of OPT) were randomly selected as the focused participants. The demographic information of the participants is depicted in Table 1.

Table 1. *Focused Group Participants' Demographic Information*

Learner	Gender	Age	Reading Level	Years of Studying English
1	Female	35	High	3
2	Male	40	High	2.5
3	Female	25	High	3
4	Female	22	High	2
5	Female	21	High	3
6	Female	45	High	3.5
7	Female	24	High	2
8	Male	26	High	2
9	Male	33	High	1.5
10	Female	35	High	2.5
11	Female	30	High	2
12	Female	40	High	2.5
13	Female	31	High	2
14	Male	40	High	2.5
15	Female	36	High	2
16	Female	18	High	2
17	Female	19	High	2
18	Female	20	High	1.5
19	Female	20	High	2
20	Female	19	High	2
21	Female	23	Low	1.5
22	Female	19	Low	1.5
23	Male	18	Low	1
24	Male	20	Low	2
25	Female	32	Low	2
26	Female	23	Low	1.5
27	Male	28	Low	2
28	Female	19	Low	1
29	Female	18	Low	1
30	Female	21	Low	1.5
31	Male	30	Low	2
32	Male	25	Low	2.5
33	Female	30	Low	1
34	Female	19	Low	1.5
35	Male	18	Low	1
36	Female	22	Low	2
37	Female	21	Low	2.5
38	Female	23	Low	1.5
39	Female	20	Low	1
40	Female	19	Low	1

Before collecting data, the researchers obtained the participants' informed consent to protect their rights (Cohen et al., 2007). One of the researchers explained the study's purpose to the students and provided them with relevant information to encourage them to participate. Also, to compensate for the time they allocated for this study, five free teaching MRs sessions were held for these participants at the end of the study. They

were also reminded that they were free to quit the study at any stage during the study.

The required data were collected in three sessions: semi-structured interviews were performed in one session, and think-aloud protocols were conducted in two sessions. The procedure for each session is explained below.

The participants attended the semi-structured interviews in the first session. The researchers explicitly informed each participant that the interviews did not impact their final results. They also informed them that there were no right or wrong answers and that their responses would not impact their academic standing. The interviews were performed individually, predominantly in English; however, the interviewer or interviewees sometimes switched to Persian for accuracy or clarity. The interview time was different for each respondent. The objective was to comprehend the readers` perceptions of different text types thoroughly.

During the second and third sessions, think-alouds were employed to ascertain the participants' MRs while reading expository and narrative texts. During the think-aloud procedure, the researchers inquired about the student's thought process if a student halted for over 15 seconds (as confirmed by the piloting process to be a suitable timeframe). Students were given sufficient time to read and comprehend a significant portion of content and comprehend it without allocating excessive time that would divert their attention from their current thoughts. Data were recorded by audio recorder throughout the think-aloud procedure. The gathered qualitative data were transcribed, analyzed, and coded to answer research questions.

4. Results

The first research question investigated Iranian EFL learners' practical use of MRs when reading English narrative and expository texts. The results indicated that learners employed more MRs when reading expository texts than narrative texts. This finding suggests that the type of text impacted readers' MRs use. The findings also revealed that learners employed identical GLOB and PROB strategies to comprehend both types of texts; however, the use of SUP varied. The most commonly employed SUPs in expository writing were paraphrasing, highlighting the facts, and vocalizing the text. Simultaneously, the act of posing inquiries was the most commonly employed SUP in narrative literature.

The second research question investigated Iranian EFL learners' perceptions regarding the role of text type on the choice of MRs when reading narrative and expository English texts. Of 40 focused participants, 39 believed that expository texts were more complicated, and only one expressed that narrative texts were more complex. Fifteen participants stated that expository texts were more difficult because they needed background knowledge. One of the participants pointed out that "*Expository text is more difficult for me because I don't have enough knowledge about many topics that I read*." Nine participants believed expository texts were more difficult because they had complicated and specialized words. One participant argued, "*In my view, expository texts are much more difficult because they have many words in specific fields that I don't know their meaning.*" Six participants stated that expository texts were more difficult because they needed a high concentration. One participant mentioned that "*expository texts are challenging because I have to concentrate on the text, which is really demanding.*" Five participants referred to the scientific nature of expository texts as the reason for the difficulty. One participant maintained, *"Expository texts are scientific, so they are difficult."* Three other participants argued that the structure of the expository texts was intricate and needed analysis. One of them argued that *"Expository texts are more difficult. They take a long time to analyze the sentences.*" Another participant also believed that expository texts have information contrasting with previous mental schemes, stating, *"When I read expository texts, they contradict my previous knowledge, and I don't like this issue."* Only one participant believed that narrative texts were more complex and referred to the colloquial language of the narrative text as the reason for the difficulty of these types of texts: *"To me, narrative text is more difficult because its language is informal, while we mostly work on formal language at university."*

It was also interesting that all learners believed narrative texts were more interesting. The most to least reasons for their choice were as follows:

a. We engage with narrative text (15 participants)
b. We obtain more information about social and cultural issues (10 participants)
c. We experience another life (9 participants)
d. It takes us into imagination words (6 participants).

An example of one of the participants' views: "*When I read narrative texts, I can't notice*

how time passes because it really gets my attention." Other ideas included: *"I really like reading narrative texts because they open a new world for me and provide me with a lot of new information about different cultures and societies."* Or, "T*o me, narrative text is more interesting because whenever I read this type of text, I feel I live in another world."*

In addition, out of 40 participants, 25 believed that background knowledge played an essential role in comprehending expository texts. A participant noted, *"Without any background knowledge, I can't understand an expository text, but I can get the gist of the topic in narrative text." However, t*en participants believed background knowledge was more critical in narrative texts. It was, for instance, expressed that *"If I don't have any background knowledge, I can't understand the author's purpose."* On the other hand, Five participants believed that background knowledge was equally crucial for both types of texts. For example, a participant stated: "*I believe that background knowledge plays an important role in both types of texts. Without background knowledge, I can't understand the narrative or expository text."*

All participants believed that textual clues were more critical for expository texts. Some participants' opinions were, *"When I read expository texts, I usually use textual clues to connect the sentences and understand the text."* The participants also highlighted the strategies of summarizing, visualizing, and finding the story's primary purpose as helpful strategies for approaching narrative texts. One participant explained, "*First, I try to read the text and enjoy it by visualizing it, and then I try to find the author's purpose for writing such text."*

Further, a few learners referred to paraphrasing strategies, connecting the text to their previous knowledge, and asking themselves questions about the text as practical strategies for expository texts. Sample attitudes included: *"In approaching expository text, after reading each paragraph, I reword it. I think this is the best way to understand this type of text."* Or, "*When I see a topic of expository text, I try to ask myself some questions about that, and then I find the answers in the text. This strategy is effective for me.*

Finally, some interviewees stressed the role of previewing for reading any text type. Few referred to critical reading for expository texts. Generally, they argued that expository texts took more time to read since they needed more attention. They also believed that the speed of reading expository texts could increase with more practice.

Considering the participants' responses, the researchers concluded that readers' perceptions were essential in applying MRs in reading texts. For instance, as the interviewees' responses indicated, they used more strategies for expository texts. Thus, as they noted, expository texts required more strategies since they were more difficult to perceive. As the results indicate, individuals' perceptions played a vital role in reading different text types. Therefore, English instructors should pay close attention to learners' perceptions of text types. They should work on MRs and learners' perceptions of text types.

5. Discussion

The current research investigated the actual use of MRS by Iranian EFL learners at the intermediate level of English proficiency when they read in English across different text types. The study also explored how learners' perceptions of text type affected their choice of MRS. The think-aloud protocol analysis indicated that learners employed more techniques when engaging with the expository than narrative texts. This discovery corroborates and expands upon the findings of Cakir (2008) and Lei (2009), who similarly observed a higher frequency of strategy use in expository texts. Besides, the findings align with the results of Shokouhi and Jamali (2013), who found that the type of text influenced readers' chosen strategies. They observed that students used MRs more frequently when reading expository texts than narrative texts. However, in a study by Sun et al. (2024), the participants used more strategies for making questions in narrative texts.

As mentioned previously, the type of text is one of the critical elements determining reading comprehension. Interestingly, most students reported that expository writings were more challenging to comprehend. This finding was consistent with the results of Soy et al. (2023), in which the learners reported the difficulty of grammar and vocabulary in expository texts. One factor is most likely to be different genres of texts. Various types of texts have rhetorical and organizational characteristics. Besides, their choice of language differs, distinguishing them from others. As Kroll (1990) pointed out, difficulties in understanding expository texts emerge from the readers' failure to make sense of particular language aspects. According to Sáenz and Fuchs (2002), text structure, conceptual density and familiarity, vocabulary knowledge, and prior knowledge are

among the variables that make expository writing more difficult for readers.

On the other hand, the text type that stood out as the students' preferred text type was narrative text. This result is comparable with a study by Panico and Healey (2009), which found that narrative texts had a more positive influence on story comprehension and listener recall than expository texts. It is reasonable to propose that students prefer to work with what might be called light and tangible text types rather than demanding and intangible ones. They generally prefer and enjoy learning texts that are factual, entertaining, and inspirational more than demanding texts that require a capacity for analytical and critical thinking. This conclusion is not new or surprising because many students generally are not enthusiastic about in-depth reading engagement, which requires a heavy workload and intellectual commitment. However, as stated by Shin (2012), tertiary learners need to engage in various activities that require skills to communicate effectively, locate and use relevant information, and analyze, evaluate, and report critically. In this regard, responses in the present study highlight the need to consider how students' preferences can be reconciled with the expectations of the tertiary language curriculum.

6. Conclusion

The present research examined intermediate EFL learners' actual use of MRs when while reading English across different text types in the Iranian context. It also explored how learners' perceptions of text type affected their choice of MRs. The results led the researchers to draw some conclusions.

First, language learners' knowledge of appropriate MRs can facilitate successful reading. Adjusting reading approaches according to text types is especially beneficial for improving L2 reading comprehension abilities (Dong & Ni, 2024). Besides, MRs enable language learners to plan, organize, and assess their learning process. Therefore, instruction can help language learners learn and use MRs effectively. One crucial point is that employing MRs can cause more fruitful learning experiences for language learners and help them become successful readers. The second conclusion is that teachers should encourage EFL learners to use MRs during reading activities. Instructors should draw learners' attention to the conscious use of such strategies. Instructors can

encourage extensive reading and practice the strategies they have learned to become proficient readers. Finally, as the findings indicated, the expository texts posed more significant challenges for learners than narrative texts; therefore, they should receive more attention and practice than narrative texts. Since background knowledge plays a crucial role in understanding expository texts, reading such texts, even in Persian, can be influential in comprehending English expository texts.

Considering the findings of this study, it may be worthwhile to provide more focus on text type distinctions in EFL reading classes. Students should be given adequate opportunity to engage with various texts to gain sufficient experience. Explicit instruction can be an excellent method for making students aware of the generic distinctions between different types of texts, boosting their reading and promoting comprehension. While the generalizability of this study's findings to EFL students in different contexts may be limited, they provide valuable insights into how text types can impact EFL reading comprehension in the Iranian setting. This study is expected to encourage additional investigation into the connections between the interconnected variables in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) reading.

The findings of the current study are limited to qualitative data. Quantitative data could surely add to the depth of the study. Besides, this study did not consider students' interests in selecting the content of the texts, nor did it consider learners' personality characteristics. Other researchers can focus on encouraging learners to study different topics, even in L1, to gain more insights into the issue in various fields. Another paramount consideration is the language teaching domain. Studies on the degree of teachability and learnability of MRs can also interest future research. The ways teachers should teach MRs and the processes learners should go through to learn such strategies could also be the subject of further studies.

References

Abdualameer, R. T. (2016). Effects of text types and reading strategies on reading comprehension performance. *University Sains Malaysia. Penang, Malaysia*.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n10p235

Akhondi, M., Malayeri, F.A., & Samad, A.A. (2011). How to teach expository text structure to facilitate reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, *64*(5), 368–372. https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.64.5.9

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

Al-Sobhani, Y.A. (2013). Metacognitive reading strategies used by Yemeni EFL undergraduate university students. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, *4*(1), 121–130.

Augusta, D. (2015). Improving students' ability in writing narrative texts using short animated stories at class VIII C of SMPN 2 [Master's thesis, State University of Yogyakarta, Indonesia]. https://eprints.uny.ac.id/26574/

Barrot, J.S. (2016). ESL learners' use of reading strategies across different text types. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *25*, 883–892. http://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-016-0313-2.

Behzadi, A. (2013). The effect of different text types on cognitive and metacognitive. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, *53*(3), 167–183.

Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(3), 463-494. http://doi.org/10.2307/3586295

Booth, D.W., & Swartz, L. (2004). *Literacy techniques for building successful readers and writers.* Pembroke.

Cakir, O. (2008). The effect of textual differences on children's processing strategies. *Reading Improvement, 45*(2), 69–83.

Chu H-C. J., Swaffar, J., & Charney, D. H. (2002). Cultural representations of rhetorical conventions: The effects of reading recall. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 511–541. http://doi.org/10.2307/3588239

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Dong, N., & Ni, J. (2024). Study on the Automatic Information Processing Strategy in L2 Reading. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, *12*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.54097/jptf7b19

Duke, N.K., & Pearson, P.D. (2008). Effective practices for developing reading

comprehension. *Journal of Education*, *189*(1/2), 107–122.

Ellis, R. (2009). A reader responds to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei's "Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation." *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(1), 105–109. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00229.x

Feller, E., Kopatich, R., Lech, E.F., & Higgs, Y. (2020). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 364–373. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420932139

Feng, X., & Mokhtari, K. (2008). Reading easy and difficult texts in English and Chinese: Strategy use by native speakers of Chinese. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8*, 19–40.

Gass, S.M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F.L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Longman.

Hong-Nam, K., & Page, L. (2014). Investigating metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use of EFL Korean university students. *Reading Psychology, 35*(3), 195–220.

Jiang, X., & Grabe, W. (2007). Graphic organizers in reading instruction: Research findings and issues. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 19*(1), 34-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2012.33055

Karbalaei, A. (2010). A comparison of the metacognitive reading strategies used by EFL and ESL readers. *The Reading Matrix*, *10*(2), 165–180.

Koda, K. (2005). *Insight to second language reading – a cross-linguistic approach.* Cambridge University Press.

Kroll, B. (1990). *Second language writing: Research insight for the classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Kummin, S. A., & Rahman, S. (2010). The relationship between the use of metacognitive strategies and achievement in English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *7*, 145–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.021

Kung, F-W. (2019). Teaching second language reading comprehension: The effect of classroom materials and reading strategy use. *Innovation in Language Learning*

and Teaching, 13(1), 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1364252

Lee, S., Zhong, M., Foster, C., Segura-Totten, M., & McCartney, M. (2022). From novice to expert: An assessment to measure strategies students implement while learning to read primary scientific literature. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, *23*(3), e00126-22 https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.00126-22

Lei, J.I. (2009*). An investigation of the effects of discourse types on Taiwanese college students' reading strategy use* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia]. https://www.proquest.com/openview/db1459912c46d4d895c084bbab491de9/1. pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750

McCormick, S., & Zutell, J. (2015). *Instructing students who have literacy problems* (7th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Maniati, M., Haydari, F., & Tazik, I.K. (2022). The effect of ESP text type on Iranian first-year medical students' language use strategies and test-taking strategies. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *46*(4), 1–12.

Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive reading strategies, motivation, and reading comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(3), 117–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p117

Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education, 25*(3), 2-10.

Mytkowicz, P., Goss, D., & Steinberg, B. (2014). Assessing metacognition as a learning outcome in a postsecondary strategic learning course. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *27*(1), 51–62.

Nash-Ditzel, S. (2010). Metacognitive reading strategies can improve self-regulation. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *40*(2), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2010.10850330

Nilforoushan, S., Rashtchi, M., & Abbasian, Gh-R. (2023). Exploring the perceived and real metacognitive reading strategies of Iranian EFL learners: Different text types in focus. *SAGE Open, 13*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231164567

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies. Self-regulation in context.* Routledge.

Pei, L. (2014). Does metacognitive strategy instruction indeed improve Chinese EFL learners' reading comprehension performance and metacognitive awareness? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5(*5), 1147–1152. http://doi.org/ 10.4304/jltr.5.5.1147-1152

Panico, J., & Healey E.C. (2009). Influence of text type, topic familiarity, and stuttering frequency on listener recall, comprehension, and mental effort. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 52*, 534-546. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0238)

Polio, C., Gass, S., & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate native speaker perceptions in native-nonnative speaker interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(2), 237–267. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060116

Rashtchi, M., & Khani, P. (2010). Improving Iranian EFL learners' oral proficiency through metacognitive strategies instruction. *Journal of English Language Studies, 1*(4), 137–156.

Roehling, J.V., Hebert, M., Nelson, J.R., & Bohaty, J.J. (2017). Text structure strategies for improving expository reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, *71*(1), 71–82.

Rustipa, K. (2011). Features of English learners` narratives. *Dinamika Bahasa Dan Budaya, 5*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.35315/bb.v5i2.387

Ryan, M-L. (2007). Diagramming narrative. *Semiotica, 65* (1), 11–40.

Sáenz, L.M., & Fuchs, L.S. (2002). Examining the reading difficulty of secondary students with learning disabilities: Expository versus narrative text. *Remedial and Special Education*, *23*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250202300105

Sari, G.R. , Asih, S., & Eka, W. (2020). Students' perception on reading comprehension problems in narrative text.*LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 23*(2), 342–353. https://doi.org/: 10.24071/llt.v23i2.2211

Schmitz, A., & Dannecker, W. (2023). Strategies for Expository and Narrative Texts: Students' Perspectives on Text Type-Specific Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, *23*, 1–

22. https://doi.org/10.21248/l1esll.2023.23.1.407

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System, 29,* 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X (01)00039-2

Shin, S. Y. (2002). Effects of subskills and text types on Korean EFL reading scores. *Second Language Studies*, *20*(2), 107–130.

Shin, S-C. (2012). KSL learners' perceptions on text types: Understanding, preferences and necessity. *23*(4), 471-493. https://doi.org/10.18209/IAKLE.2012.23.4.471

Shokouhi, H., & Jamali, R. (2013). *Metacognitive reading strategies and the text type.* In S. Baleghizadeh & K. Zahedi (Eds.), Handbook of current research on teaching English language skills (pp.128–141). Shaheed Beheshti University Press.

Singhal, M. (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness, and L2 readers. *The Reading Matrix, 1*(1), 1–23.

Soy, S., Maisarah, I., & Sovann, L. (2023). Students' perceptions of literary texts, challenges in learning, and learning strategies. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, *6*(2), 81–94. https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v6i2.19925

Sun, Q.,& Zhang, L.J. (2022) Understanding learners' metacognitive experiences in learning to write in English as a foreign language: A structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 986301. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.986301

Sun, Y., Zhou, W., & Tang, S. (2024). Effects of adjunct questions on L2 reading comprehension with texts of different types. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(2), 138. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14020138

Teng, L.S., & Zhang, L.J. (2016). A questionnaire-based validation of multidimensional models of self-regulated learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(3), 674–701. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12339

Thiede, K. W., Anderson, M., & Therriault, D. (2003). Accuracy of metacognitive monitoring affects learning of texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*(1), 66–73. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.66

Tsiplakou, S., & Floros, G. (2013). Never mind the text types, here's textual force: Towards a pragmatic reconceptualization of text type. *Journal of Pragmatics, 45,*

119–130. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.11.004

Yoshikawa, L., & Leung, C.Y. (2020). Transitional shift of metacognitive awareness of reading strategy along with L2-English reading proficiency. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *20*(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688205052143

Zhang, L., & Seepho, S. (2013). Metacognitive strategy use and academic reading achievement: Insights from a Chinese context. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 54–69.

Zhou, L., & Siriyothin, P. (2011). Effects of text types on advanced EFL learners' reading comprehension. *Journal of Language and Culture*, *30*(2), 45–55.