Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education Vol.12 No.12 (2021), 3095-3104

Research Article

Metacognitive Reading Strategy Direct Instruction Effects on Students' Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness and Their Perceptions of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Instruction at Guder Secondary School Grade 11 in Oromia, Ethiopia

Habtamu Walga Adaba[a], Tekle Ferede Metaferia[b] and Temesgen Mereba Doboche[c]

[a] Department of English Language and Literature, Ambo University, Ethiopia
[b,c]Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia

Article History: Received: 11 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 23 May 2021

Abstract: This study examined the effects of metacognitive reading strategy explicit instruction on Grade 11 students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness and perceptions about the strategy direct instruction. Metacognitive Reading strategy Awareness Inventory and interview were used as data gathering instruments. In order to achieve these objectives, a quasi-experimental research design was employed. Students in experimental group participated in the direct instruction of metacognitive reading strategy whereas control group participated in learning of metacognitive reading the strategy in a conventional way. An ANCOVA was used to analyze data after pretest and posttest in order to test the hypothesis of the study. It is found that metacognitive reading strategy direct instruction affected Grade 11 students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness. The mean scores of the experimental group increased significantly from M=2.77, SD=.20 (pretest) to M=4.29, SD=.13 (posttest). Among the three elements of metacognitive awareness of reading strategy inventory, supportive reading strategy was the least affected by the instruction (M=3.85). To the contrary, problem solving reading strategy (M=4.00) was mostly affected by the instruction. Global reading strategy (M= 3.89) was moderately affected by the instruction. In conclusion, interview result indicated that interviewees had good perception about the direct instruction of metacognitive reading strategy

Keywords: direct instruction, metacognitive reading strategy awareness, perception, global reading strategy

1. Introduction

The ability to read in English is crucial not only for academic purpose but also for international communication in this global time and information technology era. English is seen as pivotal in the whole education system as it takes over and maintains the role of medium of instruction from secondary education onwards (Grade 9 to Grade 12) in Ethiopia (Ambachew, 2003). English is used in extended ranges of function in Ethiopia. All international organizations, most non-governmental organizations and some of the well-paying government offices, such as Ethiopian Airlines, the Commercial Bank of Ethiopia and the Ethiopian Insurance Corporation use English.

At secondary level, several activities demand reading ability like understanding instructions and concepts, reading questions in assignments and examinations, and reading textbooks of different disciplines and others. They are required to understand vast reading materials, to combine a variety of resources, to analyze, to discuss, to evaluate, to reflect and to relate parts to a whole, and to apply knowledge in real-world situations (Fazal et al., 2015). Therefore, much of the teaching of English at this level need to be directed at being able to read, analyze and comprehend in English. This requires them to develop a number of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies, which assists the students not to struggle with reading (Abdelmalik, 2015).

Strategy intervention is one of the innovative learning methods, which has been receiving ever-growing attention in the areas of foreign language teaching and learning in general since 1990s (e.g. Perez, 2008), especially reading strategy instruction which impacts L2 learners' reading performance (e.g. Siegel, 2012). Metacognitive reading strategy awareness plays a significant role in reading comprehension and educational process in general (Ahmadi, Ismail & Abdullah, 2013) and in reading motivation (Wang, 2009). Thus, there is a need to discover the potential effects of explicit v of reading strategy on students' reading achievements. Particularly, the researcher of this study believes that Western Shoa Zone grade 11 students' reading deficiencies originated from the inadequate focus on the reading strategy instruction. Therefore, this study added original contribution to existing knowledge by examining the effects of metacognitive reading strategy explicit instruction on the students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness and reading strategy instruction perception of Guder Secondary School Grade 11 students.

The importance of reading strategy awareness repeatedly reported in international studies. However, some local researches noted that reading strategies, especially metacognitive reading strategies importance in classroom instruction has been deemphasized (Yohannes, 2013). Dawit (2014) also claimed that utilization methods of reading strategy instruction in Ethiopian context are not enough. Most of the existing domestic studies are task-free rather than task-based researches (e.g. Atakilti, 2011; Berhanu, 2004; Nardos, 2016; Meredith, 2012; Rufeal,

2007; Yohannes, 2013). Task-free researches are in which the research participants only answer the survey questionnaires, and interview while task-based researches used intensive reading strategies instruction followed by survey questionnaires, with other instruments of data collections prior to and after the instruction. Additionally, these researches suggest reading comprehension strategy instruction for developing students' reading skills.

Some local studies are conducted on the reading strategies used by different levels of the students (e.g. Berhanu, 2004), others have focused on the frequency of reading strategies used by EFL learners and the gender difference in using reading strategies mainly by the secondary students (e.g. Rufeal, 2007). They found that many students in Ethiopia lack reading skill necessary to meet their academic reading requirement (Atakilti, 2011). The national learning assessments made by MoE (2008) indicated that the students' reading performance as decreased time to time. The students' reading comprehension problems and reading skills problems have been studied over the past decade. One of the reason the students reading failure is that the quality of English language education and training is poor in EFL classroom (IIE, 2012; MoE, 2002). However, the majority of the local and international previous studies in most cases showed that secondary school students had high levels awareness of cognitive reading strategies than metacognitive reading strategies (Dawit, 2014).

Mabratu (2014) conducted a study on the cognitive reading strategy instruction on Grade 10 Ethiopian students' reading comprehension by designing reading comprehension tests. The experimental group performed better in the test, and they were poor in guessing and deciding on the ideas of a text. Belilew (2015) also investigated the relationship between the reading strategies university English major students use and their reading comprehension. His participants' reading comprehension was below what was expected of them. Their studies gave no attention to metacognitive reading strategies effects on the students' metacognitive reading strategies awareness. This study assumes that the cure for Guder Secondary School students' reading failure. This kind of mode of intensive intervention may lead them to sufficient reading performance. This study is also differs in including engagement to motive the students reading that leads to increase in reading comprehension. Only reading strategies training is not enough to improve the students' reading skills, they must read (Karen, 2015). Additionally, this study focuses on conducting instruction on multiple reading strategies instead of single cognitive reading to increase the students' reading strategy awareness.

Our teaching experience in English as a Foreign Language at all educational levels (elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges and universities), as well as the theoretical understanding gained through our doctoral, and our second degree thesis studies conducted make me to have interest in this area. Alhaqbani and Riazi (2012) described the three types of metacognitive reading strategies as follows: Global reading strategies are general strategies that direct readers starting the stages for reading tasks. Problem solving strategies assist readers to remedy difficulties of understanding of what they read. Finally, supportive reading strategies are used as tool to maintain approachability to reading. Therefore, this study filled the gap in the literature by employing quasi-experimental study using both qualitative and quantitative methods to examine the effects of explicit instruction of these metacognitive reading strategies on EFL students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness and perception of students reading strategy instruction.

2. Objectives of the Study

The general purpose of present study is to examine the effects of explicit instruction of metacognitive reading strategy on grade 11 students' reading strategy awareness and their perceptions about metacognitive reading instruction among Grade 11 in Western Shoa Zone, Guder, Ethiopia.

3. Research Hypotheses

In this study, there is assumption that the students might be benefited from the explicit instruction metacognitive reading strategy that they would develop positive metacognitive reading strategy awareness and good perception about metacognitive reading strategy instruction. The hypothesis of this study is mentioned as follows:

H1. There is a statistically significant difference in the metacognitive reading strategy awareness between students who explicitly taught metacognitive reading strategy and those who did not.

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in the metacognitive reading strategies awareness between students who explicitly taught metacognitive reading strategy and those who did not.

4. Review of Related Literature: Definitions and Features of Learning Strategy

Language learning strategies are powerful instruments, which can lead to the betterment of language self-confidence and learning in general (Oxford, 1990). Oxford defined learning strategies in English as an L2 context as the steps or actions taken by language learners to increase any aspect of their learning. Balcı and Üğüten (2018) discusses learning strategy as specific action taken by the learner to make learning, faster, more self-directed and

transferable to new situations. According to Mahdavinia and Panahi (2013), learning strategy can be observable or non-observable, conscious or unconscious. English teachers and students should be aware of these natures and definitions of learning strategies. Some strategies are not observable, because they refer to internal and mental processes, and researchers have to rely on learner accounts as indirect indicators of the mental processes (Bracho, 2007). Examples of observable learning strategies are cooperation and note taking because they have observable behaviors (Mahdavinia & Panahi, 2013; Oxoford, 1990), while examples of non-observed learning strategies are guessing, predicting and inferencing. Metacognition in students can be identified by using self-reporting scales. Verbal report compensates the unobserved metacognitive learning strategies.

4.1. Classifications of Learning Strategy

Second language acquisition (SLA) researches categorized L2 learning strategies based on their definitions. Most of the reviewed literatures have supported the classifications of the learning strategies into six different categories, which were done by Oxford (1990). They include cognitive, metacognitive, memory, compensatory, affective and social strategy. Stern (1992) also categorized them into five types. These are planning strategies, management strategies, cognitive strategies and affective strategies. Direct and indirect learning strategies are other classifications of language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990). According to Oxford, indirect strategies "provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation and empathy and other means" (p. 151). Griffiths (2004) categorized direct learning strategies into memorization, monitoring, deductive reasoning, guessing or inductive inference, practice, clarification or verification while indirect learning strategies are two types: production tricks and creating opportunities for practice. The other researchers (e.g. Oxford & Chamot, 1990) classified L2 learning strategies into two distinct categories, that is, cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies. Oxford and Chamot's classification was based on the information processing theory and cognitive psychology. Metacognitive direct learning controls and regulates learning to the desired level learning process of the learners. It is important to discuss the difference between cognitive, metacognitive, memory, affective, compensation and social strategies. To begin with, cognitive strategy helps readers for managing the language learning. More specifically, it includes techniques like note taking, summarizing, rephrasing, forecasting, analyzing, and context clues using (Singhal, 1999). The second type of learning strategy is metacognitive learning strategy.

Present study is concerned with metacognitive reading strategy. Tavakoli (2014) considered metacognitive reading strategy as high-order thinking skills that enable learners to plan, monitor, and evaluate reading. According to (Romzano, (2010), metacognitive reading strategy is self-regulating and self-monitoring activities. It also includes one's perception of if he or she can read and understand what he or she read. Additionally, it comprise of when and how to use it. This is why Tavakoli argues that learners without metacognitive reading strategy are learners who have no direction to future learning opportunities. Memory strategy used to help the learners' to remember and retrieve information. They include techniques such as mental image creation and association, usage of important/key words, association of words, context usage. The other type of learning strategy is compensation strategies. These strategies need the skills or techniques like reference, context guessing during reading using dictionary sometimes if needed. The students use affective strategies for encouraging themselves; for minimizing the fear, and encourage in reading is called affective strategies (Singhal, 1999).

4.2. Definition of Explicit Teaching of Reading Strategy

Direct classroom instruction gives necessary skills and knowledge that enable students score good grade and success in career development. In this kind of training, the students learn specific tasks that are broken down into specific activities (Brevik, 2019). It consists of fast effective corrective feedback, reinstructing if needed, and systematically covering of the intended elements. It also needs supports like visual for auditory learners. For instance, when teaching specific reading strategy, teachers need to write new vocabularies on boards. Additionally, the teaching techniques should vary. In general, this study showed metacognitive instruction positively affect by classroom methods and teachers' instructional materials. If participants of this study properly instructed on metacognitive reading strategies, they can easily monitor their learning. The metacognitive reading strategy instruction also promotes their thinking skills to use in their academic purpose and their future life (Joseph, 2010).

Metacognition is both readers' awareness and control what they do, not only their cognitive process but their feelings and motivation (Louca, 2003). Metacognitive reading theory posits that metacognitive reading strategy development promotes readers' reading monitoring skills and helps them to regulate their own cognitive process. Therefore, advanced degree of metacognitive awareness is very important for learners to use reading strategies more proficiently. Previous studies on reading strategies revealed that metacognitive aspect of reading strategy was one way of differentiating good and poor readers (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). Therefore, the use of reading strategy depends on whether the strategy is employed metacognitively or not. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) classified metacognitive reading strategy into three categories: global, problem-solving, and supportive reading

strategies. The use of reading strategy relies on whether the readers use the strategy metacognitively or not. This is because poor readers failed to use strategies metacognitively; they did not lack cognitive reading strategies. In order to enhance readers' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies, English teachers should teach their students metacognitive skills through classroom instruction (Yohannes, 2013). Because by learning how to use metacognitive reading strategies, the students might develop their problem solving skills (McLoughlin, et al., 2000).

4.3. Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness

Auebach and Paton (1997) defined metacognitive awareness as the process that requires the skills of applying reading strategies to comprehend texts, ability to monitor understanding of texts and the capacity to regulate strategies as needed. Metacognitive awareness in reading involves the consciousness of if the understanding is occurring or not; it is a conscious application of reading strategies (Singhal, 1999). Reading strategies awareness ability of using has positive impacts on readers' reading performance. Recent studies showed that readers who use these strategies perform better in reading proficiency tests score (Tavakoli; 2014). Metacognition training enables develop strategic readers. Many educational psychologists found that metacognition instruction also develops learners' intelligences, and enables them to control and manage their cognitive activities (Alshaye, 2002). In addition, others examined the effects of planning, reflecting and evaluating strategies, and found the positive effects on advance learners' learning performance (Kincannon et al, 1999).

5. Methodology: Research Design

This study uses a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest research design. It helps to compare students who participate in certain program to students who do not participate (Dorneyi, 2007). The researcher assigned intact groups, that is, the experimental and the control groups. Next to the administration of the pretest questionnaire, metacognitive reading strategy instruction and practicing the strategy were carried out with the experimental group, and then posttest questionnaire. In this study, since more weights are given to the quantitative data, a design suggested by Dorneyi, that is, QUAN + qual, was used. The capital letters indicate the comparative dominance given to the quantitative data, and the plus mark shows the simultaneous gathering of both quantitative and qualitative data.

5.1. Participants of the Study

The study was conducted at Guder Secondary School in Oromia, which is among 22 (21 public and 1 private) secondary schools in Western Shoa Zone. There were 906 Grade 11 in Guder Secondary School. Among this, 551 were males and 355 were females. Among 13 sections of Grade 11, 2 sections were selected by using random sampling techniques. All the sections were written on piece of paper and lottery was drawn. Accordingly, section D and G were selected for the study. In a similar way, lottery was drawn to select experimental and control groups. Section D was selected as experimental group, and section G was selected as control group. The control group participated in the conventional way of reading strategy instruction for four months. However, the experimental group students participated in the explicit instruction of metacognitive reading strategy. They were provided within the classroom and out of the classroom reading strategy practice for four months. At the end of the eight weeks, all students in both groups took posttests for metacognitive reading strategy awareness. Finally, five students from experimental group were interviewed on how the explicit instruction of metacognitive reading strategy affected their metacognitive reading strategy awareness. One trainer was recruited to train the participants of the study.

5.2. Samples and Sampling Techniques

Guder Secondary School was selected for this study using convenient sampling technique. Two sections were selected from Grade 11 students by using lottery method, simple random sampling technique. Similarly, simple random sampling was used to select both experimental and control groups from the two sections. Based on the lottery, section D was selected as experimental group while section G was selected as control group. Five students were selected for the interview by using availability sampling techniques.

5.3. Instruments of Data Collection

Quantitative and qualitative instruments were used in this study. As quantitative data gathered instrument, a modified form of the Mokhtari and Reichard's (2002), metacognitive awareness of reading strategy inventory (MARSI) was used while qualitative data was collected by using semi-structured after the intervention. In this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for overall MARSI was calculated. Additionally, the internal consistencies of the three subscales MARSI'swere computed.

5.4. Methods of Data Analysis

Data were collected using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Hence, the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 21 version. Next to descriptive statistics, ANCOVA was used to see the mean difference between the groups. The interview results were analyzed using summarization and quotation. The data were divided into different themes depending on the interview questions.

5.5. Reliability Analysis of MARSI

Table 1: Reliability Statistics for MARSI

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Items
.839	.840	29

A Cronbach's Alpha was computed to measure the reliability of the overall instrument and each MARSI subscale. The internal consistency of the overall reliability of MARSI was (α=.84), which implies that the MARSI questionnaire is reliable for this study. The alpha level was .05. This means that the MARSI is 84% reliable to measure the students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness, but is 16% unreliable. The following table 2 showed the internal consistency result for each of MARSI's subscale:

Table 2: Reliability Statistics for the Three MARSI's Subscales

MARSI subscales	**Cronbach's Alpha**	**Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items**
Global Reading strategy	.61	.62
Problem-solving Reading Strategy	.64	.63
Supportive Reading Strategy	.65	.64

Additionally, the three subscales had a high Cronbach's Alpha levels. For instance, global reading strategy had a Cronbach's Alpha of .61. The problem-solving reading strategy had .64 Cronbach alpha levels. Finally, supportive reading strategy had internal consistency of .65. The three subscales' internal consistency might be due to the small number of items in each subscale (Mokhtari et al., 2018). These data helped to establish that the MARSI is a reliable instrument for assessing the metacognitive reading strategy awareness of L2 readers (Anderson, 2003).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for the Overall Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness of the Control and Experimental Groups before Intervention

MARSI Pretest

Descriptive Statistics	**Experimental Group**	**Control Group**
Mean	2.77	2.70
Std. Deviation	.20	.18

The above table 3 displayed the SPSS output on overall MARSI scores (mean, and standard deviation of the two groups). The table indicated that there was no difference between experimental and control groups before the metacognitive reading strategy instruction. Control group scored (M=2.70, SD=.18) and experimental group scored (M=2.77, SD=.20). This result is important latter to compare the difference after the metacognitive reading strategy intervention. Both skewness and kurtosis also gave some insights of the normal distribution of the test.

Table 4: Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Mean Scores of MARSI Pretest

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	P
.001	1	139	.981

The equality of variances was computed using Levene's Test. The table 4 above has shown the test of homogeneity of variance for MARSI pretest. The probability value was .981, which is bigger than 0.05. This

showed the variances were equal with the confidence level (95%). The Levene's test of error variance indicated that there were equal initially concerning their metacognitive reading strategy awareness. In addition to this, the dependent variable's error of variance was equal across groups.

5.6. Control of the Means of MARSI Posttest

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness

MARSI Posttest		
	Experimental Group	Control Group
Mean	4.29	2.80
Std. Deviation	.13	.23
Skewness	-.215	.347
Kurtosis	-.567	-.530

The table 5 showed the means and standard deviations of the two groups. The skewness and kurtosis were exceeded negative one and positive one range. Therefore, there was normal distribution.

Table 6: Levene's of Equality of Error for Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness Posttest

F	**df1**	**df2**	**P**
Posttest 1.289	1	139	.258

The above table 6 indicated the test of homogeneity of variance for MARSI Posttest between the two groups. The result of MARSI posttest showed that the test was statistically significant since the probability value is greater than .05. This indicated that the homogeneity of variance. The following table 7 presented the result of the ANOVA:

Table 7: Analysis of Covariate Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of MARSI Posttest

Source	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**P**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Mean of Pretest MARSI	.713	1	.71	22.220	.000	.139
Group	73.421	1	73.42	2288.796	.000	.943
Error	4.427	138	.032			
Corrected Total	83.764	140				

The earlier p-value result for the MARSI pretest was .981, while the p-value for MARSI posttest was .001, which indicated that there was statistical significance between the students who participated in the metacognitive reading strategy instruction F(1,139), =22.22, P=.001, Partial Eta Squared=.139 and the students who did not participate in the metacognitive reading strategy instruction F(1,139)=4.69, P=.981. The mean scores of the experimental group increased significantly from M=2.77, SD=.20 (pretest) to M=4.29, SD=.13 (posttest). The significance difference was not from pretest to posttest (M=2.70, SD=18 to M=2.80, SD=23) as shown in the following table 8:

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for MARSI Pretest and Posttest for Both Groups

Descriptive statistics	**Experimental Group**		**Control Group**	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Mean	2.77	4.29	2.70	2.80
Std. Deviation	.20	.13	.18	.23

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for the Three Subscales of MARSI for Experimental Group

Mean Scores of subcomponents of MARSI	*N of items*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
Global Reading Strategy	13	3.14	4.53	3.89	.39
Problem-solving Reading Strategy	8	3.29	4.39	4.00	.37
Supportive Reading Strategy	8	3.33	4.27	3.85	.31

The metacognitive reading strategy instruction affected experimental group's metacognitive reading strategy awareness. The above table 9 indicated the three subcomponents of MARSI: Problem-solving reading strategy (4.00) was mostly affected by the metacognitive reading strategy direct instruction. Mean Score of global reading strategy was 3.89. Supportive reading strategy was least affected by the instruction (3.85). As a result of the metacognitive reading strategy instruction, the experimental group students increased their metacognitive reading strategy awareness.

6. Analysis of Interview

This study also examined metacognitive reading strategy instruction on students' metacognitive reading strategy perception. The interview result showed that almost all of the interview participants of this study had good perception about learning metacognitive reading strategy. All of them reflected positive view on the strategy instruction and enjoyed the presentation of metacognitive reading strategy teaching. The participants' perceptions about reading skills, strategy instruction, materials used in the strategy instruction are very important in their reading comprehension performance in English. Accordingly, participants had good perception about metacognitive reading strategy practice materials, they favored classroom metacognitive reading strategy practice than out of classroom metacognitive reading strategy practice at their homes. They reported that the modules notes helped them a lot to develop their reading skills. For instance, S1 said: ' *''The materials were very important. Ihave attended the lesson that I have not attend before.''* Semi-structure interview questions were discovery oriented. Most of the interviewees agreed that they aware of what they read. They began to consciously use metacognitive reading strategies they learnt. The other respondent S3 reported about his reading strategy awareness by saying, "*I askquestion myself about what I read, and I try to check the questions when I read and when I finishreading*.'' The interview result concerning the participants' metacognitive reading strategy use is analyzed as follow: For instance, S5 replied, ''I improve my reading strategy use." S1 said, " *The way Itake notes when I read was not full before the strategy training*.'' In a similar way, S2 reported, "I underline when I read.'' ''*My strategy use is good after the training; now I can use most the strategies during reading texts. Now, I aware of clearly what I read. I have purpose in my mind when I read.* '' The interview question "*Do you think you can improve your grade after the metacognitive readingstrategies"* was aimed at identifying interviewees' abilities to apply metacognitive reading strategies to new reading contexts to their own reading. They were also asked to express how metacognitive reading strategies instruction helped them to transfer these strategies to new situation independently rather than the tasks presented by the teacher. The research found that the metacognitive reading strategy training helped participants of this study to transfer the strategy to other reading subjects.

7. Results and Discussions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of metacognitive reading strategy instruction on students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness. Reading strategy awareness refers to being awareness of knowledge of reading strategies for processing reading texts. It also entails ability to check comprehension (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2012). Many scholars in previous study evidenced that metacognitive reading strategy instruction affect students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness (e.g. Singhal, 2001). The finding of this study also showed that teacher's teaching of metacognitive reading strategy increased participants' knowledge of metacognitive reading strategies. The finding of the study indicated that there was statistical significance between the students who participated in the metacognitive reading strategy instruction F(1,139), =22.22, P=.001, Partial Eta Squared=.139 and the students who did not participate in the metacognitive reading strategy instruction F(1,139)=4.69, P=.981. Majority of the interview respondents believed that the metacognitive reading strategy training had long lasting effects on their metacognitive reading strategy awareness and use since they improved their reading strategy knowledge because of the training. Interview result indicated that the students were reluctant at the first class. However, all of them gradually valued the strategy intervention after the metacognitive reading strategy instruction.

Permitting students to practice reading strategy independently is very essential components of reading instruction. Two reading texts were prepared for each metacognitive reading strategy. After they learnt formally and practiced in the classroom, the participants repracticed at their homes, which was vital for metacognitive reading strategy awareness. The nature of these reading texts and teaching materials in this study were also authentic and meaningful. The students learn better if they get opportunities of engaging in their culture and social contexts when learning English (Emitt & Komesaroff, 2003). All of the respondents agreed that metacognitive reading strategy intervention raised their reading strategies; encouraged them to plan reading strategy knowledge; helped them to monitor their strategy use, and evaluated their strategy use. Working with teacher, students, and authentic texts gave them chance to develop autonomy, which in turn increased their reading motivation. In a similar way, Garb (2000) suggested that one of the reasons of integrating metacognitive knowledge into language instruction is to develop learners who can take charge of their own learning. In every strategy instruction, the students in experimental group were involved in self-evaluation process, who developed sense of controlling over their reading. This study is in line with Graham and Bellert's (2005) who concluded that reading strategy knowledge develops learners who challenge new situation in their own learning. This study used clear intervention that engaged students in classroom and out of classroom metacognitive reading strategy practice, which gave them opportunities to apply reading strategies independently. The other reason for the improvement of the experimental group's reading strategy awareness was their engagement in hand-on activities after each strategy lesson, with corrective feedback based on the CALLA model of reading strategy instruction.

The finding that the students in experimental group were engaged in further reading activities in their future learning. The use of simple instructional materials, sharing and discussion with peers and teacher, extensive reading practice, and including reading texts from the students' textbook. The other reason for increment in metacognitive reading strategy was the use of CALLA as reading strategy instruction, which based on the teaching of reading strategy explicitly how to use including classroom practice, out-of-classroom practice, and students and teacher feedback. They were exposed to more than one strategy practice after they learnt in the classroom to practice each strategy. Therefore, it can be conclude from the study result that metacognitive reading strategy instruction done one of its works, that is, it changed the students' metacognitive reading strategy awareness. This can have positive impact on their academic achievements, which in turn may have impact on their academic choose.

8. Recommendations

The 21st century market calls for high reading ability. Direct strategy instruction is one way of addressing struggling English readers. Future study may examine other skills with students those have problems with reading early problems by allowing more instruction times, even longitudinal study. Using several types of reading measurements are also advisable. Future research might use other forms of quasi-experimental design. In addition, reading strategy should be become part of the school curriculum so that learners. Finally, the students themselves should take their own responsibilities to learn metacognitive reading strategies. They need to practice variety of reading texts on their own independently.

References

1. Ahmadi, R. A., Ismail, H. N. and Abdullah, M. K. (2013). The importance of metacognitive Reading strategy awareness in reading comprehension. English Language Teaching, 6(10): 235- 249. (http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/30182)
2. Alhaqbani, A. and Riazi, M. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of rea ding strategy use in Arabic as a sec ond language. Reading in a Foreign Language, 24(2): 231 -255.
3. Ambachew, M. D. (2003). The effect of primary English readers on reading skills in Ethiopia: A Study in African educational needs. PhD Dissertation: University of Pretoria etd.
4. Atakilti Gebru (1997). The Teaching of Reading Comprehension in Grade Nine, Unpublished MA Thesis: Addis Ababa University.
5. Auerbach, E and Paxton, D. (1997). It's not the English thing: bringing reading research into the classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 31: 237-261.
6. Balcı, O and Üğüten, S.D. (2018). The Relationship between EFL Learners' Language Learning Strategy Use and Achievement, International Education Studies, 11(2): 1 -12.
7. Bellilew, M. (2015). The Relationship between Reading Strategy use and Reading Comprehension among Ethiopian EFL Learners. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3(9): 34-41.
8. Birhanu Ewnete (2004). Reading Ability in English Vs Subject Area Achievement: A Study of a Relationship of Grade Nine Students in Gondar Town Secondary Schools (Unpublished MA Thesis), Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies.

9. Bracho, M H. (2007). The Effects of Metacognitive Training on English Language Learner's Reading Comprehension. PhD Dissertation, Catholic University of America, DC.
10. Chamot, A.U and O' Malley, J.M. (1994). The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
11. Dawit, T.T. (2014). The Effect of Explicit Reading Strategy Instruction on Reading Comprehension of Upper Primary Grade Students. International Journal of Education, 6(3): 81-100. (http://www.macrothink.org)
12. Emitt, M. P. J and Komesaroff, L. (2003). Language and Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Fazal, S, Majoka, I and Khan, M. (2015). Impact of Speed Reading Intervention on Students' Learning Second Language. ISER 6 th International Conference, Sydney, Australia, 12th September 2015. (www.worldresearchlibrary.org/up_proc/pdf/65-144264598612-16.pdf)
14. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive Developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34:906-911. (https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906)
15. Garb, E. (2000). Maximizing the potential of young adults with visual impairments: The metacognitive element. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 94(9): 574-583. (https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X0009400904)
16. Graham, L and Bellert, A. (2005). Reading comprehension difficulties experienced by students with learning disabilities, Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10 (2): 325-336. (https://www.tandfonline.com)
17. Griffiths, C. (2004). Language Learning Strategies: Theory and Research. School of Foundations Studies AIS St Helens, Auckland, New Zealand. Occasional Paper No. 1.
18. Joseph, N. (2009). Metacognition Needed: Teaching Middle and High School Students to Develop Strategic Learning Skills, Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 54(2): 99-103. (DOI: 10.1080/10459880903217770)
19. Kincannon, J., Gebler, M and Kim, J. 1999).). The effects of metacognitive training on performance and use of metacognitive skills in self-directed learning situations. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 436 146).
20. Mokhtari, K, Richard,. C, A and Dimitrov, M. (2018). Revising the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) and testing for factorial invariance, Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, SSLLT 8 (2): 219-24. (https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.3)
21. Mokhtari, K and Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(2): 249-259. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-
22. Mebratu, M. (201 4). Cognitive Reading Strategy Training and Its Effects on EFL Learners' Comprehension Skills: The Case of High School Learners, International Journal of Research, 1(4): 258-276.
23. (https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.684.4275&rep=rep1&type=pdf)
24. Mahdavinia , D and Panahi, S. (2013). Learning Strategies. Islamic Azad University. McLoughlin, C., Baird, J., & Pigdon, K., Woolley, M. (2000). Fostering Teacher Inquiry and Reflective Learning Processes through Technology Enhanced Scaffolding. Conference on Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia. Charlottesville, VA: AACE.
25. O'Malley, J.M and Chamot, A.U. (1990). Learner strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
27. Perez, M. L. (2008). Effective Reading Instruction for English Learners (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Southern California, California.
28. Romzano, S. J. (2010). Effectiveness of Metacognitive Strategies for Improving Reading Comprehension in Secondary Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
29. Rufeal Disassa (2007). Reading Strategies Used by Secondary Students (Unpublished M.A Thesis), Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
30. Sheorey, R and Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. System, 29 (4): 431-449. (https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00039-2)
31. Mokhtari, K and Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies, Journal of Developmental Education, 25 (3): 2-1. (https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje)
32. Sheorey, R and Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. System, 29(4): 431-49. (https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00039-2)

33. Siegel, J. (2013) Second language learners' perceptions of listening strategy instruction, Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 7(1): 1-18. (DOI: 10.1080/17501229.2011.653110)
34. Singhal, M. (1999). The Effects of Reading Strategy Instruction on the Reading Comprehension, Reading Process and Strategy Use of Adult ESL Readers (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis), University of Arizona, USA.
35. Tavakoli, H. (2014). The effectiveness of metacognitive strategy awareness in reading comprehension: The case of Iranian university EFL students. The Reading Matrix, 14(2):314- 336. (http://www.readingmatrix.com/files/11-24o5q41u.pdf)
36. Tekle, F. (2016). A Study of Independent Reading in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Ethiopian Schools (Unpublished PhD Dissertation), University of South Africa, South Africa. Texas Education Agency, 2004.
37. Wang, X. (2009). Second language theories and their influences on EFL in China. English Language Teaching, 2(4): 149–152. (doi: 10.5539/elt.v2n4p149)
38. Brevik, L.M. (2019). Explicit reading strategy instruction or daily use of strategies? Studying the teaching of reading comprehension through naturalistic classroom observation in English L2. Read Write 32: 2281–2310. (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09951-w)
39. Yohannes, T. (2013). Survey of Secondary School Students' Reading strategy Us, Teachers' Perception and Practices. Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science, 8/2:57-67. (https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ejesc/article/view/101575)
40. Yüksela, İ and Yükselb, I. (2012). Metacognitive Awareness of Academic Reading Strategies, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31:894-898. (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.164)