THE EFFECTS OF DIRECT AND INTEGRATED INSTRUCTION OF COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES AT AWARENESS-RAISING LEVEL ON READING PROFICIENCY AND STRATEGY USE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

DENİZ ÇİÇEKOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Wolf Konig
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurdan Ö. Gürbüz _____

Dr. Necmi Akşit _____

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF DIRECT AND INTEGRATED INSTRUCTION OF COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES AT AWARENESS-RAISING LEVEL ON READING PROFICIENCY AND STRATEGY USE

Çiçekoğlu, Deniz

M. A. , Program in English Language Teaching

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu

September 2003, 196 pages

This study intends to find out the possible effects of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level on reading proficiency and strategy use. In the study both qualitative and quantitative data were utilized. The relevant data were obtained by means of think-aloud protocols, semi-structured interviews, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning –SILL- (Oxford, 1990), learning diaries and the reading scores of students on a proficiency exam (COPE). A total of 24 students studying at

Bilkent University School of English Language were involved in the study. The scores of the students who received the strategy instruction on the reading paper of COPE, and the scores of the students who were not subject to any strategy instruction were used to run a t-test so as to reveal whether there was a significant difference between these two sets of scores. The data that came from the think-aloud protocols, semi-structured interviews and learning diaries were analyzed so as to trace the type of strategies employed by the students and the frequency with which they were employed. The results did not indicate a statistically significant difference. It was also discovered that all students involved in the study had a tendency to use more cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones. The cognitive strategies were more varied with the group of students who received the strategy instruction.

Keywords: Reading strategies, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, strategy instruction, reading strategy instruction, awareness-raising, reading proficiency

ÖZ

BİLİŞSEL VE BİLİŞ ÖTESİ OKUMA STRATEJİLERİNİN DİREK VE TÜMLEŞİK OLARAK BİLİNÇLENDİRME SEVİYESİNDE ÖĞRETİMİNİN OKUMA YETERLİLİĞİNE VE STRATEJİ KULLANIMINA ETKİLERİ

Çiçekoğlu, Deniz

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Y. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu

Eylül 2003, 196 sayfa

Bu çalışma bilişsel ve biliş ötesi okuma stratejilerinin direk ve tümleşik olarak bilinçlendirme seviyesinde öğretiminin okuma yeterliliğine ve strateji kullanımına olası etkilerini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu çalışmada hem nitel hem de nicel veriler kullanılmıştır. Bahsi geçen veriler sesli düşünme tekniği, mülakatlar, Yabancı Dil Öğrenme Stratejisi Envanteri-SILL- (Oxford, 1990),

öğrenme günceleri ve öğrencilerin İngilizce yeterlilik sınavının (COPE) okuma bölümünden aldıkları notlar kullanılarak elde edilmiştir. Araştırmaya Bilkent Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Meslek Yüksekokuluna devam eden toplam 24 öğrenci katılmıştır. Strateji eğitimi alan ve almayan öğrencilerin COPE sınavının okuma bölümünden aldıkları notlar aralarında herhangi bir fark olup olmadığını belirlemek amacıyla istatistiksel olarak incelenmiştir. Sesli düşünme tekniği, mülakatlar, ve güncelerden elde edilen veriler strateji tiplerini ve ne sıklıkta kullanıldıklarını gözlemlemek için analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar ortaya çıkan farkın istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olmadığını bulmuştur. Araştırma aynı zamanda araştırmaya katılan öğrencilerin biliş ötesi stratejilere oranla daha fazla bilişsel stratejiler kullandıklarını belirlemiştirç Strateji eğitimi alan öğrencilerin daha çeşitli bilişsel stratejiler kullandıklarıda saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okuma stratejileri, bilişsel ve biliş ötesi stratejiler, strateji eğitimi, okuma stratejileri eğitimi, bilinçlendirme, okuma yeterliliği

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank my thesis advisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu for her insight, positive attitude, guidance and encouragement throughout the study.

I'd also like to thank jury members Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurdan Ö. Gürbüz and Dr. Necmi Akşit for their helpful suggestions and comments.

My special thanks go to Tijen Akşit for the invaluable support and help she has provided me right from the start to the very end.

I should also like to thank Bilkent University School of English Language (BUSEL) for supporting and helping me in my postgraduate studies.

Finally, I must express my gratitude to my sisters, İlke and Sanem, for their never-ending patience and support. I'd also like to thank my mother and father who have most willingly offered their help whenever it was needed.

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date:

Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT…….. iii

ÖZ…….. v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…… vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS…… ix

LIST OF TABLES……. xiv

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION

1.0 Presentation…….. 1

1.1 Background to the Study…… 1

1.2 Focus and Scope of the Study……... 5

1.3 Research Questions……. 8

1.4 Definition of Terms……. 8

1.4.1 Learning Strategies…… 8

1.4.2 Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies……... 9

1.4.3 Integrated and Direct Strategy Instruction……. 11

1.4.4 Awareness-raising…… 12

1.4.5 Reading…….. 12

1.4.6 Reading Proficiency……. 13

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Presentation…… 14

2.1 Various Frameworks for Classifying Learning Strategies…….. 14

2.2 Reading in an EFL Setting…… 23

2.3 Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies…….. 26

2.4 Strategy Instruction…… 28

2.4.1 Importance of Strategy Instruction……. 29

2.4.2 Types of Strategy Instruction…….. 31

2.4.2.1 Awareness-Training…….. 32

2.4.2.2 One-Time Strategy Training……. 34

2.4.2.3 Long-Term Strategy Training…… 34

2.4.3 Implementation of Strategy Instruction…… 35

2.4.3.1 Separate and Integrated Methods of Strategy Instruction……. 35

2.4.3.2 Direct and Embedded Methods of Strategy Instruction……. 37

2.4.3.3 Training of the Teachers Involved in Strategy Instruction…… 38

2.4.3.4 Materials in Strategy Instruction……. 39

2.4.3.5 Instructional Models in Strategy Instruction…… 40

2.4.3.6 Effects of Individual Characteristics on Strategy Instruction…… 46

2.5 Research on Reading Strategies…….…… 48

2.5.1 First Language Reading Research…… 49

2.5.2 Second and Foreign Language Reading Research…… 50

2.5.3 Metacognitive Reading Strategy Research…… 53

2.6 Research Investigating the Frequency and Variety of Strategy Use…… 55

III. METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

3.0 Presentation……. 58

3.1 Design of the Study…… 58

3.2 Participants…….. 60

3.3 Data Collection Instruments…… 61

3.3.1 Qualitative Data Collection Instruments…….. 62

3.3.1.1 Think-aloud Protocols……. 62

3.3.1.2 Semi-structured Interviews…… 66

3.3.1.3 Learning Diaries…… 67

3.3.2 Quantitative Data Collection Instruments…… 69

3.3.2.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)……. 69

3.3.2.2 Certificate of Proficiency in English (COPE)…… 71

3.4 Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Instruction…… 73

3.4.1 Strategy Instruction Session 1…… 75

3.4.2 Strategy Instruction Session 2…… 76

3.4.3 Strategy Instruction Session 3…… 78

3.4.4 Strategy Instruction Session 4…… 79

3.5 Procedure…… 80

3.5.1 Procedures before the Strategy Instruction……. 81

3.5.2 Procedures during the Strategy Instruction……. 87

3.5.3 Procedures after the Strategy Instruction……. 89

3.6 Limitations……. 93

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.0 Presentation…… 98

4.1 Research Questions…….. 98

4.1.1 Results for Research Question 1…… 99

4.1.2 Results for Research Question 2……. 101

4.1.2.1 Results from TAPs and Semi-structured Interviews…….. 102

4.1.2.2 Results from Learning Diaries…….. 112

4.1.2.2.1 Types of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in the Learning Diaries from Group A and Group B….. 114

4.1.2.2.2 Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies…… . 118

4.1.2.3 Results from the SILL……. 124

V. DISCUSSION

5.0 Presentation……. 138

5.1 Summary of the Study…… 138

5.2 Discussion…… 139

5.3 Pedagogical Implications…….….. 143

5.4 A Model for Strategy Instruction……. 144

5.5 Evaluation of the Study……. 147

5.5.1 Implications for Further Research …… 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY……... 151

APPENDICES

A Reading Text for TAP 1……. 162

B Reading Text for TAP 2……. 164

C Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategy Inventory…… 166

D SILL…… 167

E Sample Think-aloud Transcript …….. 174

F Diary Guidelines…….…… 177

G Diary Collation Charts for Group A…… 178

H SILL Collation Chart for Group A…… 184

I Diary Analysis for Group A and Group B…….. 195

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. Oxford's Strategy Classification Scheme……. 20
2. Strategy Instruction Stages by Chamot and O'Malley…….. 45
3. Types of Data and Instruments…… 59
4. Descriptive Statistics for Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper in COPE……. 100
5. The z scores and T scores of Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper in COPE……. … 101
6. T-test for Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper of COPE……. 101
7. The Type of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP 1 and TAP 2 in Group A…… 102
8. The Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP 1 and TAP 2 in Group A…… 105
9. The Type of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP 1 and TAP 2 in Group B…….. 109
10. The Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP 1 and TAP 2 in Group B……... 110
11. The z scores and T scores of Group A on Part B of the SILL…. 126
12. Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A…….. 127
13. T-test for Cognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A……. 127
14. The z scores and T scores of Group A on Part D of the SILL… 128
15. Descriptive Statistics for Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1

and SILL 2 for Group A……. 128
16. T-test for Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A…… 129
17. The z scores and T scores of Group A on Part B and D of the SILL……. 130
18. Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A……... 130
19. T-test for Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A…….. 131
20. The Frequency of Use of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies for SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A……. 133
21. The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 1 for Cognitive Strategies in Group A……. 134
22. The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 2 for Cognitive Strategies in Group A…… 135
23. The Frequency and Percentage of Answers in SILL 1 for Metacognitive Strategies in Group A…… 136
24. The Frequency and Percentage of Answers in SILL 2 for Metacognitive Strategies in Group A…… 137
25. Steps in the Strategy Training Model…… 147
26. Diary Collation Charts for Group A……. 178

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Presentation

This chapter is intended primarily to present the purpose of the study and to explain the background to the study so as to reveal the significance of the phenomenon at hand - learning strategies and strategy instruction. Secondarily, the focus and scope of the study will be explained. This will be followed by the research questions which the study set out to answer. Finally, the terms that were used in the study will be defined.

1.1 Background to the Study

Education is a lifelong process and as educators, one of our most important responsibilities is to equip our learners with all the necessary tools to cope with the demands of an ever-changing world. Undoubtedly, for the successful fulfillment of such a significant responsibility, learners need to be made aware of the true nature of learning and the importance of acquiring skills and strategies that would enhance and promote the learning process. These two major concerns on the part of the educators, and researchers alike, have led to a

plethora of research on how to help individuals become successful learners and how teachers can help individuals learn effectively. Such concerns have initiated interest in a phenomenon known as learning strategies, which inevitably gave rise to the instruction of learners in strategies.

The learning strategy research is a direct consequence of the shift in emphasis from teachers and teaching to learners and learning as characterized by works like Nunan's (1988) learner-centered curriculum and Tudor's (1996) learner-centeredness in language education. Putting the learner at the foreground, unavoidably, led to the scrutiny of the kinds of learners, particularly the successful ones. The theory, as noted by Wenden and Rubin (1987), that good language learners make use of certain strategies that result in successful language learning outcomes, gave impetus and inspiration to researchers like Wesche (1975), Naiman et al (1978), Bialystok (1979), Tarone (1977, 1981), Hosenfeld (1977), Cohen and Aphek (1980, 1981), Wenden (1982), Chamot and O'Malley (1987), and Oxford (1990).

Rubin in 1975 asserted that the successful learners used strategies, whose deployment enhanced language learning. Following on from this discovery, she rightly argued that such strategies could be made available to less successful students. This idea, in return, gradually gave rise to concerns about instructing learners in the use of strategies. Thus, all the influential figures above helped in shaping what we know about strategies and learner training today. That's the foremost reason why we see the emphasis, with differing degrees, on strategies and learner instruction in various educational contexts.

Stimulated by the theory which advocated the instruction of learners in the use of strategies, for the purposes of increasing the gains in learning, the present study will be conducted. There have been many studies carried out into the effects of strategy use not only in one's native language (Rubin, 1981), but also in English as a second language (Chamot & O'Malley, 1990; Bialystok, 1981; Carrell, 1985) and English as a foreign language settings (Chamot & Kupper, 1989). Some of the studies cited focused on particular skills; for instance, Brown and Palincsar (1982) were interested in the skill of reading in one's native language, Chamot and Kupper (1989) , in one of their studies, did research into listening comprehension strategies used by foreign language students. Thus, the field has seen a wealth of research focusing on different aspects of the phenomenon. Similarly, the present study had its focus as the instruction of advanced level Turkish university students in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL from now on) context as regards cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level.

The importance of the learning strategies is that they transcend all contexts; hence, its significance lies in the fact that they come into play whenever learning is concerned. That is to say, learning strategies are not limited solely to native language (L1) learning. Nor are they under the domain of second or foreign language learning. On the contrary, as Lessard-Clouston (1997) noted, learning strategies are 'involved in all learning regardless of the content and context' (p.2). Thus, the use of strategies has been shown to have

considerable impact on learning in different contexts, and once they are learnt, the strategies may benefit the learners in whatever subject they are engaged in.

This is one of the reasons that makes the phenomenon important, yet it is certainly not the least. The amount of popularity learning strategies have been receiving for the last couple of decades can be linked to the idea of learner autonomy. The implication is that a learner who can successfully make use of strategies is also one who is autonomous; he has the means and resources "for the specific attacks" he makes about a given problem triggered by second language input and output (Brown, 1994, p.114). Thus, learning strategies have been shown to foster autonomy as reflected in the works by Wenden (1987), who asserted that learning strategies are crucial for autonomy and that the foremost aim of learner training ought to be the facilitation of autonomy (as cited in Wenden and Rubin, 1987). Thus, given the importance attached to the concept of autonomy and the learning strategies, further exploration of this phenomenon may benefit the field.

Learning strategy research has focused on acquisition of vocabulary and some particular skills like listening and reading. In a foreign language context, it cannot be denied that reading is a skill of great importance and it is emphasized to a great extent. This is, by no means, to say that reading is more important when compared to other skills. Yet, the significance of this particular skill in an EFL context cannot be denied. What's more, the strategic competence in reading may well transfer to other skills. As Cohen (1990) remarked, through the cultivation of reading, learners are allowed to one more channel of

communication and can benefit from one more important source of input. Besides, it is no secret that if reading is improved, this may "provide usable data in improving language skills and skilful reading can accelerate language learning" (Cohen, 1990, p.73).

1.2 Focus and Scope of the Study

This particular study was conducted in Bilkent University School of English Language (BUSEL from now on), which is the preparatory school of Bilkent University. In BUSEL, at the beginning of each academic year all registered students take the Certificate of Proficiency in English (COPE from here on) exam, which is a proficiency and a placement exam. Students who pass the COPE exam are exempt from the preparatory program and go directly to their departments. The ones who fail have to attend the courses in the preparatory program, which consist of five levels; namely, (a) Beginner level, which is the elementary level for beginners and false starters; (b) Pre-intermediate level, which is the next level following the elementary level; (c) Intermediate level, which leads the students to the advanced levels; (d) Upper-intermediate level, which is an advanced level when compared to elementary and intermediate levels; and (d) Pre-faculty level, which is the exit level and the level at the end of which students take the COPE to be exempt from the Preparatory Program. The nature of instruction is such that in the first two levels students receive relatively more structural input when compared to the other levels. That is to say, starting with the Intermediate level students receive less structural input and more skills-based teaching.

The nature of the programs in BUSEL is English for Academic Purposes (EAP from now on). The instruction in all levels aims at enabling the students to be competent in all four academic skills. Thus, the ultimate aim of the BUSEL program is not only to equip the learners with all the necessary skills for them to be able to cope with the demands of their studies in the target setting, but also to help them attain the necessary language proficiency necessary to continue their studies in their departments.

In addition, in BUSEL, a great deal of emphasis is placed on learner-training and autonomous learning. Thus, the saying "Give a man a fish, he will eat for a day. Teach him how to fish, he will eat every day" is the motto. Therefore, there is a learner-training component in all levels, whose aim is to help the students realize their own potentials as learners, to raise their awareness on what learning involves, and also to help them become autonomous learners. Thus, learner training and autonomy are seen as indispensable ingredients in helping the students at BUSEL deal with the future demands of their departmental studies.

As was aforementioned, the aim of BUSEL is to help students acquire the language proficiency necessary for them to deal with their future studies in their departments but also to help them become autonomous learners. Hence, in line with the general policy of BUSEL which advocates the importance of learner training and autonomy, the study was conducted to see the possible effects of strategy instruction. It sought to reveal the possible benefits of carrying out strategy instruction on cognitive and metacognitive

reading strategies at awareness-raising level with Pre-faculty, therefore, advanced, students.

At the Pre-Faculty level, the Pre-faculty course book is used. Due to the nature of the Pre-faculty course, academic reading and writing are heavily focused on. In terms of the reading component, the Pre-Faculty course book abounds in academic texts that provide linguistic and cognitive challenge to the learners. Reading and reading strategies, as was previously mentioned, are one of the most important components for the survival of learners, particularly in academic contexts and once reading skills and strategies are fostered, this may accelerate the language learning process and overall language proficiency. The writing component of the Pre-faculty course has adopted the process writing approach. The process of drafting is aided through tutorials during which teachers give support to the learners as much as possible. Within the program, an integrated skills approach has been adopted and each student receives 25 hours of tuition, 15 hours of which is devoted to reading, listening, and speaking per week. In addition, considerable amount of language support is also provided. Alongside the emphasis on academic skills like reading, writing, listening and speaking, the Pre-faculty course book also trains the learners in the use of various strategies, in somewhat an indirect manner.

Hence, this study primarily focused on the possible effects of an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level on the reading proficiency of advanced level Turkish university students in an EFL setting. Secondarily, the study

attempted to shed light on whether an integrated and direct strategy instruction in reading at awareness-raising level would cause an increase in the frequency and variety of cognitive and metacognitive strategies involved in reading.

1.3 Research Questions

1. Does an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level in an EFL setting affect advanced level Turkish university students' reading proficiency?
2. Does an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level lead to an increase in the frequency and variety of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies?

1.4 Definition of Terms

1.4.1 Learning Strategies

One dictionary definition of the word 'strategy' is "the art of planning the best way to achieve something or to be successful in a particular field" (Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary (1992), p.1442). A similar definition came from Oxford (1990) who thought a strategy as 'a plan, a step, or conscious action toward achievement of an objective' (p. 8). Ellis (1994), on the other hand, took a step forward and provided a definition for the word 'strategy' by linking it to the framework of learning languages. He proposed a

strategy 'consisted of mental and behavioral activity related to some specific stage in the overall process of language acquisition or language use' (p. 530).

For the purposes of this study, however, the learning strategies are handled as conscious and deliberate actions that the learners employ in the process of learning a language (Hartman, 2001, p.33).

1.4.2 Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Cognitive and metacognitive strategies, which are both equally significant for successful language learning, have been found to be difficult to separate from one another. Yet, it was emphasized that describing the strategies under specific strategy terms and definitions was useful especially when conducting research (Chamot and O'Malley, 1990). Thus, the cognitive and metacognitive strategies were defined using Oxford's typology as the framework (1990).

The cognitive strategies, which are referred to as 'direct' strategies in Oxford's typology (1990), are strategies that students make use of when they are working on a language learning task or when they are problem solving, and they operate directly upon the incoming information.

While cognitive strategies are most helpful during the execution of a language learning task, metacognitive strategies, are beneficial in overseeing, regulating and self-directing the language learning process (Wenden & Rubin, 1987). As the prefix "meta" suggests, metacognition is "beyond" cognition, or as some researchers put it, it is "cognition of cognition" (Carrell, Pharis & Liberto,

1989, p.647). Thus, metacognitive strategies are ones that are employed for the understanding of the cognitive process.

Just like the case with cognitive strategies, with metacognitive strategies, too, Oxford's typology will be employed as the framework. In Oxford's terms, metacognitive strategies are "indirect" and they are crucial for successful language learning as they organize, or manage, the learning process (1990, p.136).

Within the boundaries of this study, the metacognitive strategies under scrutiny will be twofold; one is the metacognitive strategies that are employed *while* performing the language learning task and the other is the group of metacognitive strategies that are made use of *after* the performance of the task for the purposes of evaluation and self-monitoring.

Thus, this study will make use of Oxford's cognitive and metacognitive typology as the framework and pull together cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies from the research conducted into reading strategies to make a custom-made inventory of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies.

1.4.3 Integrated and Direct Strategy Instruction

As a result of the research conducted into strategy instruction, a number of considerations have been voiced about the *why*, *what* and *how* of the strategy instruction. As a direct consequence of these considerations, some terms and definitions have emerged to shed light on these various aspects of strategy instruction. One of these aspects is about *how* to implement the strategy

instruction. The terms "integrated" and "direct instruction", thus, set out to explicate *how* one can go about strategy instruction.

For the purposes of this study, the term "integrated", as the name suggests, means integrating or incorporating the strategy instruction in the language or content subject (Chamot and O'Malley, 1990, p.152). Thus, the strategy instruction that was carried out for the purposes of this study was *not* offered as a separate course. Rather, it was integrated into the curriculum of the Pre-faculty class to whom the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction was offered.

As for the term "direct", again the definition by Chamot and O'Malley was employed. As Chamot and O'Malley remarked (1990), in "direct" instruction students are informed about the value and purpose of the strategy instruction, as opposed to the "embedded" instruction, in which students are not aware that they are learning or practicing strategies. For the purposes of this study, direct instruction, as was described by Chamot and O'Malley (1990), was utilised. Therefore, the students who were offered the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction were well aware of the fact that they were being taught cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies.

1.4.4 Awareness-raising

The cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction was offered to raise the awareness of students on particular cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. This meant that the instruction solely aimed at making the students conscious about certain cognitive and metacognitive

reading strategies that could help them in accomplishing tasks and in aiding comprehension. The strategy instruction also accommodated some opportunities for practice to a certain extent, however, since the sole aim was raising the awareness of students, regular practice was not available.

1.4.5 Reading

The skill of reading, which has a vital role in language learning, not just in the acquisition of one's native language, but also in second and foreign language learning environments, has been defined in various ways. According to the Michigan Department of Education, reading is the modus operandi of building up meaning by means of a dynamic interplay among the reader's existing knowledge, the message conveyed by the written text as well as the context of the reading situation (Dutcher, 1990). Although reading has long been regarded as a receptive process, the above definition captures
the essence of this particular skill as a dynamic interplay between the text and the reader. Nuttall (1989) regards the skill of reading as the, "active interrogation of a text". Such an interaction, without doubt, requires complicated cognitive abilities and involves a considerable amount of mental juggling on the part of the reader.

The present study, thus, sees the reading process as a dynamic and complex process involving both the cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

1.4.6 Reading Proficiency

Proficiency, as Ellis notes (1994), refers to the learners' ability in using the target language. Obviously, Ellis is talking about the general ability of the

learners in using the target language. However, for the purposes of this study, only the reading proficiency, or the ability of using the reading skills and strategies will be considered.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Presentation

This chapter intends to provide background information about those aspects of strategies and strategy instruction that set the scene for the current study at hand. Thus, the chapter will start off by providing information about some of typologies that have been used to classify strategies. Then, the importance of reading as a skill in an EFL setting will be considered. Next, cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading will be examined, which will be followed by the section that bears information about strategy instruction. The reading strategy research, which forms the next section in this chapter will provide information on various research conducted particularly in English as a Second Language (ESL) and / or EFL settings. Finally, in the last section there is information about studies that particularly studied the frequency and variety with which strategies were employed.

2.1 Various Frameworks for Classifying Learning Strategies

Second language acquisition research has focused on both the learning process and the language learner. The emphasis on the learning process and the language learner, in return, has led to an interest in a phenomenon known as the learning strategies, which has attracted considerable amount of attention for more than 30 years. Despite a considerable amount of work in the relevant field, some "vagueness", in Ellis's terms, still persists (1994). Primarily, the alternative definitions of the term "learning strategies" put forward by several researchers and different classification schemes for the same phenomenon have caused problems in the field. Nevertheless, despite these problems, various works done regarding the learning strategies have notably benefited the second language acquisition (SLA) research.

Before talking about the various definitions offered, and the issues associated with them, it may be worthwhile to define what a skill is. Thus, it might be useful to make a distinction between what a "strategy" is and what a "skill" is commonly referred to as. In Oxford's terms a skill simply means "ability, expertness or proficiency that is gained incrementally during the language development process" (1990, p.6). In other words, as Cohen puts it, a skill is an "overall behaviour or general class of behaviours" while a strategy is "the specific means for realizing that behaviour" (1990, p.83). Thus, in the light of the above definitions, it can be concluded that when a learner makes use of a strategy, there is the element of choice-the learner makes a conscious choice as to which strategy to employ so as to tackle a particular task. However, when a

skill is at play, the steps followed for the execution of a task is automatic; thus, all the steps involved are followed unconsciously. As Paris, Wasik and Turner (1991) (as cited in Carrell, 1998) put it:

> Skills refer to information-processing techniques that are automatic, whether at the level of recognizing grapheme - phoneme correspondence or summarizing a story. Skills are applied to a text unconsciously for many reasons including, expertise, repeated practice, compliance with directions, luck and native use. In contrast, strategies are actions selected deliberately to achieve particular goals. An emerging skill can become a strategy when it is used intentionally. Likewise a strategy can "go underground" (in the sense of Vygotsky, 1978) and become a skill. Indeed strategies are more efficient and developmentally advanced when they become generated and applied automatically as skills. Thus, strategies are "skills under consideration." (p.2).

Having seen how skills are defined in relation to strategies, it would be worthwhile to consider some definitions offered for learning strategies. By this way, what Ellis (1994) means by "vagueness" as far as the alternative definitions of the term learning strategies are concerned, will be clearer.

When one looks at the definition of the term "learning strategies", a variety of definitions are available, which, unfortunately, reveals a number of problems. According to Stern (as cited in Ellis 1994) a learning strategy is "…best reserved for the general tendencies or overall characteristics of the approach employed by the language learner…" (p.531). In Weinstein and Mayer's view (1985) (as cited in Ellis 1994) learning strategies are "the behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning that are

intended to influence the learner's encoding process" (p.531). For Wenden and Rubin (1987) the learning strategies are "strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly" (p.23). For O'Malley and Chamot (1990) they are "special thoughts and behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain, new information" (p. 1). And finally for Oxford (1994) learning strategies are "specific actions, behaviours, steps, or techniques that students employ-often consciously- to improve their progress in internalizing, storing, retrieving, and using the L2" (p.175).

Thus, when one reads all the definitions provided, the main problem that stems from these various definitions is whether to see strategies as behavioural or as mental or both. For instance, Oxford sees them as predominantly behavioural, whereas Weinstein and Mayer (1985) regard them as both behavioural and mental. As a means of tackling this problem, the researchers prefer defining what they specifically mean by learning strategies for their particular research designs.

As was aforementioned, despite the plethora of research conducted into strategies, some problems still persist, one of which is the vagueness in defining what a strategy is. The other problem is the different classification schemes that have come into existence over the years.

It is a known fact that the wealth of research on learning strategies has essentially emerged from a concern for identifying the traits of good language learners. The earlier studies focusing on the good language learners tried to list the strategies deployed by such students. Some of the leading studies conducted in this area are by figures like Rubin (1975), Wesche (1975), and Naiman, Frochlich, Stern and Todesco (1978). Rubin (1975), one of the pioneers in the field of successful language learner research and also in learning strategies, attempted to identify the strategies employed by the successful language learners and tried to classify them. As a result of her earlier studies came the following list in which Rubin (1975) suggested that good language learners:

- are prepared to guess,
- attempt to communicate,
- are uninhibited about mistakes,
- attend to form by analyzing, categorizing, and synthesizing,
- practise (e.g. by initiating conversation),
- monitor own and others' speech, and
- attend to meaning (p.20).

As more and more research was conducted, a number of lists with the successful learner strategies were contributed to the field. Tarone (1977), Naiman et al (1978), Reiss (1985), are but a few of the prominent names in this field, whose works have been considerably beneficial. When looked at, the studies listed above yielded five important aspects of successful language

learning, which Ellis (1994) lists as; "(a) a concern for language form; (b) a concern for communication; (c) an active task approach; (d) an awareness of the learning process; and (e) a capability to use strategies flexibly in accordance with task requirements" (p.546).

The most prominent outcome of the studies mentioned above has been in verifying that good language learners made use of strategies that helped and enhanced their learning and that the learning strategies employed by the successful learners could be described and classified. Yet, as Ellis noted, although researchers contended that strategies could be classified, "little attempt was made to classify the strategies into general categories" (1994, p.535). Two of these few attempts were by Naiman et al (1978) and Rubin (1975), for instance. Naiman et al (1978) proposed a classification scheme, which consisted of five main categories - Active Task Approach, Realization of Language as a System, Realization of Language as a Means of Communication and Interaction, Management of Affective Demands, Monitoring L2 Performance - accompanied by a number of secondary categories. In 1981 Rubin suggested an alternative classification scheme which listed learning strategies under two main categories; namely, Strategies That Directly Affect Learning, and Processes That Contribute Indirectly to Learning. Under each category there were some subgroups like, Clarification / Verification, Monitoring, Memorization, etc.

Another significant study that was conducted with the aim of identifying the range, type and frequency of learning strategies, and which consequently paved the way for another classification scheme, was conducted by Chamot and O'Malley (1987) (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990). The results of this research showed that strategies could well be classified into three categories; namely, metacognitive, cognitive, and finally, social / affective strategies. This was, no doubt, quite an important classification scheme as Chamot and O'Malley relied heavily on the contributions of the cognitive psychology, which had formulated learning strategies through an information-processing model.

The other significant strategy classification scheme is the one provided by Oxford (1990). What Oxford did was to make use of all the earlier studies with the aim of incorporating every single strategy that was previously mentioned in the literature into her classification scheme. After she came up with her first typology in 1985, she later updated and presented a new classification scheme in 1990 that was "perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (Ellis, 1994, p.539) (See Table 1).

Table 1: Oxford's Strategy Classification Scheme

DIRECT STRATEGIES	INDIRECT STRATEGIES
I. MEMORY STRATEGIES	**I. METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES**
A. Creating mental linkages	**A. Centering your learning**
1.Grouping	1. Overviewing and linking with already known material
2.Associating/elaborating	**2.** Paying attention
3.Placing new words into context	

B. Applying images and sounds	3. Delaying speech production

Table 1 (cont.)

1.Using imagery 2. Semantic mapping 3. Using keywords 4. Representing sounds in memory **C. Reviewing well** 1. Structured reviewing **D. Employing action** 1. Using physical response or sensation 2. Using mechanical techniques **II. <u>COGNITIVE STRATEGIES</u>** **A. Practicing** 1. Repeating 2. Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems 3. Recognizing and using formulas and patterns 4. Recombining 5. Practicing naturalistically **B. Receiving and sending messages** 1. Getting the idea quickly 2. Using resources for receiving and sending messages **C. Analyzing and reasoning** 1. Reasoning deductively 2. Analyzing expressions 3. Analyzing contrastively (across	B. Arranging and Planning your learning 1. Finding out about language learning 2. Organizing 3. Setting goals and objectives 4. Identifying the purpose of a language task 5. Planning for a language task 6. Seeking practice opportunities **C. Evaluating your learning** 1. Self-monitoring 2. Self-evaluating **II. <u>AFFECTIVE STRATEGIES</u>** **A. Lowering your anxiety** 1. Using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation 2. Using music 3. Using laughter **B. Encouraging yourself** 1. Making positive statements 2. Taking risks wisely 3. Rewarding yourself **C. Taking your emotional temperature** 1. Listening to your body 2. Using a checklist **3.** Writing a language learning diary

languages)	

Table 1 (cont.)

4. Translating 5. Transferring **D. Creating structure for input and output** 1. Taking notes 2. Summarizing 3. Highlighting **III. <u>COMPENSATION STRATEGIES</u>** **A. Guessing intelligently** 1. Using linguistic clues 2. Using other clues **B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing** 1. Switching to the mother tongue 2. Getting help 3. Using mime and gesture 4. Avoidingcommunication partially and or totally 5. Selecting the topic 6. Adjusting or approximating the message 7. Coining words 8. Using circumlocution or synonym	**4.** Discussing your feelings with someone else III. **<u>SOCIAL STRATEGIES</u>** **A. Asking questions** **1.** Asking for clarification or verification 2. Asking for correction **B. Cooperating with others** 1. Cooperating with peers 2. Cooperating with proficient users of a new language **C. Empathizing with others** 1. Developing cultural understanding 2. Becoming aware of other's thoughts and feelings

As can be seen, there have been considerable amount of progress as far as classification of the strategies are concerned. The classification schemes or

typologies which provide a basis for the researchers and teachers to work on are much more detailed and elaborate when compared to the early beginnings when all there was was a mere list of strategies.

However, there still are some issues related to these classification schemes which beg further research. For instance, as Ellis (1994) noted, some of the categories laid out in the classification schemes require some interpretation on the part of the researcher for identification or some strategies may be more specific when compared to others. For instance, regarding the problem of specificity, the strategy of repetition is much more specific than self management (1994, p.540). No matter how grave these issues can be, one thing is clear; these schemes are quite helpful for the researcher and the teacher alike because they provide considerable amount of help in guiding all that are interested in learning strategies. This point was also reiterated by Ellis who noted that despite these issues, these schemes prove useful not just to the teacher and the researcher but are also quite beneficial, especially "where learner training is concerned" (1994, p.540).

2.2 Reading in an EFL Setting

The significance of reading as a skill lies primarily in the fact that we learn new information through reading, not just in the first language setting but also in the second and foreign language settings. Thus, it is as important to the native reader as it is to the non-native reader.

Particularly, in the educational context, for many students reading is undoubtedly one of the most important skills, because it is fundamental in second and foreign language contexts, particularly in English-medium universities that rely heavily on academic texts written in English. In other words, problems with reading will presumably result in poorer learning. Thus, so as to function adequately in the university environment, sufficient reading proficiency is a must for the students who will pursue academic studies. Carell (1998), one of the prominent figures in research on reading skills, reiterated the above premise by the following claims:

> In second language reading, learners are exposed to valuable second language input which they can use to advance their second language acquisition. And in both first and second language reading, reading is the primary source of new information about all sorts of topics. The goal of most second language reading programs is to turn "learning to read" to "reading to learn" (p.1).

What's more, Tom Maguire (1997), in one of his articles pinpointed to another aspect of reading by saying that:

> Reading is one of the basic pillars on which self-development rests. It's through reading that we begin to extend our learning outside the classroom and so gradually develop the capacity to learn without a teacher. This is the beginning of our independence as learners (p.36).

The significance of the above remark lies in the fact that proficient readers are the ones who are independent and autonomous learners. And, in education, autonomy and self-reliance are two of the targets whose achievement

is much desired, and once reached will benefit the learners in all kinds of contexts.

The researchers, having acknowledged the importance of reading as a skill, conducted considerable amount of research, which in return, benefited both the first, second and foreign language contexts. One of the most important findings of research was the realization that reading was not a simple process. In other words, it was discovered that, as Aebersold and Field (1997) noted, during the reading process, readers were engaged in various cognitive processes so as to "assign meaning to the written symbols in that text" and that they interacted with the text (p.15). Thus, let alone being a receptive process, reading was in fact an extremely dynamic process. And this dynamic nature of the reading process was also emphasized by Rumelhart (1980) who asserted that the process of reading, "involves the reader, the text, and the interaction between the reader and the text" (as cited in Aebersold and Field, 1997, p.5).

Thus, such findings helped researchers and the teachers to realize that reading should be treated with care in the first, second and foreign language classrooms. Besides, these findings among many more, pointed to the fact that anyone who treated reading as a simple act, was bound to make a serious mistake since it was quite difficult to pinpoint what exactly was transpiring in the minds of the readers during the reading process in its entire complexity.

In the light of all the above mentioned facts, one can readily argue that reading as a skill will persist to be treated in both first and second and foreign language settings with utmost care for the sole aim of equipping the students

with all that is necessary to help them function adequately and independently in their future studies.

2.3 Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies

In Cohen's (1990) terms, reading strategies are "those mental processes that readers consciously choose to use in accomplishing reading tasks" (p.83). It is believed that if the readers are aware of the reading strategies and particularly, how to make use of these reading strategies, then this may result in successful reading.

For the readers to improve in terms of reading, then, it is necessary to make the various reading strategies available. However, when one attempts to draw a line between any kind of strategies, not just reading strategies, some problems are bound to surface. As was mentioned before, it had been acknowledged that drawing a line between, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, for instance, is not very easy. Researchers like Brown, Bransford, Ferrara, and Campione (1983); and Chamot and O'Malley (1990), are but a few who have experienced the same difficulty.

Yet, no matter how elusive the line between various strategies may seem, it is believed that drawing a distinction between them is practical if not beneficial. For instance, Chamot and O'Malley emphasize that despite the little precision of the division between cognitive and metacognitive strategies, discarding this division is not advisable, and add that for research purposes it

would be better to "describe strategies under specific strategy terms and operational definitions" (1990, p.145).

Cognitive strategies, as Rubin noted, are "steps and operations used in learning or problem-solving that require direct analysis, transformation or synthesis of learning materials" (as cited in Wenden and Rubin, 1987, p.23). They operate directly upon the incoming information. Thus, cognitive reading strategies are those which are employed when students are engaged in a reading text. Therefore, they are most helpful during the execution of a reading task. As for the cognitive reading strategies employed for the purposes of the study at hand, it was seen apt to compile various reading strategies from the works of researchers like Baker and Brown (1984), who were interested in native language reading; and also from the works of Hosenfeld, Arnold, Kirchofer, Laciura, and Wilson (1981), and Hosenfeld (1977, 1979) to pull together a list of the cognitive reading strategies.

Metacognitive reading strategies, on the other hand, are those that regulate the reading process and help readers self-direct themselves. Fostering metacognitive strategies like identifying the purpose of the task, evaluating guesses, activating relevant prior knowledge, may result in distinct reading gains.

As for the inclusion of both cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in the study, it should be noted that, as Stern (1992) remarked "there is always the possibility that the good language learning strategies are used by bad language learners, but other reasons cause them to be unsuccessful" (as

cited in Lessard-Clouston, 1997, p.3). What Stern means by the "other reasons" is the ignorance and incompetence on the part of the learner in using the metacognitive strategies. In fact, Vann and Abraham (1990) found evidence that suggests both good and unsuccessful language learners could be actively employing similar language learning strategies but that the unsuccessful ones were found to be lacking the metacognitive strategies, which "would enable them to assess the task and bring to bear the necessary strategies for its completion" (as cited in Lessard-Clouston, p.4).

Therefore, dealing with both of these strategies at the same time to foster the reading proficiency of students might bring about success in the language learning process. What's more, it may also facilitate the much-desired autonomy, which has come to be viewed as an indispensable ingredient in successful language learning (Grenfell & Harris, 1999, p.35).

2.4 Strategy Instruction

Many educationalists, and researchers alike, have felt the need to emphasize learning strategies. Among many reasons, since learning strategies are also applicable to other subject areas, and since they are not confined only to learning languages, learners may benefit immensely from strategy instruction in contexts other than learning a second or a foreign language. What's more, if one acknowledges the fact that teaching, irrespective of discipline or content area, does not guarantee the amount of learning, then teaching the learners *how to learn* may benefit the learners considerably.

2.4.1 Importance of Strategy Instruction

The views which reiterate the significance of strategies and their instruction have been built upon foundations whose concrete have been the findings of research that were conducted into the strategies of the good language learner and the learning strategies for more than three decades in the first, second and foreign language settings. According to the results of the relevant research, effective language learners are very much aware of the specific strategies that they employ and have a clear idea about why they employ them; besides, as Oxford (1992) puts it, these learners have been found to make use of "strategies that work well together, and match the language task in which they are engaged." (p.19)

As Grenfell and Harris (1999) argued, trying to describe the strategies to learners by utilizing examples "is likely to be no more successful than describing grammar and expecting them to generate fluent language on the basis of that knowledge" (p.38). What the above idea reiterates is the importance and necessity of strategy instruction. In fact, long ago, drawing on from the successful language learner studies of prominent researchers like Stern (1975), Naiman et al. (1978), Wenden and Rubin (1987), the idea that the particular strategies employed by the successful learners could be made available to the not so successful learners prompted the idea of strategy instruction. As Chamot and O'Malley (1990) noted through strategy instruction "less competent learners should be able to apply strategies to the acquisition of

a variety of different language skills and transfer the strategies to similar language tasks" (p.133).

Just like the learning strategy research, the strategy instruction also experienced an explosion in terms of the amount of work conducted so as to see the possible effects of strategy instruction on the learners. As a result of the abundance of research, some general characteristics regarding strategy instruction were determined. For instance, Brown and Palincsar (1982), (as cited in Chamot & O'Malley, 1990) argued that "although cognitive strategies serve as the core of most strategy instruction, present evidence suggests that a combined metacognitive/cognitive instruction approach is superior in producing transfer of strategies to new tasks" and this very idea forms the basis for the inclusion of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies in the strategy instruction that will be administered in this study.

Thus, with a mindset as such, which recognizes the relative merits of emphasizing strategies, helping learners use them better should be seen as a valid challenge. And in Oxford's view, this challenge should be accepted wholeheartedly so that learners' "eyes will be more practiced, their ears more receptive, their tongues more fluent, their hearts more involved and their minds more responsive" (1990,p.xi).

Acknowledging the importance of strategies and strategy instruction, inevitably, paved the way for a zealous attempt on the part of the researchers, and teachers alike, in finding out how to make the strategies used by the successful learners available to the not-so-successful ones. This was a valid

concern because it was noted by various researchers like Rubin (1975) that such unsuccessful learners were reported not to " have a clue as to how good learners arrive at their answers and feel that they can never perform as good learners do. By revealing the process, the myth can be exposed" (p.282). And as Grenfell and Harris (1999) pointed out, exposing this myth and making it available to the ones who need it, would only be acceptable, if not reasonable and it "might not only serve to increase such learners' range of strategies, it might also improve their motivation" (p.73).

2.4.2 Types of Strategy Instruction

The various studies in the field accumulated a lot of information which proved the importance of strategy instruction, or "Strategy Training" as Oxford noted (1990, p.202). The findings of relevant research helped in aiding the ones who wanted to make strategy instruction, or training, a part of their classroom teaching. Thus, before determining which method to use, or what materials to employ during the strategy instruction, or even much before thinking about the instructional steps, anyone who has the propensity to go about strategy instruction had to, at the outset, decide on the type of strategy instruction they wished to administer. According to Oxford (1990) there are three main types of strategy instruction: "Awareness Training", "One-Time Strategy Training", and finally, "Long-Term Strategy Training".

2.4.2.1 Awareness Training

In this type of training participants are usually made aware of the language learning strategies, and they are made conscious about how learning strategies can help them in doing a language learning task on a micro level, and how learning strategies can help in learning in general on a macro level. An important feature of this type of training is that as Oxford noted (1990) "participants do not have to use the strategies in actual, on-the-spot language tasks" (p.202).

Although this type of strategy instruction may not provide many opportunities for practice, it is a very important stage in strategy instruction, which should be accommodated in whichever type of training you choose to execute. Oxford (1990) also added a cautionary remark by saying that this type of strategy training should be "fun and motivating, so that participants will be encouraged to expand their knowledge of strategies at a later time. For this reason, it is best not to use the lecture format for awareness training" (p.203).

There have been other prominent figures who have pronounced the benefits of awareness raising training like Brown, Branford, Ferrara, and Campione (1983); and Wenden (1986). These figures have noted that learners may possibly benefit from developing an appreciation of the possible effects of strategy training and also from developing an awareness of the purpose, nature and importance of strategy training, as well as one's own strategy use.

In addition to the above mentioned researchers, another important point raised by some others like Redfern and Weil (1996) regarding awareness raising

is that it has also proved very useful with teachers who were not very confident about routinely teaching language learning strategies, mainly due to unfamiliarity. This premise was linked to the fact that according to the findings of research by figures like Flaitz and Feyten (1996) there was some evidence which suggested that students might well benefit from even a limited exposure to activities which have been designed to raise their general level of awareness as regards language learning strategies.

Another research study conducted into the possible effects of awareness training in strategy instruction by Flaitz, Feyten and LaRocca (1999) discovered that a "significant positive effect was observed among members of the experimental group who received awareness raising training, suggesting the benefits of raising students' consciousness" (p.37). In this particular study a group of high school students were subjected to a metacognitive awareness raising training, which was termed MAR. The MAR session was designed so as to fulfill some aims as explicated by Flaitz, Feyten and LaRocca (1999):

> MAR is defined as the process of heightening learners' general awareness of some language learning strategies through the administration of a one-time 50- minute session which includes interaction with the material, involvement of students, use of higher order thinking skills, and accommodation of students' social and affective needs (p.37).

Thus, as the above studies suggest, the significance of awareness raising cannot be denied and that this importance attached to the issue is one of the

main reasons why awareness raising is an indispensable ingredient in any strategy instruction.

2.4.2.2 One-Time Strategy Training

In Oxford's (1990) terms one-time strategy instruction entails learning and practicing one or more strategies through a language learning task. This type of strategy instruction provides the learner with "information on the value of the strategy, when it can be used, how to use it, and how to evaluate the success of the strategy" (p.203). However, it should not be forgotten that this type of training has been found to be more appropriate when the aim is to target particular strategies that could be taught in a single or a few sessions.

Despite its usefulness, one-time strategy training has been found to be not as valuable as long-term strategy training (Oxford, 1990, p.203).

2.4.2.3 Long-Term Strategy Training

What is meant by long-term strategy training is that, as the name suggests, this type of training lasts longer and incorporates a greater number of strategies. Furthermore, although long-term strategy training bears some similarities with one-time strategy training, like having students learn and practice strategies with actual language tasks, to monitor and evaluate their own performance, the regular treatment of strategy training for a long period of time distinguishes it from the former. What's more, it is also found to be more effective than one-time strategy training (Oxford, 1990).

2.4.3 Implementation of Strategy Instruction

In the former chapters the significance of strategy instruction has been clarified. Having thus clarified the *why* of strategy instruction, the next step would be to explicate the *how* of strategy instruction. In other words, researchers had to discover the best methods to go about strategy instruction to ensure maximum gains on the part of the not-so-successful students. While trying to discover the best possible method for strategy instruction, various concerns or dilemmas were faced.

One of these concerns, apart from the type of strategy instruction, was the model of instruction. By this, what was meant was whether to follow a separate instruction or an integrated one while performing the strategy instruction.

2.4.3.1 Separate and Integrated Methods of Strategy Instruction

Separate and integrated methods of instruction, as the names suggest, involve separating the strategy instruction from what is taught in class in the former, and combining the strategy instruction with the classroom material in the latter. As can be expected there are different views regarding the benefits of each. The ones who advocated the use of separate instruction like Derry and Murphy (1986), Jones et al. (1987) (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990, p.152) held the view that students had a higher chance of learning the strategies if they could focus all their attention on developing their strategies rather than on the material at hand. An example of separate strategy instruction might be Dansereu's (1984) Computer-Assisted Cooperative Learning Program, which was designed to train pairs of students in using a sequence of reading

comprehension strategies, which were in return, presented and practiced by computer.

Those who supported the deployment of integrated instruction, on the other hand, contended that strategy instruction would be more effective if it was handled in context. The main reason offered was the belief that practicing strategies in context, that is while engaged in an academic task, would facilitate the transfer and use of these strategies (Chamot and O'Malley, 1987; Campione and Armbruster, 1985 as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990).

Apart from the ones who were for the employment of a separate strategy instruction scheme and the ones who were against it, there was a third party. Weinstein and Underwood (1985), for instance, made use of both approaches in one of their studies; thus, they implemented both separate and integrated strategy instruction. In that particular study, learners received both a separate instruction of strategies on using learning strategies effectively and an integrated training through incorporating learning strategy instruction in their regular courses (as cited in Chamot & O'Malley, 1990).

2.4.3.2 Direct and Embedded Methods of Strategy Instruction

Regarding the strategy instruction, another dilemma, which faced the ones who wanted to accommodate it in their classrooms, was experienced when researchers started talking about direct versus embedded instruction. In direct instruction, students were explicitly made aware of the advantages and the main purpose of the strategy instruction. In embedded instruction, however, the activities which would bring about the use of strategies were built in to the

materials which were used in the strategy instruction. Some studies which were cited in Chamot and O'Malley (1990), like Brown, Armbruster and Baker's 1986 study, were reported to have employed the embedded approach with no particular benefits. Thus, it was reported that the embedded approach led to little transfer of strategies to other tasks. Wenden (1987), who was one of the forerunners in learner autonomy and whose work had considerable benefits in the field of strategy research, criticized the embedded approach on the grounds that if learners were unaware of the strategies they were using, they had little opportunity of becoming autonomous learners (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990).

The findings of research conducted into strategy instruction justified the above remark by Wenden by revealing that the most successful form of strategy instruction was the one in which the strategies were made explicit to the learner. What this meant was nicely put forth by Oxford (1994):

> Learners are told overtly that a particular behaviour or strategy is likely to be helpful, and they are taught how to use it and how to transfer it to new situations. Blind training, in which learners are led to use certain strategies without realizing it, is less successful, particularly in the transfer of strategies to new tasks. Strategy training is best when woven into regular class activities in a normal basis (p.19).

However, in the relevant literature another finding, which actually pointed towards an advantage about an embedded approach was also mentioned. Jones (1983), for instance, pinpointed the fact that the embedded

approach required little, if any, teacher training due to the fact that the strategy instruction was incorporated into the exercises and materials and the students learnt to use the strategies that were triggered and induced by these exercises and materials (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990, p.154) In fact, this point made by Jones and others revealed another significant issue when the instruction of strategies was the point under scrutiny- the *teachers* who would naturally be responsible for the teaching of strategies.

2.4.3.3 Training of the Teachers Involved in Strategy Instruction

Another concern associated with strategy instruction was one which had not been given much thought, mainly on account of the fact that most strategy instruction had been performed by researchers who were, naturally, more knowledgeable than an average teacher. Therefore, the development and training of the teachers that were to be involved in the strategy instruction emerged as a grave issue. In relation to this very problem, another related concern had also been voiced by some, which was the need to convince the teachers as to the potential benefits and effectiveness of the learning strategies. Thus, some studies had been conducted to train the teachers to make them aware as regards the importance and also the instruction of learning strategies. For instance, Chamot and O'Malley (1990), in their joint teacher training effort found out that:

> Teachers need considerable exposure to the concept of learning strategies as opposed to teaching strategies, and repeated practice in designing and providing learning strategy

> instruction before they feel comfortable with incorporating strategy training in their classrooms (1990, p.155).

Thus, for an effective strategy instruction to take place, as important as the method of instruction was the training of everybody that would potentially be involved in the instruction, and particularly, for the teachers, it was necessary to see strategies as an integral part of learning and not just as an added extra to their every day teaching.

2.4.3.4 Materials in Strategy Instruction

Still as another concern for strategy instruction was materials that would be used during the strategy instruction. According to Cohen (1990) over the last twenty-five years publications that provide information about learning strategies and strategy instruction, especially in target language learning, have begun to appear, reflecting the dramatic departure from the publications which focused predominantly on the training of teachers on all kinds of matters regarding teaching, like the works of Allen and Vallette (1977), Rivers (1981) and Omaggio (1986). However, with the emphasis on teaching and the teacher, having shifted to learning and the learner, striking novelties were experienced. The learning strategies, which had long been nothing more than a mere complement to the suggestions about teaching, now started to be seen under a whole new light. At the beginning there were quite a few instructional materials on learning strategies but they were all developed for English-speaking students (like Jones 1983; Jones, Amiran and Katims, 1985; Derry and Murphy, 1986; and Dansereu, 1985). For the second and foreign language settings,

however, when strategies were newly starting to gain attention, there weren't many materials on the market.

Yet, gradually, the number of publications that aimed at instructing learners in the second and foreign language classrooms on strategies started to emerge. A few of the course books that teach strategies that are readily available on the market are the Tapestry (2000) series by Rebecca Oxford and Robin C. Scarcella, which aim at equipping the second and foreign language learners with strategies to handle all four skills, the book titled Developing Reading Skills which provides many activities to foster the reading strategies by Francoise Grellet (1994), From Reader to the Reading Teacher by Aebersold and Field (1997) , who not only provide practical activities to practice reading strategies but also provide theoretical information about the skill of reading.

2.4.3.5 Instructional Models in Strategy Instruction

Apart from the above-mentioned considerations, another crucial concern was the planning and the sequencing of the strategy instruction so as to obtain optimum gains. In order to help the teachers, and the researchers, several instructional models were developed to help them accommodate strategy instruction in their classrooms. The vast amount of research in the first as well as second and foreign language settings shaped the models which will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

As a consequence of the plethora of studies conducted into strategy training, a number of different models have emerged. Some of these models were primarily employed in the first language settings, yet they had their

implications in the second and foreign language classrooms. One of these models is Jones et al's (1987) model, otherwise known as the "Strategic Teaching Model". This particular framework was developed for instruction in all of the content areas based on cognitive learning theory and the following six research-based assumptions about learning as stated by Jones et al (1987) were at the core of the model:

> 1. Learning is goal oriented. Expert learners have two major goals during the learning process: to understand the meaning of the task and to regulate their own learning. In other words, learners have both declarative knowledge, or content goals, and procedural knowledge, or strategic goals for a learning task,
> 2. In learning new information is linked to prior knowledge. Prior knowledge is stored in the form of knowledge frameworks or schemata, and new information is understood and stored by calling up the appropriate schema and integrating the new information with it. Knowing how and when to access prior knowledge is a characteristic of effective learners,
> 3. Learning requires knowledge organization. Knowledge is organized in recognizable frameworks such as story grammars, problem/solution structures, comparison/ contrast patterns, and description sequences, among others. Skilled learners recognize these organizational structures and use them to assist learning and recall,
> 4. Learning is strategic. Good learners are aware of the learning process and of themselves as learners, and seek to control their own learning through the use of appropriate learning strategies. Strategies can be taught, but many do not transfer to new tasks. Although each content area may require a particular set of strategies and skills, a number of core skills underlie all subject areas. Examples of these core skills are using prior knowledge, making a representation of the information, self-monitoring and summarizing,
> 5. Learning occurs in recursive phases. All types of learning are initiated with a planning phase, followed by an online processing, and ending with consolidation and extension of the new information. In the planning phase, the problem is identified, new information is integrated, assimilated and used to clarify and modify existing ideas. During consolidation and

> extension the learner summarizes and organizes the new information, assesses achievement of the goal established in the first phase, and extends learning by applying it to new situations. During each phase the learner may return to the previous phase to rework to one or more of its aspects,
> 6. Learning is influenced by development. Differences between older and younger students and between more and less proficient learners are due in large part to differences in prior knowledge and learning strategy use. These differences may present when children begin school or may develop over time, but in either case they tend to persist unless intervention is undertaken (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990, pp. 187-188).

Thus, in the Strategic Teaching Model, the above six assumptions provided the guidelines in planning and implementing strategy instruction. During the implementation of the strategy instruction, the specific sequence suggested starts with analyzing the current strategy use of the students, explaining the new strategy, then modeling the new strategy and consequently providing extensive help to students whenever they need it, which is also known as scaffolding, particularly, when the students try the new strategy for the first time. The support and help provided by the teacher gradually becomes less and less until the student is confident enough to use the strategy correctly. In this model, therefore, the teacher always actively thinks about the needs of the students by constantly assessing what the students know and what they need to know, and subsequently, how to provide them with what they need.

Another model by Weinstein and Underwood (1985) was the one developed for a university course which was designed for students who needed or wanted to improve and strengthen their academic learning skills. In this

model the first step was identifying the academic and strategy needs of the students through questionnaires, think-aloud procedures, interviews or group discussions. The second step was to develop goals for strategy use both for individuals and for the whole class, which was followed by providing background information about issues like motivation, cognition, strategies and study skills and transfer. Providing different practice opportunities like engaging learners in discussions, role-playing activities and peer tutoring was the next step. And finally, the last step was evaluating the strategy acquisition by providing both individual and group feedback and by developing self evaluation with students journals and papers.

Inevitably, the models which were developed for the first language contexts had implications on the second and foreign language classrooms. This can be exemplified by the instruction model that was determined by Hosenfeld et al (1981) to improve the reading comprehension skills of high school students of French as a foreign language. The strategy instruction, like the previous two models, started by identifying the current reading strategies employed by the students through thinking aloud. Then, the importance of strategies was explained. This was followed by the step in which students were helped to analyze their own strategies in their native language before they were encouraged to practice their L1 strategies in the target language, in this particular case, French. The next step was to provide direct instruction on reading comprehension strategies by explanation, practice, application to reading assignments and evaluation of success of strategies. Finally, the model

incorporated a final evaluation step by repeating the second step which aimed at identifying the current reading strategies.

Another well-known model which was developed as part of a content-based elementary and secondary ESL program was Chamot and O'Malley's (1990) "Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach", or CALLA in short. The CALLA framework combined learning strategy instruction, content area topics and language development activities. In a typical CALLA lesson, as Chamot and O'Malley (1990) noted, "new learning strategies are introduced and familiar ones are practiced, so that the use of learning strategies to approach all kinds of tasks becomes an integral part of the regular class routine" (p.201). What's more, the CALLA tended to include both teacher-directed and learner-centred lessons. Each lesson in the CALLA model would invariably include five phases that have been explained in Table 2 below. In the first step, which was the preparation phase of the lesson, the teacher sought to find out what students knew about the topic under scrutiny through brainstorming and aimed at raising the awareness of students through techniques such as interviews, discussions, and thinking aloud. In the presentation phase of the lesson, students were informed about the importance of strategies by being provided about the rationale for strategy instruction in order to develop their knowledge about strategies. In this particular stage, describing and modeling the strategy use were common practices. In the third step, which was the practice stage, students were encouraged to work in small groups to practice the strategies under focus. This phase of the model was particularly learner-centred

as the teacher assumed the role of a facilitator and was a mere guide. The fourth step was the evaluation stage in which students were asked to check the level of their performance in order to evaluate their own learning and to identify any areas that needed further practice. Finally, the last step was devised for students to transfer the newly learnt or practiced strategies to new tasks.

Table 2: Strategy Instruction Stages by Chamot and O'Malley (1990)

1.**Preparation**: Develop student awareness of different strategies through: -small group retrospective -interview about school tasks -modelling think-aloud, then having students think-aloud in small groups -discussion of interviews and think-alouds 2. **Presentation**: Develop student knowledge about strategies by: -providing rationale for strategy use -describing and naming strategy use -modeling strategy

Table 2 (cont.)

3. **Practice**: Develop students skills in using strategies for academic learning through: -cooperative learning tasks _think-alouds while problem solving _peer tutoring in academic tasks _group discussions 4. **Evaluation**: Develop students ability to evaluate own strategy use through: _writing strategies used immediately after task _discussing strategy use in class -keeping dialogue journals (with teacher) on strategy use 5. **Expansion**: Develop transfer of strategies to new tasks by: -discussions on metacognitive and motivational aspects of strategy use -additional practice on similar academic tasks -assignments to use learning strategies on tasks related to cultural backgrounds of the students

All of the models developed by various prominent figures in the field, like Hosenfeld et. al (1981), Jones et al (1985), and Chamot and O'Malley (1987), the basic steps were the same. That is to say, all of these suggestions accommodated a needs analysis stage; the teacher, or the researcher, identified and assessed the strategy use of the learners before implementing the strategy instruction. Then, consequently, the instruction program was put into operation.

2.4.3.6 Effects of Individual Characteristics on Strategy Instruction

The last, but surely not the least, of the concerns that should not be ignored was the effects of learner characteristics on the strategy instruction. Individual traits like motivation, aptitude, learning style, age, sex, educational and cultural background of the learners that were to receive the instruction were shown to play an important role in the effectiveness and success of the instruction. To exemplify, the findings of some research could be offered. For instance, one of the findings of the research conducted by Chamot and O'Malley (1989) was that the reception of new strategies during the strategy instruction was very much related to previous success with the strategies the students were already making use of and also with their prior educational level. Another relevant finding to support the importance of learner characteristics on strategy instruction was pointed out by Wenden in her 1987 study in which she carried out a strategy instruction at the American Language Program at Columbia

University with English as a second language students. At the end of the instruction, Wenden gave the learners a questionnaire to get feedback on the instruction they had had. The results of the questionnaire revealed that most learners did not deem the strategy instruction as useful. This pointed out the fact that attitude and motivation was very important for learning to take place.

Although the researchers raised the important issues regarding strategy instruction and provided the necessary steps to help in going about it by means of a lot of research conducted in first language as well as second and foreign language settings, as Chamot and O'Malley noted "Research is needed on the development, implementation and evaluation" of a curriculum that incorporated strategy instruction and the effects of many variables like age, sex, motivation, educational and cultural backgrounds of the learners on the effectiveness of the instruction (1990, p.159). What's more, the strategy instruction should also focus on affective as well as the social strategies that have been largely ignored for the sake of cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Oxford, 1992).

2.5 Research on Reading Strategies

Reading has been shown to be quite an important component in second and foreign language learning settings mainly on account of the fact that particularly in English-medium universities students are expected to tackle academic texts written in English. Apart from this evident fact, the findings of

research conducted into reading strategies in the first and foreign language settings have also helped in assuring the significance of this particular skill.

Research on reading strategies stemmed from the premise that if "less competent learners are able to improve their skills through training in strategies evidenced by more successful learners" then it followed that "the same is true for reading strategies: Less competent readers are able to improve through training in strategies evidenced by more successful readers" (Carrell, Pharis and Liberto, 1989, p.648). Since the research on first language reading has notably affected research in second and foreign language reading, it would be beneficial to mention some of the most important reading strategy research conducted in first, second and foreign language settings, as well as some of the most outstanding metacognitive reading strategy research.

2.5.1 First Language Reading Research

The reading strategy research in the L1 setting first started with the aim of identifying the characters of good readers. Thus, it was very much influenced by the good language learner studies. For instance, it was shown by research conducted by figures like Garner (1987); and Brown and Palincsar (1982) that good readers were better at monitoring their comprehension than poor readers and that they were more aware of the strategies that they use when compared to the poor readers as well as being able to use strategies more flexibly and efficiently. What's more, good readers were also evidenced as being able to

distinguish between important information and supporting details, and that they could relate new information to information that had already been stated (Baker and Brown, 1984; Garner, 1980 as cited in Song 1998).

Research studies like these led the researchers to ponder about what would happen if less successful readers were to be instructed in reading strategies. So as to provide an answer to this question, Brown and Palincsar, for instance, carried out a study in 1982, in which native speakers of English were taught some reading strategies like summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting. The findings of the research indicated that strategy training had benefited the students and that it was effective in enhancing reading ability of the students. Besides, having analyzed the strategies employed by good readers Palincsar and Brown were able to identify four main features, which were respectively: (a) stopping and summarizing what they have just read periodically, (b) formulating questions to ensure that they have grasped the main points, (c) checking back and clarifying any points about which they feel uncertain, and (d) predicting what will come next. Another study conducted by Brown, Armbruster and Baker in 1986, with the aim of analyzing the strategy use of successful and unsuccessful students showed that lower achieving students use less sophisticated and inappropriate reading strategies while reading a text.

One other study carried out by Paris et al (1991) set out to examine comprehension monitoring as well as the strategy use of good and poor readers.

As a result of the research it was discovered that poor readers do not make use of comprehension monitoring – like writing notes, making summaries to remember what has been stated in the text- as often as good readers do. In addition, the study also revealed that good readers made use of more strategies.

2.5.2 Second and Foreign Language Reading Research

While the study of the first language reader was at the foreground at the outset, gradually some other studies which focused on reading strategies in second and foreign language contexts came into existence. For instance, Hosenfeld in 1977 reported on the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful second language learners. In this particular study, Hosenfeld was able to show that successful readers attempted to, for instance, keep the meaning of the passage in mind, read in broad phrases, ignore unnecessary words, and guess the meaning of unknown vocabulary from context (as cited in Hosenfeld, 1992). Sarig (1985), as cited in Cohen (1990), conducted research with high school Hebrew students who were learning English as a foreign language, at the end of which 126 strategies were identified (p.166). This study was particularly significant because Sarig managed to organize these strategies into four basic categories; namely, support strategies, paraphrase strategies, strategies for establishing coherence in text, and finally strategies for supervising strategy use. What's more, the study also proved useful in providing insights about the similarities and differences between first and foreign language reading. To illustrate, it was observed by Sarig that a majority

of the students transferred their first language reading style to the foreign language. One of the students who did not transfer his first language reading styles to the foreign language was an intermediate level reader and the other was a poor one. Thus, she viewed these findings as an indication of the fact that the ability to transfer reading skills from the first to the foreign language was not dependent on foreign language proficiency, but rather it was a process that resulted from "individual cognitive traits", as Cohen put

it (1990, p.167). In addition, she also found out that successful transfer of strategies to the foreign language did not necessarily promote comprehension on account of the fact that both the low and high performers in reading were observed to transfer strategies that supported and sometimes, blocked comprehension.

Block in 1986, studied native and non-native English speakers who were enrolled in freshman remedial reading courses in the U.S. Thus, they were poor readers. As a result of the research, she identified some characteristics that seemed to separate the more successful from the less successful of these poor readers, like integration, recognition of aspects of text structure, use of general knowledge and experiences. There have been many more research studies conducted by Devine (1984); Hauptman (1979); Knight, Pardon, and Waxman (1985) (as cited in Carrell, 1998) which were similar in nature to Sarig's and Brown's studies as they intended to shed light on the relationship between various reading strategies and successful or unsuccessful second language

reading. Yet, as noted by Carrell (1998, p.5) "the picture is more complex than suggested by these early case studies" and that "unfortunately, the relationship between strategies and comprehension are not simple and straightforward".

There were also some studies that sought to establish a relationship between use of reading strategies and comprehension. Anderson, in 1991, worked with native Spanish-speaking, university level, intensive ESL students reading in English. According to the findings of this study, there were no simple correlations or a one-to-one relationship between particular strategies and successful and unsuccessful reading comprehension. What Anderson made out of this finding was that, successful second language reading comprehension was not "simply a matter of knowing what strategy to use, but the reader must also know how to use it successfully and know how to orchestrate its use with other strategies'' and that it was not "sufficient to know about strategies, but a reader must also be able to apply them strategically" (as cited in Carrell, 1998, p.5).

2.5.3 Metacognitive Reading Strategy Research

Such research and the findings derived from studies like the ones above were quite significant in paving the way for the researchers to conduct research on another aspect of reading strategy use, which had been somewhat neglected. This aspect was metacognition. Work on metacognitive strategies was mostly stimulated by the work of Wenden (as cited in Wenden & Rubin, 1987), and it

had added an important dimension to the already existing literature, with its emphasis on the metacognitive knowledge in second language learning and the importance it attached to autonomy. Thus, researchers in the second and foreign language settings conducted research on the metacognitive reading strategies with the aim of seeing the effect of metacognitive reading strategies on foreign language reading.

Carrell's 1989 study, which she carried out with high-intermediate level adult second language students, examined the combined effects of cognitive and metacognitive strategy instruction on reading comprehension. The findings of the research indicated that the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction was effective in enhancing reading comprehension.

Another study that observed the possible effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on reading and reading comprehension was the one by Cotterall (1990) (as cited by Akyel and Salataci, 2002, p.3). What Cotterall did was to replicate Palincsar and Brown's 1982 study in the first language context and analyze the possible effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on four Japanese and Iranian students. The findings indicated that the metacognitive instruction had benefited these students.

Song (1998) also conducted research by replicating Palincsar and Brown's study and found out that strategy instruction enhanced and improved the reading ability of Korean college learners in a foreign language setting.

Similarly, Auberch and Paxton in 1997 administered strategy instruction into their reading classes, the result of which indicated that students improved their metacognitive strategy use at the end of this strategy instruction program that lasted for a semester.

2.6 Research Investigating the Frequency and Variety of Strategy Use

The types of strategies students use and the frequency with which these strategies are used have always been two of the focal points in empirical studies in the literature. The research studies that have been mentioned in the former sections are but evidence to prove the above remark.

Thus, starting with the good language learner studies (Wenden &Rubin (1987) , Stern (1975), that aimed at identifying the types of strategies employed by the good language learners, ultimately to make them available to the not-so-good language learners, there have been other attempts at pinpointing the type or variety of strategy use. Brown and Palincsar (1982) , for instance, as was mentioned beforehand, conducted research in which they taught some reading strategies to the native speakers of English. As a result of the research it was found out that the students, having received the strategy instruction, made use of some strategies like stopping and summarizing what they have just read, formulating questions to ensure that they have grasped the main points and also checking back and clarifying any points about which they were uncertain.

Sarig's (1985) study with Israeli college-bound students, involved reading texts in Hebrew and in English by the students and providing verbal

data by means of the think-aloud procedure. This particular study showed that individual differences had a considerable effect on the frequency with which strategies were employed.

Zupnik's study (1985) targeted two intermediate level university EFL readers, one of whom was a high and the other a poor reader. In the study it was found that the poor performer displayed a larger variety of strategies and more frequently. Yet, when the strategies deployed by this particular reader were analysed, it was observed that these strategies had to do with clarification and simplification whereas the high performer was focusing ore on strategies like critical analysis, self evaluation and awareness of lack of comprehension. What's more, another significant finding of the research was that, most of the low reader's strategies had a "deterring effect on comprehension", in Cohen's terms, while all of the high performer's strategies were helpful in promoting comprehension (as cited in Cohen, 1990, p.166).

Chamot and O'Malley (1987) were involved in a study in which they set out to investigate the type and frequency of learning strategies used by English as a second language students. At the end of the research, they were able to classify the types of strategies evidenced during the study under three broad categories; namely, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social mediating strategies. As regards the frequency with which these strategies were employed, it was seen that the metacognitive strategies of planning, evaluating and monitoring were used the most frequently.

Another study by Brown, Armbruster and Baker (1986) investigated the strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers as a result of which it

was discovered that less competent readers used less strategies and rather inappropriately. Similarly, Paris and Meyers (1991) examined comprehension monitoring and strategy use of good and poor readers. The findings of the research indicated that good readers deployed more strategies when compared to the other party.

Yet another relevant study was by Akyel and Salataci (2002) in which they investigated the reading strategies of Turkish EFL students in Turkish and English and the possible effects of reading instruction on reading in Turkish and in English. The results of the study indicated that the reading instruction in English affected the L1 reading of the students, and that the instruction was bi-directional. What's more, the students were seen to be using reading strategies more frequently both in Turkish and in English.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

3.0 Presentation

This chapter briefly summarizes the design of the study at the outset and then provides information about the participants. Then, all the instruments that

will yield both qualitative and quantitative data will be explained but the detailed information about how they were utilized will be handled in the procedures section. The procedures section is subdivided into three sections- "Procedures *before* the strategy instruction", "Procedures *during* the strategy instruction" and "Procedures *after* the strategy instruction". As was mentioned, these sections are intended to provide detailed information about *which* instruments were used, how they were used, *with whom* they were used and *when* they were used. In addition, information on *how* the data generated by these tools were analyzed is also put forth.

3.1 Design of the Study

In an attempt to uncover the possible effects of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy training at awareness-raising level on reading proficiency, an integrated and direct strategy instruction on cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies only at an awareness-raising level was implemented to one of the two groups-Group A- involved in the study. The other group, Group B, on the other hand, was limited to the strategy-training strand that was already incorporated in the Pre-faculty course book.

Before and after the strategy instruction, 8 students-4 from Group A and 4 from Group B- were involved in think-aloud protocols. During the think-aloud protocols, semi-guided interviews were also conducted. All of the students in Group A were also administered the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford twice- once before and once after the strategy instruction. Both Group A and Group B kept learning diaries for the

duration of the strategy instruction that lasted four weeks. At the end of four weeks, both groups took the COPE exam.

Table 3 below summarizes the data types and the instruments used to obtain the data for the study.

Table 3: Types of Data and Instruments

	TYPES OF DATA				
	QUALITATIVE			QUANTITATIVE	
	Think-Aloud Protocols (TAPs)	Semi-Structured Interviews	Learning Diaries	Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)	COPE
GROUP A (n= 12)	X *	X*	X	X	X
GROUP B (n=11)	X*	X*	X	---	X

*= involved only four students

3.2 Participants

The participants of this study were students who were all at the tertiary level enrolled in the preparatory program at BUSEL in Ankara, Turkey. All 24 participants in the study were in the sixteen-week Pre-faculty course, and they were rank ordered and put in classes after the COPE they took in September. All the participants were, thus, at an advanced language proficiency level. Since they were rank ordered according to their scores on the COPE exam, it was assumed that all subjects were at about the same level.

The ages of the 24 Turkish participants ranged between 18 and 24 (*M=21, SD=2.16)*. Seven of the participants were female and the rest were male and apart from 4, all of them were newly registered students.

In terms of the educational backgrounds of the participants, a majority came from public Anatolian high schools in Turkey and 17% were from private high schools. The participants were heterogeneous with regard to the disciplines they were going to study.

The proficiency and language levels of the two groups were approximately the same. Apart from the rank order after the COPE, the other measure to show that the groups were more or less at the same level was the grades the groups scored in the cumulative achievement tests (CATs). The CATs are achievement tests which test the students on various skills as well as grammar and vocabulary. In an eight-week course students normally take nine CATs. Thus, when the grade averages of Group A and Group B were compared at the end of the first eight weeks- that is, before the strategy instruction- the averages for both classes were 53.33 and 53.97 respectively, out of a possible 95. This was another indicator that the subjects were approximately at the same level before the strategy instruction took place.

The participants were chosen through convenience sampling, as the researcher was teaching both of these groups at the time of the study. It was seen apt to deliver the strategy instruction in Group A mainly because the researcher had more contact hours with that particular group which would enable the execution of the strategy instruction.

As a policy in BUSEL, at the beginning of each course, there is a compact learner-training program, which lasts approximately two weeks. Thus, both groups involved in the study had received this compact strategy training geared

at raising the awareness of students on issues like studying effectively, learning independently as well as strategies on reading, listening, writing and speaking, upon arriving in the pre-faculty level.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

As was noted by Oxford (1990) there are particular techniques seen apt for the collection of data regarding the identification of strategies learners make use of. Namely, "think-aloud" protocols, note-taking, diaries or journals, interviews and self-report surveys. These techniques can be utilized on their own; yet, researchers have mostly made use of at least two of them to obtain data while working on a single research.

Similarly, the present research also made use of a combination of data collection techniques so as to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data. (See Table 3 above). The instruments utilized to obtain qualitative data were think-aloud protocols, semi-structured interviews and learning diaries. As for the acquisition of the quantitative data, two main tools were used: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) and the COPE exam, which was administered at the end of January.

3.3.1 Qualitative Data Collection Instruments

3.3.1.1 Think-aloud Protocols

According to Faerch and Kasper (1987) there are three distinct types of data collection techniques; the first of these is simultaneous introspection, which involves the learner reporting on the strategies used while engaged in a language learning task; the second is immediate retrospection, in which the

learner reports on a task that has just been completed; and finally, delayed retrospection, which is concerned with the reporting of strategies used with a task that was previously completed (as cited in Chamot & O'Malley, 1990).

Looking at the above definitions for these techniques, it is obvious that the think-aloud protocols (TAPs from here on) come under the first technique, which is the simultaneous introspection. In the think- aloud procedure, the student is asked to "provide an oral commentary while undertaking a task in the foreign language" (Grenfell & Harris, 1999, p.53). That is to say, while engaged in a reading activity, the student comments on what he is doing, what he is thinking about, and verbalizes, as much as he can, almost anything and everything, that comes to his mind regarding the reading task at hand. Chamot and O'Malley note that the particular advantage of this kind of retrospection is that strategies which "occur only fleetingly in short-term memory can be identified and reported" (1990, p.90). Thus, just like the Impressionist painters, the researchers aim at identifying and making use of what happens for a very short time in such a technique.

In Oxford's terms, in think-aloud protocols "the student lets his thoughts flow verbally in a stream-of-consciousness fashion without trying to control, direct, or observe them" (1990, p.195). This particular technique has been widely made use of in learning strategy research. Thus, its use is also quite common in reading strategy research.

Despite its usefulness, the think-aloud procedure is certainly not without some shortcomings. As Nunan (1992) has pointed out in one of the problems

that confronts the language researcher is the fact that a considerable amount of the hard work involved in language development and use is indiscernible as it goes on in the minds of the learners. Thus, there have been a number of criticisms directed at this technique on account of not being able to capture what is going on in the learner's "black-box" with any accuracy since the learner may be unaware of the operations of memory, attention and comprehension processes. What's more, failure in memory can also distort the verbal data elicited through the think-aloud protocols.

Although such concerns have been voiced in literature, it is also accepted that despite the drawbacks, the think-aloud protocols provide the researchers with invaluable insights, the provision of which would have been otherwise impossible. Aebersold and Field, for instance, advocate the use of think-aloud protocols because they believe that the data elicited "can be astonishingly rich" (1997, p.115).

Thus, it was deemed appropriate to make use of TAPs in the present study. The TAPs which were carried out once before and once after the strategy instruction fulfilled two main functions. Primarily, the first round of the TAPs served as a needs analysis tool. That is to say, by using the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory during the TAPs, the researcher was able to identify which cognitive and metacognitive strategies were deployed by the ones involved. This, in return, guided the researcher in planning and shaping the strategy instruction. The second function of the TAPs was to help the researcher in evaluating the strategy instruction to some extent. After the

strategy instruction, the researcher carried out the second round of the TAPs, again making use of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory. The data that was generated helped the researcher in identifying any changes in the use of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies after the instruction at awareness-raising level.

As was mentioned, for the purposes of this study, two rounds of TAPs were carried out with four participants from Group A and Group B. The first round of the TAPs took place before the strategy instruction and the second round after the strategy instruction. For each of the TAPs, a different reading text, with accompanying questions, was used. For the first TAPs, a reading text about water shortages around the world and what UNICEF does about this particular problem forms the content (App. A). For the second TAPs, another reading text called "Why Pupils Take in Little from TV" was used (App. B). Both of the texts were taken from the book First Certificate Reading Skills by David Foll (1988).

It is an accepted fact that TAPs usually generate considerable amount of information, which may be difficult to sift through and analyse afterwards. Oxford (1990) noted that various researchers had made use of similar inventories or "interviewer guides" as she called them. For instance, the interviewer guide which was also made use of to a certain extent in the present study was developed by Hosenfeld et al (1981) and it was said to be quite beneficial for "preliminary diagnosis of strategies before training, and then to assess changes in strategy use after training" (Oxford, 1990, p.195).

Thus, bearing in mind the above concerns and so as to safeguard against this problem, the present study used a custom-made cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory (App. C). The inventory came into being by compiling relevant reading strategies from earlier works by Baker and Brown (1984), Hosenfeld et al (1981) and Oxford (1990).

3.3.1.2 Semi-structured Interviews

The semi-structured interviews have been found to be effective in gathering information about the learning strategies (Oxford, 1990). As the name suggests the semi-structured interviews are partially structured. As Krathwohl (1998) notes, the questions and order of the questions are preplanned and the questions are formulated in such a way as to yield as much information as possible in semi-structured interviews. In such interviews the interviewer records the essence of each response (1998).

In this study, although the questions were predetermined, the order of the questions was not predetermined; thus, the order varied. However, because of the predetermined order of the questions, it was seen apt to call the interviews semi-structured. In the study at hand, the semi-structured interviews were carried out at the same time as the TAPs, and the preplanned questions were " What do you generally do before you start reading a text?", "What do you normally do when you don't understand a part in a reading text?" and "What would you have done if I had given you the questions first?".

In research literature concerning the learning strategies, this data collection technique has been widely employed. For instance, Wenden (1982) has utilized this technique for some of her studies (as cited in Oxford 1990). Apart from utilizing this particular data collection method, Wenden has also provided the interviewers with possible foci to formulate the questions to be directed at the learner during the interview (1991).

3.3.1.3 Learning Diaries

The foremost reason for the inclusion of this particular type of data collection technique is to emphasize the importance of metacognition on the learning process. Thus, within the boundaries of the study at hand, the ultimate function of the Learning Diaries was to foster the metacognitive aspect of the strategy instruction.

Research in the past was predominantly focusing on the use of strategies that came into play while executing a task; yet, it was recognized that this single-minded emphasis on cognitive strategies would not be sufficient in producing the desired learning processes and outcomes. Such a realization paved the way for the employment of techniques that would yield information about the metacognitive strategies. Thus, learning diaries started to be used as an effective method of data collection on metacognitive strategies.

As Bailey (1983) defines it, a diary study is the first person account of a language learning experience which is recorded through regular, candid entries in a personal journal and then analyzed for recurring patterns or salient events. What learning diaries involve, in Chamot and O'Malley's terms, is delayed

retrospection (1990). In other words, in this data collection technique, learners are asked to reflect on their use of strategies with particular language tasks that were completed long ago.

Despite their popularity, the diary studies, which generated a wealth of written data, have received some criticisms. For instance, it was argued that the diary studies elicited far more information that is of little value for the learning strategy research (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987). As a solution to this particular problem, Wenden thought of providing the learners with some guidance, like some unfinished statements or open-ended questions that would make it possible for the students to reflect on the particular tasks completed, without losing the focus.

Nunan (2000), very much aware of the same problem, has supplied some headings like "This week I studied…", "This week I learned…", My difficulties are…", "I would like to know…", or "My learning and practicing plans for next week are…" (p.17).

Whatever the allegations against them might be, the diary studies have not lost their popularity because they are not only windows opening to the minds of the learners, but also effective tools for fostering metacognitive strategies. As Nunan nicely puts it "In addition to facilitating the growth of learners' capacity for autonomy and independence, diaries can be very illuminating for both teacher and student" (2000, p.17).

Therefore, the Learning Diaries were employed in the study and they fulfilled two main functions. Firstly, as was stated before, the main function of

the Learning Diaries was that they were intended to endorse the metacognitive aspect of the strategy instruction program. By making the learners reflect on each one of the strategy instruction sessions which were at the level of awareness-raising, the learners were asked to reflect on their use of relevant reading strategies. Secondarily, the Learning Diaries helped in shaping, and ultimately, in evaluating the strategy instruction to a certain extent.

3.3.2 Quantitative Data Collection Instruments

3.3.2.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

One of the tools which yielded quantitative data was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning by Oxford (1990), otherwise known as the SILL (App. D). The SILL was created by Oxford for the Language Skill Change Project, which assessed the amount of change found in language skills after the learners' foreign language training was completed. The items found in the inventory are based on the strategy system developed by Oxford. The SILL is a self-report, paper and pencil survey which is made up of six parts, each assessing a different strategy. Part A reveals information about memory strategies, Part B about cognitive strategies, Part C compensation strategies, Part D metacognitive strategies, Part E affective strategies and finally Part F about social strategies.

In each part there are statements about relevant language learning strategies to which students are expected to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale indicating how true of them each statement is. If the student opts for 1, which stands for "never or almost never true of me", it means that the particular statement is very rarely true of the student. If the student opts for 2, which

stands for "usually not true of me", it means that the statement is true less than half the time for the student. If 3, which means "somewhat true of me", is opted, it means that the statement is true about half the time. 4, which stands for "usually true of me", means that the statement is true more than half the time. And, finally, if 5 is opted, which stands for "always or almost true of me", it means that the particular statement is true for the student almost always.

For the purposes o f the study only Part B and Part D were utilized. However, as was aforementioned, the SILL was designed to provide information about the overall use of language learning strategies. Thus, the statements under Part B and Part D did not only pertain to reading. For instance, under Part B, there were statements like "I say or write new English words several times", "I try to talk like native English speakers" or, "I practice the sounds of English". Similarly, under Part D, there were statements like "I pay attention when someone is speaking in English" and "I look for people I can talk to in English". Within the boundaries of the study, these statements obviously lay beyond the focus; thus, although the learners in Group A answered all the statements under Part A and Part D, the researcher did not consider the irrelevant statements in the statistical analyses. Therefore, under Part B, statements 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17; and under Part D, statements 32 and 35 were disregarded.

SILL has got two versions; one is version 5.1, which was designed for English speakers learning a new language; and the other is version 7.0, which was created with the English as a second and foreign language learners in mind.

Both versions have been widely used, yet, for the purposes of the study, version 7.0, which is geared at English as a second and foreign language learners was used, only with Group A twice-once before and once after the reading strategy instruction.

3.3.2.2 Certificate of Proficiency in English (COPE)

Certificate of Proficiency in English, otherwise known as COPE, is the proficiency exam administered in Bilkent University School of English Language (BUSEL). It not only acts as the proficiency exam but also as a placement test. This proficiency exam is prepared by the Curriculum and Testing Department in BUSEL and it is administered three times every year. Once in September, once in February and for the third and last time in July.

The COPE was deployed in the study as it provided a reliable and valid measure for proficiency, and since the primary goal of the study was to observe the possible effects of cognitive and metacognitive strategy instruction on proficiency, its employment was seen apt.

The COPE, as was noted, is a proficiency exam that is made up of four papers devoted to Reading, Listening, Use of English and Writing. The first paper is the Reading Paper in which there are 6 parts. In the first part of the Reading Paper students need to answer a multiple-choice cloze test of ten blanks. However, although this part is included in the Reading Paper, in fact it tests the ability to recognize grammatical structures. Thus, for the purposes of the study at hand this section was disregarded during the analysis. In the second part of the Reading Paper students are expected to complete a total of 15

gaps in two short texts, each from a choice of four options. This section aims to test the ability of recognizing vocabulary from its meaning, context and collocations. In the third part of the Reading Paper students are expected to match each of eight statements to one of five short texts, which tests the ability to read quickly so as to get a general idea, to find specific information as well as the ability to infer meaning. In part four of the Reading Paper, the students complete a total of four gaps in one short text from a choice of sentences that are given. This part is designed to test the ability to understand coherence and cohesion in a text through linkers and reference words. In part five of the same paper, students are asked to identify the correct heading for four paragraphs from a choice of five options given and also they have to identify the correct ending for four sentences from a choice of five options. This part is designed to test the ability to identify the main idea of a paragraph and also, the ability to understand the supporting detail in a paragraph. Finally, in the sixth part of the Reading Paper, students are expected to identify the correct answer to a total of five questions, each with options, based on one text. This final part in the Reading Paper is designed to test the ability to read intensively, the ability to infer meaning and the ability to guess the meaning of vocabulary from context.

The second paper is the Listening Paper and it is made up of three parts. In the first part students listen to an interview or a lecture and tick the boxes next to the statements that are mentioned during the interview or lecture. In part two of the Listening Paper students again listen to a lecture or an interview and answer multiple choice comprehension questions, which test the ability to

listen for detailed understanding of specific information. In the last part of the Listening Paper, students listen to three short conversations and answer multiple choice comprehension questions.

The third part of COPE is devoted to the Use of English Paper, which is made up of five parts. Part one requires the completion of twenty gaps in a text using one word only. Part two necessitates the completion of a total of fifteen gaps in one or two texts by making one or two changes to the given word. In part three, students have to complete a total of ten gaps in two texts or group of sentences from a choice of words given in a box. In the fourth part of the Use of English section, the examinees are expected to identify an extra word, if any, in each of fifteen lines of a text. And finally, in the last part students complete ten short dialogues using one or more words.

Finally, in the Writing Paper, in the first part the examinees are required to write a 120-word report or letter. In the second part, a 250-word, well-organized, coherent and accurate essay is expected from the exam takers.

Naturally, for the purposes of the present study the Reading Paper, Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were analyzed statistically.

3.4 Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Instruction

The direct and integrated cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction was originally planned to last for four weeks, and each week Group A was scheduled to receive 2 hours of reading strategy instruction. Unfortunately, due to some constraints beyond the control of the researcher, the reading strategy instruction had to be quite intensive, which meant that Group A received four hours of instruction

within 2 weeks. Although the total amount of time devoted to the strategy instruction did not change, this new timetable surely had some effects on the study, which was mentioned in the limitations section in Chapter 3 earlier.

As was noted, the needs analysis for the strategy instruction came into being through the first round of the TAPs and semi-structured interviews with Group A. The utilization of these tools guided the researcher in planning the reading strategy instruction by diagnosing the strategies the participants made use of and incorporating those strategies that they lacked but whose acquisition is vital for survival in the target language situation.

Naturally, when deciding on the content of the strategy instruction the strategies whose enhancement was particularly important for success in COPE were also considered by the researcher. This also added an element of motivation to the study, which undoubtedly is a very important ingredient. Another instrument which guided the researcher was the data from the diaries. What this meant was that, after the participants in Group A reflected on their strategy use regarding a particular instruction session, the researcher evaluated the diaries and made alterations or additions to the instruction program.

For the strategy instruction, predominantly, reading texts in the pre-faculty course book was used to foster the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. However, although the texts were used almost always additional activities to foster reading strategies were incorporated. The instruction program also made use of outside sources; thus, apart from the texts in the course book, other texts and activities were also deployed.

3.4.1 Strategy Instruction Session 1

For the first strategy instruction session, a text called "Talking Horses and Featherless Chickens" was used. Almost all the strategy sessions started with a brainstorming activity, and this first session was no exception. The main rationale behind the inclusion of brainstorming activities was the fact that the activation of content schemata helps the readers considerably, and that if students could be made aware of this fact, they might try to employ it with other language learning tasks. The brainstorming activity was called ABC Brainstorming and students were expected to find words related to the topic which all start with the letters of the alphabet. Then, the participants made some guesses about what kind of information they expected to find in the reading text. This was followed by explicitly dealing with the benefits of skimming and scanning and how we run our eyes over the text when asked to skim or scan a text. The difference between the two was made explicit to by means of a scanning activity brought in by the researcher and a skimming activity in their course book. Skimming was particularly focused on because in COPE students are expected to skim texts so as to locate main ideas. Another activity was the referencing activity. The participants were shown the significance of coherence and cohesion by means of a text that was incoherent and incohesive. Later on they were asked to answer some reference questions. Being able to identify references is particularly important for the COPE exam because in COPE Reading Paper Parts 4 and 6, for instance, they are expected to be able to answer reference questions.

All in all, in the first session, the participants practiced cognitive strategies like skimming and scanning, referencing, identifying main ideas, inferring information from context; and metacognitive strategies like brainstorming and activating schemata and evaluating guesses. They also had the chance to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses in terms of reading as far as the reading text and tasks in the first session were concerned after the instruction in their learning diaries. As was previously mentioned, this constituted one of the aspects of the metacognitive training that was offered.

When the first entries to the diaries were analyzed, it was seen that almost all the students were very much aware of the importance of brainstorming and activating content schemata. They noted that they liked brainstorming and scanning activities best. Unfortunately, since there were only four students on the day of the first strategy instruction, the researcher could not obtain enough information to shape the second strategy session; yet, the feedback from the participants, no matter how few in number, were incorporated.

3.4.2 Strategy Instruction Session 2

The second strategy session took place in the same week as the first session and again a reading text from the Pre-faculty course book called "Past, Present and Future" was used, similar to the first strategy session, extra activities were also brought in. The session started off by a brainstorming activity-Carousel Brainstorming. In this type of brainstorming, after the students look at the title, picture, and/or headings, they get into groups and

each group receives a piece of paper with a different aspect of the topic written on the paper. For instance, the text they were going to read was about scientific findings about crash dieting. Thus, after putting the participants into three groups, each group received a piece of paper. On one of the pieces of paper, "A new study suggests that crash dieting reduces mental performance" was written, in the other "The psychological effects" was written, and finally, on the last piece of paper, "Poor performance" was written. The groups took a couple of minutes to make guesses about what could be mentioned under the topics that their group had received. After each group made some notes on their pieces of paper, they passed it on to the next group, and the same thing was done until all the groups though and made notes about all the topics noted on the pieces of paper.

After the brainstorming session, the students were asked to take down notes on the reading text, after being told the benefits of taking down notes when reading a text. Then, some comprehension questions were answered. This was followed by some referencing questions.

The final activity of the second session was to reiterate the importance of making guesses before reading something. They were explicitly informed about the uses of guessing what a text is about before reading it. They had to look at four headlines taken from the same newspaper and choose the sentences which best describe the possible contents of the articles by looking at the headlines.

The cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies that were targeted during the second session were as follows respectively; making guesses,

reading the title and inferencing, taking down notes on the reading text, identifying main ideas, referencing; and brainstorming to activate schemata, evaluating guesses, and finally reflecting in their learning diaries.

When the learning diaries were observed, it was seen that most participants had found the brainstorming activity quite useful, and the most significant problem they had was with vocabulary. Seven out of 12 participants voiced their concerns about having difficulty in guessing meaning from context. Thus, the next session was planned in such a way as to address the concerns voiced by the students.

3.4.3 Strategy Instruction Session 3

The third strategy instruction session again made use of a reading text in the Pre-faculty course book- The Lighter Side of Education. The session started with a brainstorming activity. The participants had to make guesses about a sentence which was taken from the reading text and put on the board. Apart from activating schemata and making guesses, the activity also aimed at identifying clues in a text.

After the initial discussion, participants thought about the purpose of the text, and they were also asked to think about the style and what information this could provide the reader with. For instance, the text was a narrative and it talked about the experiences of a person when he was a student. The students were asked to notice the use of personal pronoun "I" in the text and they were also asked to notice the inclusion of personal thought and reactions in the text.

After the above activities, an activity devised so as to work on the complex sentences was done. Students were asked to match the verbs with their subjects in sentences taken from the reading text on the board.

In the next block students answered some comprehension questions about the reading text and practiced guessing meaning from context.

The cognitive reading strategies that were focused on in this particular session were making guesses and inferencing, recognizing formulas and patterns, identifying main ideas, guessing meaning from context and referencing; as for the metacognitive reading skills there was once again a brainstorming activity and participants were asked to think about the purpose of a text. The third session came to an end by participant reflection in the learning diaries.

Once again the learning diaries were analyzed and it was seen that most of the participants had liked working on guessing meaning from context and doing work on complex sentences. As for the problems they had noted, most of the students mentioned having difficulties with vocabulary.

3.4.4 Strategy Instruction Session 4

In the fourth and final session of the strategy instruction, a reading text called "Laughter is the Best Medicine" from the Pre-faculty book was used, just like in the former sessions. Students mainly worked on taking down notes on the reading text. They also answered some reference questions. Then they were asked to do a skimming activity to identify the main ideas in short texts. What they had to do was to read three short articles taken from newspapers and

match a suitable heading with each. They were also asked to do a scanning activity, in which they were given a page full of Help Wanted advertisements and accompanying questions. They had to scan the advertisements and answer ten questions.

The fourth session emphasized the cognitive skills of taking down notes on the reading text, skimming, scanning and identifying main ideas; and as for the metacognitive reading strategies, evaluating guesses, highlighting important information in the text and evaluating guesses were at the foreground.

When the last diary entries were written, it was observed that the participants had particularly liked the note-taking and skimming activity. And almost all the participants mentioned vocabulary as the most problematic area, which was a recurring theme in the diaries.

3.5 Procedure

As can be seen in Table 3 above, the qualitative data for the study mainly came from introspective techniques, namely, think-aloud protocols, semi-structured interviews that were carried out during the think-aloud protocols; and finally, the learning diaries. The quantitative data, on the other hand, was collected through the use of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford; and the COPE exam.

3.5.1 Procedures *Before* the Strategy Instruction

Before the strategy instruction was implemented, the first round of the TAPs and semi-structured interviews were conducted with 4 participants from Group A and another four from Group B. The 8 participants involved in the

think-aloud protocols were chosen by random sampling. The researcher drew lots to choose the participants and the same participants were involved in both rounds of the TAPs and they received an initial training on the think-aloud procedure before the actual data elicitation.

This first round of the TAPs functioned as a needs analysis tool and provided an initial picture for the researcher on the participants' use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in both groups. Naturally, since only 4 students from both groups were involved in the TAPs, the data gathered was representative of the strategies that were supposedly employed by the participants in Group A and Group B. Thus, the first round of the TAPs was designed not only to function as a diagnostic tool to aid the researcher in preparing the strategy instruction for Group A, but also to identify which cognitive and metacognitive strategies were used by the participants and with what frequency in each group before. Similarly, the semi-structured interviews, which took place at the same time as the first TAPs, were employed so as to provide the researcher with an idea of not just the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies the participants made use of that were observed because of task demands at hand, but also to enable the researcher a richer insight by supplying data about the participants' general cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy use.

As was mentioned, the semi-structured interviews were carried out at the same time as the TAPs. The participants were asked some questions to make them reflect on their use of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in

general. In the first round of the TAPs, the researcher asked some preplanned questions at the participants like " What do you do before you start reading a text?", "What do you normally do when you don't understand a part in the reading text?" and "What would you have done if I had given you the questions first?" so as to extract information about their use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in general.

As was previously explained, during the first TAPs, a reading text from the book First Certificate Reading Skills by David Foll (1988) and accompanying questions were used (App. A). The reading texts and tasks were carefully chosen because according to theory using texts that were slightly higher in level than the students' level of proficiency would bring about the strategy employment by the students. Thus, the reading text used in the first round of the TAPs –and so was the other reading text used in the second round of the TAPs- and accompanying questions were selected with care.

The TAPs took place outside the class hours and one participant at a time was involved in each TAP session. Each TAP lasted for a minimum of half an hour. All eight of the TAPs were tape recorded with verbatim transcripts made of subjects' verbal reports as they worked on a foreign language reading task.

The think-aloud protocols were conducted in the subjects' native language (i.e. Turkish) to facilitate data elicitation. During the elicitation of data through the think-aloud protocols, some interviewer reminders, or prods, were used as recommended by Ericsson and Simon (1987) like verbal commenting

such as "Keep Talking" or "What are you thinking about?" if and when the subject became silent (as cited in Chamot & O'Malley, p.92).

Since the think-aloud protocols usually generate a lot of data, some researchers have thought of using some inventories to ease data analysis afterwards. Thus, a cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory (App.C) was used. The inventory was compiled from the works of researchers like Baker and Brown (1984), who were interested in native language reading; and also from the works of Hosenfeld, Arnold, Kirchofer, Laciura, and Wilson (1981), and Hosenfeld (1977, 1979), who have been interested in foreign language reading, and they were all organized by making use of Oxford's typology (1990). That is to say, all the relevant strategies that were pulled from the studies mentioned above were organized and fed under the cognitive and metacognitive strategies in Oxford's typology. During the compilation of this inventory, it was acknowledged that this inventory was by no means exhaustive. Thus, the researcher expected that some of the participants involved in the TAPs might mention other cognitive and metacognitive strategies that were not on the inventory, which were then added to the inventory.

This cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies inventory not only assisted the researcher in recording the data during the TAPs and the semi-structured interviews, but also proved useful in identifying the type and frequency of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies of the eight participants that were involved in the TAPs and the semi-structured interviews.

Whenever a participant mentioned a reading strategy/strategies, cognitive or metacognitive, while reading the given text or while doing the accompanying tasks, or while answering the questions for the semi-structured interview, the researcher circled the relevant strategy/strategies used by students. This provided the researcher information as to the type of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies employed by the participants. The frequency with which the participants used these reading strategies was also recorded on the inventory- every time a cognitive or metacognitive reading strategy was used, the researcher put a tally next to the relevant reading strategy. After that, the results were collated for each student on the inventory that was employed during the execution of the TAPs.

Apart from employing the inventory that was used during the TAPs, the verbatim transcripts (see App. E for a sample) of the TAPs that were made after the execution of the after the TAPs were used to ensure the accuracy of the results, and thus, to increase the reliability.

What's more, participants' answers to the questions in the semi-structured interviews - which took place at the same time as the TAPs - were also recorded by means of this cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies inventory. Thus, the researcher posing the preplanned questions, whenever she deemed appropriate, obtained information about the general reading strategies employed by the participants. Depending on the answers to these questions, the researcher put a tally next to the relevant strategies mentioned by the participant on the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies inventory.

As was anticipated, after the initial execution of the TAPs, together with the semi-structured interviews, it was observed that the eight students who were involved in the TAPs made use of some other cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies that were not readily on the inventory. Thus, these reading strategies were added to the inventory. It was observed that most of the strategies that came up during the first think-aloud protocols were cognitive and there was only one metacognitive strategy that was added to the inventory. The cognitive strategies mentioned by the relevant students during the think-aloud protocols were using visual clues like

punctuation marks and highlighted sections, employing a top down approach, employing a bottom up approach, identifying key words, making use of cognates, making use of personalization, linking sound and visual imagery, using visualization. In addition to the cognitive strategies mentioned above, there was one metacognitive strategy that came up during the first round of the think-aloud protocols, which was the activation of the content-schemata.

Another tool that was employed before the strategy instruction was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990). The SILL (App.D) was administered only to the twelve participants in Group A to obtain data about the types of cognitive and metacognitive strategies employed and also the frequency with which they were employed.

Before it was used with Group A, the SILL was piloted with another Pre-Faculty class in BUSEL so as to ensure a greater accuracy of results. What's

more, a Turkish version of the SILL was also provided in case students had problems in understanding some of the statements.

The SILL gave information about the different kinds of strategies like memory strategies, compensation strategies, affective strategies, etc. However, for the purposes of the study, although all the participants in Group A answered all the parts in the SILL, only those parts which dealt with the cognitive and metacognitive strategies-Part B and Part D- were taken into consideration for the purposes of the study. What's more, as was noted beforehand, some statements which lay beyond the boundaries of the study were not considered during the statistical analyses. Statements 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17 from Part B; and statements 32 and 35 from Part D were not included in the data analyses, in other words.

3.5.2 Procedures During the Strategy Instruction

During the strategy instruction all 24 students in Groups A and B kept learning diaries, which predominantly revealed the process participants went through during the course of the reading strategy instruction in Group A and learning in general in Group B. The inclusion of such a technique for the elicitation of qualitative data was primarily to foster the metacognitive strategies of the learners like self-evaluation, setting goals and objectives, etc.

During the study, all twenty-four students, twelve from Group A and another twelve from Group B kept diaries during the four-week strategy instruction offered to Group A. Thus, both groups were asked to write their

reflections about their own learning and also, with Group A, particularly about their use of reading strategies.

As was mentioned previously, both groups were asked to write in their diaries once every week for four weeks, that is, for the duration of the strategy instruction. In order to avoid the loss of data, the diary entries were written as soon as possible after the execution of the reading task. The twenty-four participants were provided with some guidelines (App. F) in the completion of their diaries. These guidelines were in English but the participants were free to respond either in Turkish or English.

The qualitative data that was generated by the learning diaries were analyzed by the researcher weekly to obtain feedback about the instruction program implemented with Group A and also to find out about how Group B was doing in terms of reading strategies. Thus, in a way, the diaries were a part of the strategy instruction program since it was designed to reinforce metacognition by encouraging and guiding the students to reflect on their use of relevant reading strategies.

As was aforementioned, the diaries served a very important purpose particularly during the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction program that was implemented with Group A. Not only was it a part of the metacognitive strategy instruction but also it was a useful instrument for the researcher to shape the strategy instruction sessions offered to Group A. Therefore, during the reading strategy instruction program, the researcher made four charts (App. G) which collated the reflections of *only* the participants

in Group A. The researcher made four collation charts, one for each diary entry for the four instruction sessions. Thus, the diary entries of the students after each strategy instruction for Group A were collated separately, for each of the strategy instruction sessions. Thus, after the first strategy instruction lesson, for instance, which was devised using a reading text called "Talking Horses and Featherless Chickens" in Pre-faculty course book used by the participants, the researcher, having had the participants to write their diaries, collated the information for

that particular strategy instruction lesson. This enabled the researcher to see what the kinds of reading strategies employed by the participants in Group A, their problems as regards reading and their perceived needs. These in return affected the content of the reading strategy instruction offered to Group A.

Group B, who didn't receive any strategy instruction, also kept diaries. Since all the strategy instruction was designed in such a way as to make use of the reading texts in the Pre-faculty course book, the participants in Group B, after doing the reading lessons reflected in their diaries.

3.5.3 Procedures *After* the Strategy Instruction

After the strategy instruction was administered, the second round of the TAPs with four students each from Group A and Group B was carried out. As was the case with the first round of the TAPs, in the second round, too, semi-structured interviews were conducted at the same time with the TAPs. The function of the second TAPs and the interviews were helping the researcher in

evaluating the strategy instruction by enabling the researcher to compare and contrast the type and frequency of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies used particularly by the four participants from Group A that had received the strategy instruction. For the second round of the TAPs a different reading text (App. B) from the same book that was employed in the first TAPs was used. Just like in the first round of the TAPs and interviews, the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory was used. During the execution of the second TAPs and interviews, the researcher circled the strategies mentioned by the 8 students, and put as many tallies as the number of times a strategy was mentioned.

As was put forth, thus, the benefits of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory was twofold. Firstly, through this inventory, it was possible to identify the type and frequency of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies, for the purpose of initially diagnosing the reading strategy use of the eight students. Thus, it provided guidance in the planning of the strategy instruction. Secondly, this inventory also proved helpful later when observing the changes reflected in the cognitive and metacognitive strategy use after the strategy instruction was conducted.

Therefore, after the second round of the TAPs, the information that came from the TAPs and the answers obtained as a result of the semi-structured interviews, the data was analyzed for each of the four students in groups A and B using this cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory. For each of the 4 students involved in the TAPs and semi-structured interviews, the

researcher made use of a copy of the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy inventory. The strategies that were not originally on the inventory were added later on. The cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies employed by each participant and the frequency with which they were employed were collated on this copy of the updated inventory. Making use of the inventory that was circled and tallied and also using the verbatim transcripts of the TAPs for each student the researcher was able to analyze the data. This enabled the researcher to observe the type and frequency of the cognitive and metacognitive strategies employed.

As for the semi- structured interviews, the same questions were used for the second round as well; however, the participants were also asked to compare the first reading text they read in the first TAPs and the second text they read in the second TAPs to give them a chance to evaluate their performance during the second and last round of the TAPs and also to think about factors which affected their performance and use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

Another instrument which was employed after the strategy instruction was the SILL by Oxford (1990). Just like before the strategy instruction, it was again only administered to Group A, who had received the strategy instruction. The answers to the SILL, which was administered to Group A twice - once before the strategy instruction and once after it- were collated using the strategies mentioned under Part B and Part D of the SILL. The collation chart (App. H) which was used showed the frequencies with which each participant utilized the strategies under Part B and Part D both for the first round of the

SILL (SILL 1) before the strategy instruction and for the second round of the SILL (SILL2) after the strategy instruction. The data that was collated as explained in the previous paragraph enabled the researcher to run statistical analyses. The first statistical analysis was three t-tests. However, as was mentioned previously, some statements form Parts B and D have been excluded and these very sentences have been shaded in the collation chart (see App. H).

The primary reason why the t-test was used was to shed light on whether the strategy instruction led to any significant differences regarding the frequency with which cognitive and metacognitive strategies were used by the participants in Group A before and after the strategy instruction.

After the strategy instruction program, in accordance with the aims of the study, the learning diaries from both Group A and Group B were utilized to yield information about the type and frequency of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies deployed by the participants. To obtain the relevant data the information from the learning diaries were collated in a chart (App. I). The collation chart used the guidelines as the framework and noted the reflections of the participants in Groups A and B under these guidelines. Under each guideline, the researcher listed all the strategies mentioned by the participants and whenever a particular strategy that was put under the guidelines was mentioned, the researcher put a tally next to the respective strategy. Thus, the frequencies that were obtained showed the overall frequency with which the relevant reading strategies were mentioned and used for the duration of the strategy instruction.

The above mentioned collation chart enabled the researcher to observe not only the types of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies deployed by the participants, but also gave information about the frequency with which these relevant strategies were used.

After the strategy instruction, all the participants involved in the study took the COPE exam which was administered at the end of January. In line with the boundaries of the study, the scores of each participant in Group A and Group B only on the Reading Paper of COPE were used. As was previously explained, the first part of the Reading Paper aimed at testing grammar; hence, that particular part was ignored during the analysis stage. As a result, the remaining five sections were utilized.

The use of grades scored on the reading Paper of the COPE enabled the researcher to obtain quantitative data and, thus, to cross validate the results that were obtained from the qualitative data collection by providing information about whether the strategy instruction had any effect on the reading proficiency of the participants involved in the study. The scores of the subjects on the reading section of the COPE exam were compared by means of statistical analysis.

3.6 Limitations

One of the major limitations of the present study was the fact that variables such as attitude, motivation, emotion, age, personality, gender, learning style, and the effects of socio-economic background lay beyond the

boundaries of the study. Thus, any effects the former might have had on the reading performance and strategy use of the students were not focused on.

Another limitation was encountered as regards the delivery of the cognitive and metacognitive strategy instruction. Originally, the strategy instruction had been planned to be implemented for two blocks (50 minutes X 2) every week for four weeks. However, due to some constraints beyond the control of the researcher, the instruction took place within two weeks for four blocks (50 minutes X 4) each week. Although this did not make any difference to the amount of strategy instruction students received, it surely had some adverse effects on the metacognitive side of the strategy instruction. To be more exact, the importance of metacognition is a fact long established by prominent figures such as Wenden (1987), Stern (1975), Vann and Abraham (1990), and Grenfell and Harris (1999), and having acknowledged the significance of metacognition, the researcher had included in her design the use of learning diaries by the participants who received strategy instruction, and also by the participants in Group B who didn't receive any strategy instruction. It was planned that the participants who were offered the strategy instruction would reflect on the various aspects of the strategy instruction after each session of the instruction in their diaries, by means of which some metacognitive strategies could be fostered. However, due to the intensive nature of the strategy instruction, the participants were asked to write in their diaries ever so often, which had some implications on the way the participants wrote in their diaries. Thus, some of

the reflections were not genuine, some were irrelevant and worse still some participants did not reflect at all.

One other limitation was related to the selection of cognitive and metacognitive strategies that were relevant for the scope of the study, which was primarily about reading strategies. As was mentioned before, Oxford's typology (1990) was utilized as the framework for cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. In this typology the cognitive, or direct, strategies are categorized under four main domains; namely, (a) Practicing; (b) Receiving and sending messages; (c) Analyzing and reasoning; and finally, (d) Creating structure for input and output. Although these categories for the cognitive strategies set out by Oxford (1990) were employed in the study, some alterations inevitably had to be made. This was due to the fact that the typology was drawn to accommodate *all* the strategies that were utilized in language learning in general. Hence, cognitive strategies like formally practicing with sounds, which involved pronunciation and intonation practices for the improvement of the speaking skill, and recombining, which involved the combining of known elements in new ways to produce longer sequences for the enhancement of the writing skill, were ignored being beyond the aims of this study.

Similarly, the same route was followed for the metacognitive strategies, or indirect strategies, as Oxford (1990) called them. As is known, Oxford's metacognitive strategies fall under three main categories which were further divided. The first category was centering your learning; the second, arranging and planning your time; and finally, the last category is evaluating your

learning. Due to the scope of this particular study, however, some metacognitive strategies are omitted on the same grounds as the

omission of some of the above-mentioned cognitive strategies. For instance, delaying speech production to focus on listening was not considered for the purposes of the study, and neither was seeking practice opportunities to practice the new language in naturalistic situations.

A further limitation was the statements in SILL, under Parts B and D, which were beyond the purposes of the study. As was explicated previously, the researcher only made use of Parts B and D. However, since the SILL aims at evaluating the overall language learning strategy use, under Parts B and D, there were statements which were not relevant to the study. Therefore, although the students were asked to do the SILL in its entirety, during the data analyses stage, the statements which lay outside the boundaries of the study in Parts B and D had to be ignored.

What's more, issues of sampling was the other most important limitation which may have been a threat to the internal and external validity of this study. A sample size of 23 participants-which was originally 24 but one of whom dropped out later in the course- could not be generalized because it was not sufficient to make informed judgments based on a study involving too few subjects.

One other concern was the attitude of the participants in Group A. Although they were very well-behaved, some of them just wanted to do exam

practice and probably deemed the instruction as unnecessary or untimely because they were about to take the COPE. Thus, although they did the activities in the instructional sessions, they were reluctant to keep diaries, which constituted an important practice in fostering metacognitive strategy use.

Still as another limitation, the researcher had to decide on her own in assigning which strategies are cognitive and which are metacognitive. Having mentioned the difficulty in drawing a line between the former and the latter, this was a valid concern on the part of the researcher. However, having acknowledged the threat this might pose to the reliability of the study, so as to safeguard against it, the researcher made use of multiple data collection techniques. The study, thus, accommodated both qualitative data and quantitative data, which enabled the cross validation of the results obtained and the conclusions drawn.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.0 Presentation

This chapter deals with the results and offers interpretations for the various findings. It has been designed under the two research questions that the study has set out to answer. Thus, in the first part of this chapter, the results that will help in answering the first research question will be handled. Then, the results that will help yield information about what the second research question aims at revealing will be considered.

4.1 Research Questions

This study was primarily designed to unveil the possible effects of an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading at awareness-raising level on the reading proficiency of advanced level Turkish university students in BUSEL in an EFL setting. The secondary concern of the present study was to address the issue of whether an integrated and direct instruction of the reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level would cause an increase in the frequency and variety of cognitive and metacognitive strategies involved in reading.

Below are the two research questions that the study has attempted to answer:

1. Does an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level in an EFL setting affect advanced level Turkish university students' reading proficiency?
2. Does an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level lead to an increase in the frequency and variety of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies?

4.1.1 Results for Research Question 1

So as to find out if an integrated and direct instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies at awareness-raising level in an EFL setting affected the reading proficiency of the participants in Group A, before the inferential statistics, the data from the Reading Paper of COPE were analyzed in terms of general tendency. Namely, the scores of all the participants on the Reading Paper of COPE were analyzed in terms of mean, mode, median, and standard deviation (see Table 4).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper in COPE

	GROUP A	GROUP B

MEAN	29,2	28,7
MODE	29	26
MEDIAN	29,5	27
SD	3,45	3.74

N=23

The results obtained as a result of the statistical analysis as shown in Table 4 indicate, the mean scores of the two groups were quite close (Group A: *M=29.1* and Group B: *M=28.7*). This indicated that Group B, who hadn't received the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level, did almost as good as Group A, who had received the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction.

So as to see whether the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level had a significant effect on the reading proficiency of Group A, a t-test was run to test mean differences of Group A, who had received the strategy instruction, and Group B who was not subject to any special treatment, at $\alpha=0.05$ level of significance. Before the t-test was run the raw scores of both groups on the Reading Paper of COPE were converted to z scores and subsequently to T scores (see Table 5).

Table 5: The z Scores and T Scores of Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper in COPE

GROUP A			GROUP B		
Raw Scores	**Z scores**	**T scores**	**Raw Scores**	**Z Scores**	**T Scores**

32	0.81	58.1	26	-0.72	42.8
29	-0.05	49.5	26	-0.72	42.8
24	-1.50	35	27	-0.45	45.5
31	0.52	55.2	26	-0.72	42.8
28	-0.34	46.6	32	0.88	58.8
25	-1.21	37.9	24	-1.25	37.5
30	0.23	52.3	25	-0.98	40.2
24	-1.50	35	34	1.41	64.1
29	-0.05	49.5	34	1.41	64.1
34	1.39	63.9	32	0.88	58.8
34	1.39	63.9	30	0.34	53.4
30	0.23	52.3			

N=23

The results of the t-test did not indicate a statistically significant relationship between strategy instruction at awareness-raising level and reading proficiency as Table 6 below shows. The figure 0,934 for significance did not put forth a statistically significant difference.

Table 6: T-test for Group A and Group B on the Reading Paper of COPE

				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**	**Lower**	**Upper**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Group A and Group B	-, 36	14,17	4, 27	-9, 88	9, 15	-, 085	10	, 934

N=23

4.1.2 Results for Research Question 2

In order to answer the second research question, both qualitative data and quantitative data were deployed. First of all, the results generated by the implementation of TAPs and semi structured interviews, which took place at the same time as the TAPs, will be discussed together. Then the data that came from the learning diaries will be analyzed, and this will be followed by the

statistical analyses run using the data that was obtained by the administration of the SILL (Oxford, 1990).

4.1.2.1 Results from TAPs and Semi-structured Interviews

When the data from the first and second TAPs and semi-structured interviews from the 4 participants of Group A were collated and analyzed, it was observed that, on the whole, Group A made use of more types of cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones (see Table 7). This can be observed in the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies inventory which contained twenty-three cognitive strategies but only eight metacognitive ones. Thus, it was observed that the four participants in Group A used more cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones.

Table 7: The Type of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP1 and TAP2 in Group A

	TAP1		TAP2	
	Most Frequent	**Least Frequent**	**Most Frequent**	**Least Frequent**
Cognitive Strategies	- identifying key words	- recognising formulas and patterns - identifying main ideas - comparing L1 and L2 - attempting to link sound and imagery	- identifying key words	- identifying main ideas - looking for markers of cohesion - acknowledging the importance of concentration

Table 7 (cont.)

Metacognitive Strategies	- trying to activate content schemata - identifying the purpose of the	- attempting to relate important points in the text to one another to understand the text	-evaluating guesses -identifying the purpose of the task -trying to activate content schemata	-overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata - reconsidering and revising hypothesis

	task - reconsidering and revising hypothesis about the meaning of a text - evaluating guesses overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata - changing the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked	as a whole - highlighting important information in the text		about the meaning of a text - highlighting important information in the text

When the frequency with which these four students from Group A used these cognitive strategies in TAP 1 and TAP 2 was analyzed, it was seen that the most frequently used cognitive strategy was identifying key words in both of the TAPs. This cognitive strategy-identifying key words- was employed 17 times during the first, and 16 times during the second think-aloud protocols. The least frequent cognitive strategies in TAP 1 were recognizing formulas and patterns, identifying main ideas, comparing L1 and L2, and finally attempting to link sound and visual imagery, which were all evidenced once. When the least frequent scores in the use of cognitive strategies during TAP 2 were inquired, it was seen that identifying main ideas together with looking for markers of cohesion and acknowledging the importance of concentration were utilized once by these four students.

Apart from the most frequent and least frequent cognitive strategies explained in the paragraphs above, there was one cognitive strategy that was

not employed by any of the four participants in Group A neither in TAP1 nor in TAP 2 and that was applying rules in L1 to the L2 context.

As regards the use of metacognitive reading strategies with the four students from Group A in TAP 1, the most frequent strategy was trying to activate content schemata (employed six times), identifying the purpose of the task (employed 5 times), reconsidering and revising hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content (employed 4 times), evaluating guesses (employed 4 times). Overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata (employed 3 times) and changing the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked (employed 3 times) were evidenced less than the formerly mentioned metacognitive strategies. However, the least frequent of all the metacognitive strategies observed in TAP 1 were attempting to relate important points in the text to one another to understand the text as a whole and highlighting important information, which were both employed no more than 2 times.

However, when TAP 2 was analyzed to uncover the most frequent metacognitive strategy, it was seen that he most frequent metacognitive strategy in the second TAPs was evaluating guesses (employed 6 times). Identifying the purpose of the task and trying to activate the content schemata were utilized less than evaluating guesses (employed 4 times). The least frequent among the metacognitive strategies were overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata (employed 2 times); reconsidering and revising hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content; and highlighting important information which were all employed 2 times.

Table 8: The Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP1 and TAP2 in Group A

Participant	1		2		3		4	
COGNITIVE STRATEGIES	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2
	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.
1.Rereads a section if meaning isn't clear.	2	3	1	2	1	3	1	2
2.Recognizes formulas and patterns.	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	-
3.Reads title (makes inferences).	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4.Identifies main ideas.	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
5.Skims and scans as needed.	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
6.Summarizes, makes notes, paraphrases, highlights, etc to remember what has been stated in the text.	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1
7.Compares L1 with L2.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.Translates into native language.	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	2
9.Attempts to infer information from context.	3	3	3	-	2	3	3	1
10.Looks for markers of cohesion (i.e. reference words, linkers).	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	-

Table 8 (cont.)

11.Analyzes grammatical category of words	2	2	1	-	-	1	-	1
12.Applies rules in L1 to the L2 context.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13.Tries to guess meaning of vocabulary from	4	3	3	-	2	3	1	3

context.								
14.Pays attention to text structure.	2	2	2	1	-	1	2	3
*15.Uses visual clues (punctuation marks, bolded or italicized parts)	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	3
*16.Employs top down approach.	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1
*17.Employs bottom up approach.	1	3	1	-	1	-	1	2
*18.Identifies key words and figures (i.e numbers).	8	6	4	2	2	4	3	4
*19.Makes use of cognates.	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
*20.Uses personalization.	1	3	-	-	2	1	-	-
*21.Attempts to link sound and visual imagery.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
*22.Uses visualization.	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
*23.Acknowledges the importance of concentration.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES								
1. Overviews the text before reading to activate schemata.	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1
2. Identifies the purpose of the task.	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
3. Reconsiders and revises hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content.	2	1	2	-	-	1	-	-

Table 8 (cont.)

4. Changes the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked.	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
5. Attempts to relate important points in the text to one another to	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1

understand the text as a whole.								
6. Evaluates guesses.	2	1	1	1	-	3	1	1
7. Highlights important information (by underlining, circling, etc.)	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-
*8. Tries to activate content schemata.	4	2	-	-	2	2	-	-

* These strategies were added to the inventory after TAP 1 with Groups A and B.

When the results of Group B in TAP 1 for each of the four participants were collated and analyzed, it was observed that, Group B, just like Group A, made use of more types of cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones. Thus, it was seen that the four participants in Group B used more cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones (see Table 9). In TAP 1, the most frequent cognitive strategy used by Group B was trying to guess the meaning of vocabulary from context, which was evidenced 18 times. The other cognitive strategies witnessed in descending order were identifying key words and figures (employed 15 times), skimming and scanning (employed 13 times) followed by translating into native language (12 times). The least frequent cognitive strategies, on the other hand, were using personalization, employing bottom-up approach, applying rules in L1 to L2 context and comparing L1 with L2. There were also some cognitive strategies not employed at all, and these were employing top-down approach, making use of cognates, linking sound and visual imagery and acknowledging the importance of concentration. As for the metacognitive strategy use in TAP 1 by Group B, the most frequent strategy was trying to

activate content schemata and all the other metacognitive strategies were employed much less than 5 times.

As for the results of Group B in TAP 2 regarding the use of cognitive reading strategies, it can be seen that the most frequent cognitive reading strategy, just like in TAP 1, was trying to guess the meaning of unknown vocabulary from context, which was evidenced 14 times. This particular cognitive strategy was followed by rereading a section if meaning isn't clear, which was employed 10 times. The other two relatively more frequent cognitive reading strategies were skimming and scanning, and identifying key words and figures, both of which were deployed 8 times.

When the data that came from Group B after TAP 2 was analyzed, this time for the least frequent cognitive reading strategies, it was seen that recognizing formulas and patterns, employing top-down approach, acknowledging the importance of concentration were all used once (see Table 9). The other cognitive strategies like summarizing, taking notes, etc to remember what has been stated in the text; comparing L1 with L2, and attempting to infer information context were all evidenced twice. There were also some cognitive strategies that were not used at all. Some of these strategies were looking for markers of cohesion, applying rules in L1 to L2 context, making use of cognates, using personalization, attempting to link sound and visual imagery and finally, using visualization.

Following the most and least frequent cognitive reading strategies analysis by the data from Group B in TAP2, the same analysis was conducted

this time for the metacognitive reading strategies. As can be seen in Table 10, during TAP 2 in Group B, the most frequent metacognitive reading strategy was trying to activate content schemata, which was utilized six times. The other two most frequent metacognitive reading strategies were identifying the purpose of the task and changing the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked, which were both deployed thrice. The least frequent metacognitive reading strategy was overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata, which was observed twice. There was one strategy that was not used at all and that was reconsidering and revising hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content.

Table 9: The Type of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP1 and TAP2 in Group B

	TAP1		TAP2	
	Most Frequent	**Least Frequent**	**Most Frequent**	**Least Frequent**
Cognitive Strategies	-trying to guess the meaning of vocabulary -identifying key words and figures	-using personalization - employing bottom-up approach	-trying to guess the meaning of vocabulary - rereading a section if meaning isn't clear - skimming and scanning	- recognising formulas and patterns - employing top-down approach - acknowledging the importance of concentration

Table 9 (cont.)

	-skimming and scanning -translating into native language	- applying rules in L1 to L2 context - comparing L1 with L2 - attempts to relate important points in the text to one another to understand the text as a whole - evaluates guesses -highlights important information	-identifying key words and figures	

Table 10: The Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in TAP1 and TAP2 in Group B

Participant	1		2		3		4	
COGNITIVE STRATEGIES	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2	TAP1	TAP2
	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.
1.Rereads a section if meaning isn't clear.	6	5	2	1	1	2	2	2
2.Recognizes formulas and patterns.	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
3.Reads title (makes inferences).	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
4.Identifies main ideas.	1	1	-	1	2	1	3	1
5.Skims and scans as needed.	4	3	2	1	3	2	4	2
6.Summarizes, makes notes, paraphrases, highlights, etc to remember what has been stated in the text.	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-
7.Compares L1 with L2.	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-
8.Translates into native language.	10	12	-	1	1	1	1	-
9.Attempts to infer information from context.	1	1	-	-	2	-	3	1

Table 10 (cont.)

10.Looks for markers of cohesion (i.e. reference words, linkers).	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
11.Analyzes grammatical category of words.	6	4	1	-	1	-	1	-
12.Applies rules in L1 to the L2 context.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
13.Tries to guess meaning of vocabulary from context.	9	7	1	2	6	4	2	1
14.Pays attention to text structure.	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	1

*15.Uses visual clues (punctuation marks, bolded or italicized parts)	1	1	-	1	-	-	4	2
*16.Employs top down approach.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
*17.Employs bottom up approach.	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
*18.Identifies key words and figures (i.e numbers).	6	3	2	2	5	2	2	1
*20.Uses personalization.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
*21.Attempts to link sound and visual imagery.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
*22.Uses visualization.	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
*23.Acknowledges the importance of concentration.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES								
1. Overviews the text before reading to activate schemata.	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
2. Identifies the purpose of the task.	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1
3. Reconsiders and revises hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 10 (cont.)

4. Changes the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked.2	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	1
5. Attempts to relate important points in the text to one Another to understand the text as a whole.	1	-	-	-	2	1	2	-
6. Evaluates guesses.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
7. Highlights important	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-

information (by underlining, circling, etc.)								
*8. Tries to activate content schemata.	4	2	2	1	2	1	4	2

* These strategies were added to the inventory after TAP 1 with Groups A and B.

4.1.2.2 Results from Learning Diaries

Before talking about the results obtained after analyzing the learning diaries, it would be worthwhile to mention the fact that some data could not be used. For instance, one of the participants in Group A after receiving the first session of the strategy instruction wrote in her diary that she used the cognitive strategy of brainstorming before reading the text, and the researcher, in return, put this particular strategy under the relevant section in the collation chart.

However, during the data analysis procedure, it was observed that some participants did not talk about the kinds of strategies they used while doing the activities. For example, the first guideline in the diary asked students to reflect about the strategies they used before reading the text and one of the students in Group B mentioned the activity not the strategy that was employed. Thus, an entry like "finding the meaning of some proper nouns in Turkish" was seen in the data during the analysis stage. Or, when the participants were asked to reflect on the strategies they employed after reading the text, some mentioned answering comprehension questions, which was also seen in the data. Thus, although the remark made by the student(s) was included in the data collation chart, it was not taken into consideration during the data analysis stage. What's more, it was noticed that some participants in both groups put the remark "I

don't know" under the guidelines that aimed at metacognition. Thus, if and when a participant mentioned that he did not know how he can solve the problems he encountered in reading, for instance, the researcher considered such data as informative and valuable because it showed that there were some participants who were not aware of their problems and could not set themselves goals to overcome these problems. Besides these points, the researcher also made use of the strategies that did not pertain to reading. For instance, when the participants were asked to reflect on how they could solve the problems they encountered in reading, some mentioned affective strategies like not getting enough sleep or relaxing, which were also taken into consideration because the effects of the affective domain is a widely accepted phenomena.

As was previously noted, the data from the learning diaries were processed by means of a collation chart (App. I). To reiterate, this chart was used in order to analyze and disclose the types of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies and also the frequencies with which they were employed in both groups.

4.1.2.2.1 Types of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies in the Learning Diaries from Group A and Group B

The results obtained from the learning diaries were processed by means of a collation chart (App. I) which was explicated in detail above. In the

following paragraphs these results will be explained following the order of the guidelines that were utilized in the diaries.

When the collation chart which was intended to give information about the types and frequency of use of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies was analyzed to obtain information about the *types* of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies, it was seen that Group A, who has received the four-week strategy instruction, displayed slightly more types of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. For instance, for the first part of the first question, which inquired about the strategies employed by the students before reading the text, it was observed that on top of the metacognitive strategies like brainstorming and overviewing the text, and some cognitive strategies like scanning; skimming;; guessing; looking at the title and subtitle; which were used by both groups, in Group A some cognitive strategies like looking at the pictures; identifying main ideas; making an outline and making inferences were used. On the other hand, as different from Group A,

Group B were seen to be displaying cognitive strategies like looking at highlighted/bolded sections in a text; predicting content by the given clues and the metacognitive strategy of previewing the questions before answering them. Thus, Group A displayed slightly more types of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies like using visual clues, identifying main ideas, making inferences, making an outline and finally, acknowledging the importance of concentration.

As for the questions-or guidelines-which gave information about the types of strategies used by the groups while reading the text and after reading the text, approximately the same number of cognitive reading strategies were employed and five of those strategies-namely, guessing meaning from context, identifying main ideas, reading intensively, skimming and scanning- were evidenced by both groups. However, the groups employed different types of strategies too. For example, participants in Group B used some cognitive reading strategies of focusing on highlighted sections in the text; employing bottom-up approach; and employing top-down approach; and also the metacognitive strategy of brainstorming. The last two of the reading strategies evidenced in Group B were particularly significant. Some students in the diaries mentioned trying to decode a reading text word by word, which is known as one of the reading models- the bottom-up approach. In Carrell's view (1990) employing a bottom-up approach is commonly known as "…a decoding process of reconstructing the

author's intended meaning via recognizing the printed letters and words, and building up a meaning for a text from the smallest textual units at the "bottom"(letters and words) to larger and larger units at the "top" (phrases, clauses, intersentential linkages)" (p.1).

As for the top-down approach, which is another model of reading acknowledged in the literature, it was observed in Group B by remarks from the participants like "looking at the other sentences in the paragraph to get to the meaning". As is known, the top-down approach, referred to as "meaning-based

reading" by O'Malley and Chamot involves "relating larger chunks of language " to get to the meaning (1990, p. 167). This is in fact the cornerstone of what is known as the interactive model of reading. The implication is that when the reader employs a top-down approach he is interacting with the text and as was claimed by Eskey (1986) a reader should interact with the text by means of applying both the bottom-up and the top-down approaches.

When both of the groups were compared as to the types of strategies they employed while completing post-reading activities were again approximately the same but Group A tended to show little more variety in the type of strategies employed. To illustrate, the cognitive reading strategies of referencing; inferencing; summarizing; evaluating guesses; focusing on the main points and the metacognitive strategies of making an outline, criticizing what is read and identifying the purpose of the task were observed in the relevant entries.

When the diaries of both groups as regards the answers they gave to the question "Which activity did you find most useful?" were compared, it was seen that Group A's answers were relatively more varied. The participants in Group A mentioned the activities which provided them with practice about the cognitive strategies like finding main ideas, skimming, note taking, summarizing and finding key words, and metacognitive strategy of outlining . What the two groups had in common regarding this question was three strategies in total-scanning and guessing meaning from context, which are cognitive in nature and the metacognitive strategy of brainstorming.

The answers collated under "What problems did you have with the reading text?", similar points were raised by both groups. To exemplify, both groups picked on not knowing the meaning of some words; complex sentences, and some participants mentioned concentration problems. Some participants in Group B also raised the importance of background information, which showed that some of them were aware of the importance of activating content schemata while reading a text.

When the reasons for these problems were inquired by means of the question "Why do you think you had these problems?", again similar types of reasons were listed. For instance, both of the groups mentioned the problem of unknown vocabulary as an obstacle to comprehension. What's more, the groups also mentioned the importance of having background information, which was raised a couple of times under some previous guidelines. Some other points listed by Group A are the difficulty they experienced in the cognitive strategies of skimming and scanning; not revising the vocabulary items learnt; and finally, boring topics and lack of concentration. In Group B, some participants tied down their problems in reading to factors such as not knowing enough grammar; not reading carefully; not knowing how to study vocabulary; not knowing the purpose of reading before reading the text and not reading carefully.

When both groups were asked to reflect on what they could do to solve the problems listed above, once more similar types of solutions to the identified problems were offered. For instance, both Group A and Group B mentioned

using a dictionary, reading more, learning how to guess the meaning of vocabulary from context; and learning more vocabulary. The other solutions offered by Group A were consulting the teacher; studying more; doing more reading exercises; and being careful. Other suggestions made by Group B as different from Group A were studying more; reading more carefully; using different methods to learn vocabulary; motivation and studying grammar.

4.1.2.2.2 Frequency of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Having analyzed the types of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies, the researcher then observed the frequencies with which certain strategies were used by both of the groups. In Group A, the most frequent strategy was the metacognitive strategy of brainstorming when the answers given to the question "What kinds of strategies did you use before reading the text?" were analyzed. All through the strategy instruction, in Group A brainstorming was mentioned eleven times. The other most frequent strategies offered as answers to this question were the cognitive strategies of scanning and skimming, which were used 8 times each. The least frequent strategies were the cognitive strategies of making guesses, looking at the picture, making inferences and the metacognitive strategies of overviewing the text and making an outline. In Group B, on the other hand, the most frequent strategy was the cognitive strategy of scanning, which was employed fourteen times. Following it, was the metacognitive strategy of brainstorming, which was used thirteen times. The least frequent strategies, which were both employed once or twice, were the

cognitive strategies of skimming, making guesses, predicting content by given clues and the metacognitive strategy of overviewing the text.

As for the frequency of the strategies mentioned under the "What kinds of strategies did you use while reading the text?" was considered, the most frequent strategy in Group A was the cognitive strategy of identifying main ideas, which was used six times and the least frequent strategies were strategies like concentration, connecting the subject with the ideas generated during the brainstorming, rereading a section if meaning isn't clear,

note-taking, reading intensively, and skimming, which were not used more than twice. The data collected for the same guideline generated the following results in Group B: the most frequent strategy was the cognitive strategy of guessing meaning from context, which was used twenty-three times; and the least were the cognitive strategies of focusing on the highlighted sections in the text, identifying main ideas, and skimming, and the metacognitive reading strategy of brainstorming, which were all used once.

Regarding the answers given to the strategies used after reading a text, Group A cited the cognitive strategy of referencing as the most frequent strategy as it was used five times. The least frequent strategies, on the other hand, were the cognitive strategies of scanning, summarizing, and focusing on the main points; and the metacognitive strategies of making an outline, as well as criticizing what is read, which were all evidenced once. In Group B the most frequent strategy cited for the same guideline was the cognitive strategy of

guessing meaning from context, which was allegedly employed nine times. As for the least frequent strategies the cognitive strategies of scanning; and rereading a section if meaning is not clear were cited by the members of the relevant group.

When the participants in Group A were asked about which activity they found most useful, the strategy of brainstorming activity, which fosters metacognition, was found to be the most frequent strategy, having been mentioned nine times. When the least frequent strategies were looked at, the cognitive strategies like paraphrasing, summarizing, finding keywords, scanning, working on complex sentences and the metacognitive strategy of making an outline were utilized no more than twice. With the other group, Group B, the most frequent strategy proved to be the cognitive strategy of guessing meaning from context, which was used twelve times; and the least frequent strategies were identifying purpose of the task, guessing activity, and brainstorming which were used no more than two times.

When the participants were asked to ponder about the problems they encountered while reading the text, Group A mentioned not knowing the meanings of some words fourteen times. The least frequent problem was reading intensively which was mentioned only once. In Group B, the picture was not different. The most frequent problem was not knowing the meaning of some words like in Group A, but it was mentioned almost twice as many times as in Group A. The least frequent problem among Group B were specific and

advanced structures, concentration, not reading carefully, referencing and not having any background information about the topic.

As for the next guideline in the diaries, students had to think about the reasons why they had the problems they put down under the previous guideline. In Group A, the most frequent answers were don't know and not revising vocabulary much, which were both repeated four times. The other most frequent reason was not knowing the meaning of some words, which was mentioned twice. The least frequent reasons were the boring topic, not getting enough sleep; not being used to reading much; skimming and scanning difficulties and the need for good background knowledge. In Group B the most frequent reason was not knowing the meaning of some words, which was mentioned eleven times. The least frequent ideas put forward as the reasons for the problems they encountered, were not knowing enough grammar, not knowing the purpose of reading before reading the text, lack of motivation, not speaking enough in English; not knowing how to study vocabulary, not reading carefully, which were all repeated no more than twice.

So as to reinforce the use of metacognitive strategies, the participants were asked to reflect on how they could solve the problems they experienced while reading a text. In Group A, the most frequent solution offered was reading more, which was evidenced ten times. Following it was studying more, which was repeated six times. The least frequent solutions offered were sleeping enough, asking for help from the teacher, learning how to guess the meaning of vocabulary, relaxing, being willing, studying upper intermediate vocabulary,

learning core vocabulary, and being more careful. With the other group, Group B, the most frequent solutions were reading more and studying vocabulary, which were both mentioned seven times. The least frequent solutions suggested were using different methods to learn vocabulary, studying more grammar, motivation, identifying the purpose of reading and speaking in English more, which were all evidenced once.

Finally, regarding the remarks made by the participants in both groups under the "Any other comments" section, participants in Group A voiced what they thought was important for being a successful reader. Some of the remarks were "it's better to take down notes", "guessing is very important", "finding the main idea is very necessary", and "making an outline is useful", etc. In Group B, the participants emphasized the importance of vocabulary and some mentioned some worries about the COPE exam.

Since the study at hand aimed at unearthing the possible effects of a cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction on the frequency with which receivers of the strategy instruction used these relevant strategies, another analysis was conducted just for Group A.

As was formerly noted, the results of the diaries were collated under the headings employed in the diaries. As can be remembered the researcher had made use of some guidelines (App. F) to aid the participants in their reflections. When the answers of the participants were collated, it was observed that in the first diary entry students in Group A mentioned using 4 cognitive strategies in total, which were identifying main ideas, skimming and scanning, and trying to

guess meaning of vocabulary from context; however, in the final diary it was seen that they mentioned 7 cognitive strategies, that is, in addition to the four cognitive strategies mentioned above, the participants mentioned the cognitive strategies of rereading a section if meaning isn't clear, reading title, and paying attention to text structure.

A similar trend was observed for the metacognitive strategies. In the first diary entry only 3 metacognitive strategies were mentioned by the students, which were trying to activate content schemata or brainstorming, reading outside the classroom, and acknowledging the importance of concentration while in the last diary 5 metacognitive strategies were mentioned. These were overviewing the text before reading to activate schemata, identifying the purpose of the task together with the three metacognitive strategies which were mentioned above.

4.1.2.3 Results from the SILL

So as to shed light on the second research question three statistical analyses were performed by using the data obtained from the SILL. The first of these statistical analyses were three t-tests, the second was finding the averages each participant in Group A scored for cognitive and metacognitive strategies before and after the strategy instruction, and finally, the SILL was analyzed in terms of the responses given to the statements on the 5-point Likert-type scale to see the most frequent response- 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5- given to the statements before and after the strategy instruction.

As was explicated in the former chapter, the SILL was only administered to the group who received the strategy instruction-Group A. Group A answered the SILL twice; once before the strategy instruction and once after it, to see if there were any statistically significant gains in Group A as regards the type and frequency of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. The results were then collated by means of a SILL collation chart (App. H). The totals for each participant for cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies in SILL 1, and the totals for each participant for cognitive and metacognitive strategies in SILL 2 were utilized for the statistical analyses (App. H). As was previously mentioned some statements form Part B and Part D had to be excluded on the grounds that they were beyond the scope of the study, and these very statements that were excluded have been shaded in the collation chart (see App. H).

In order to find out whether the strategy instruction led to any significant differences as regards the frequency with which the cognitive and metacognitive strategies were used, three t-tests were run with Group A at $p = 0.05$ level using the data in the SILL collation chart. The first of the t-tests was run to see whether there were any significant differences between the cognitive strategy use in Group A before and after the strategy instruction. The second t-test was run to see whether there were any significant differences between the metacognitive strategy use in Group A before and after the strategy instruction. Finally, the third t-test was run to see whether there were any significant differences between the cognitive and metacognitive strategy use together in

Group A before and after the strategy instruction. The t-tests employed were paired and two-tailed.

As was the case with the scores of students on the Reading Paper of COPE, the scores of students on the SILL in Group A was converted to z scores and then to T scores before statistical analyses were run. Table 11 below shows the z and T scores of Group A on Part B, from both the first and the second administration of the SILL. As was previously mentioned, Part B of the SILL gives information about the cognitive strategy use, and students answered it twice-once before and once after the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level.

Table 11: The z Scores and T Scores of Group A on Part B of the SILL

Cognitive 1			Cognitive 2		
Raw Scores	**Z scores**	**T scores**	**Raw Scores**	**Z Scores**	**T Scores**
3.2	0.24	52	3.1	-0.04	50
3.5	0.84	58	3.2	0.17	52
4	1.84	68	3.5	0.83	58
2.6	-0.96	40	2.5	-1.35	37
2.7	-0.76	42	3.1	-0.04	50
3.1	0.04	50	3	-0.26	47
2.3	-1.56	34	2.8	-0.69	43
2.8	-0.56	44	3	-0.26	47
3.5	0.84	58	4.3	2.56	76
3.5	0.84	58	3.1	-0.04	50
2.7	-0.76	42	2.8	-0.69	43

N=11

After converting the raw scores to standard scores, some descriptive statistics were run. The descriptive statistics for cognitive strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 indicated that the mean of cognitive strategies employed before the strategy instruction (*M=50,1818; SD=9,7757*) and the mean of cognitive strategies employed after the strategy instruction (*M=50,2727; SD=10,1399*) was

almost the same (see Table 12 below). This showed that the average of Group A in terms of the cognitive reading strategies before and after the strategy instruction did not reveal a significant difference before and after the strategy instruction at awareness-raising level.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

	Mean	SD	SEM
Cognitive 1	50,1818	9,7757	2,9475
Cognitive 2	50,2727	10,1399	3,0573

N=11

As for the inferential statistics, as was mentioned previously, a t-test was run using the scores of the students in Part B, which gave information about the cognitive strategy use. Thus, the results of the first t-test, which was run for cognitive strategies before and after the strategy instruction, revealed that the result was not statistically significant (see Table 13 below).

Table 13: T-test for Cognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**	**Lower**	**Upper**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Cog1 and Cog2	-9,E-02	8, 79	2, 65	-5, 99	5, 81	, 034	10	, 973

N=11

After analyzing the scores of the students in Group A as regards the use of cognitive strategies as put forward by their grades in the SILL before the

strategy instruction and after the strategy instruction, the use of the metacognitive strategies were analysed.

Similar to the practice in analyzing the use of cognitive strategies before and after the strategy instruction, the raw scores of students in Group A on Part D, which gave information about the use of metacognitive strategies, were converted to z scores and ultimately to T scores (Table 14).

Table 14: The z Scores and T Scores of Group A on Part D of the SILL

Metacognitive 1			Metacognitive 2		
Raw Scores	**Z scores**	**T scores**	**Raw Scores**	**Z Scores**	**T Scores**
3	0.48	55	2.8	0.13	51
2.5	-0.35	47	2.2	-0.73	43
2.7	-0.02	50	3.5	1.13	61
2.5	-0.35	47	1.8	-1.30	37
1.2	-2.52	25	1.8	-1.30	37
2.5	-0.35	47	2.2	-0.73	43
3	0.48	55	3	0.41	54
2.7	-0.02	50	2.7	-0.01	50
3.7	1.65	67	4.1	1.99	70
3.1	0.65	57	3	0.41	54
3	0.48	55	2.8	0.13	51

N=11

Having converted the raw scores to standard scores, the descriptive statistical analysis was performed. This analysis revealed that the average of the metacognitive strategies used before the reading strategy instruction (*M=50,4545; SD=10,3089)* and after the strategy instruction (*M=50,0909; SD=9,9544*50, 4545*)* were almost the same, similar to the results obtained from the analysis of cognitive strategies (see Table 15).

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**
Metacognitive 1	50, 4545	10, 3089	3, 1082
Metacognitive 2	50, 0909	9, 9544	3, 0014

N=11

This indicated that, as was the case with the cognitive strategies, the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level resulted in almost no gains on the part of the participants in Group A. The other statistical analysis was the t-test. The results gained from the t-test were supportive of the descriptive statistical analysis in that no statistically significant difference was apparent as is shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16: T-test for Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**	**Lower**	**Upper**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Meta1 and Meta2	, 36	6, 68	2, 01	-4, 12	4, 85	, 180	10	, 860

N=11

Thus, the results of the t-test (see Table 16), which was computed so as to discover any positive effects as a result of the strategy instruction at awareness-raising level on metacognitive strategies, revealed that the results of training did not create a statistically significant result, indicated by the significance value of 0.860.

Finally, the last set of scores to be converted to the z scores and then to T scores was the scores from the cognitive and metacognitive sections together (see Table 17 below). That's to say, the scores students received from the cognitive and metacognitive strategies – from Part B and Part D, in other words- in SILL 1 and SILL 2 were calculated together.

Table 17: The z Scores and T Scores of Group A on Part B and D of the SILL

Cognitive and Metacognitive 1			Cognitive and Metacognitive 2		
Raw Scores	**Z scores**	**T scores**	**Raw Scores**	**Z Scores**	**T Scores**
6.3	0.55	56	5.9	0	50
6.1	0.33	53	5.5	-0.36	46
6.7	1.00	60	7	1.00	60
5.1	-0.78	42	4.3	-1.45	36
3.9	-2.11	29	4.9	-0.91	41
5.6	-0.22	48	5.2	-0.64	44
5.3	-0.55	45	5.8	-0.09	49
5.5	-0.33	53	5.7	-0.18	48
7.2	1.55	66	8.4	2.27	73
6.6	0.89	59	6.1	0.18	52
5.7	-0.11	49	5.6	-0.27	47

N=11

Similar to the case with cognitive and metacognitive strategies, when the averages of cognitive and metacognitive strategies were calculated *together* to see any differences before and after the strategy instruction at awareness-raising level, it was witnessed that the average was slightly better after the strategy instruction, yet it failed to bear any significance. That is to say before the strategy instruction the average was 50, 9091 (*M=50, 9091; SD=10, 0842)* and 49, 6364 (*M=49, 6364; SD=9, 8719)* after (see Table 18).

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics for Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**
CogMeta 1	50, 9091	10, 0842	3, 0405
CogMeta 2	49, 6364	9, 8719	2, 9765

N=11

Finally, for the third t-test that was administered for the cognitive and metacognitive strategies *together* before and after the strategy instruction, and the results were not statistically significant (see Table 19). Thus, similar to the case with cognitive

and metacognitive reading strategies, the overall cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy use in Group A, who had received the strategy instruction, was not any better after the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness-raising level.

Table 19: T-test for Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies in SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	**SD**	**SEM**	**Lower**	**Upper**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
CogMeta1 and CogMeta2	1, 27	6, 37	1, 92	-3, 00	5, 55	, 662	10	, 523

N=11

The other statistical analysis performed was calculating the average number of strategies used by each participant on cognitive and metacognitive strategies on SILL 1 and SILL 2 in Group A (App. H). This enabled the researcher to evaluate each participant separately.

As was noted, the SILL gave information about how often a particular strategy was used. In line with how the SILL was designed, the averages each student scored for cognitive and metacognitive strategies before and after the strategy instruction for Group A were calculated (App. H). After calculating the averages for each student on the cognitive and metacognitive strategy use, the results were evaluated using the key provided by Oxford to interpret the SILL results. Thus, while reporting the data, out of the possible 5.00, the mean rating 3.50 and above were considered as “high frequency of use”, 2.50 to 3.50

“average frequency of use” and any mean rating below 2.50 was considered as “low frequency of use” of the strategy.

Taking the above ratings into consideration, it was observed that a majority of the students in Group A -5 out of 11- showed no difference in terms of the frequency with which they employed cognitive and metacognitive strategies. For instance, if they displayed medium frequency of use in their cognitive and metacognitive strategy use before the strategy instruction, they displayed the same frequency of use after the instruction (see Table 20). It was observed that with a total of 4 students there was a reduction, either in the frequency with which they employed cognitive or in the frequency with which they employed metacognitive strategies. To exemplify, 3 students were observed to have regressed from a medium frequency of use to low frequency of use in terms of the deployment of metacognitive strategies, and 1 student from high frequency of use to low frequency of use as regards cognitive strategy use.

Only two participants were seen to have improved as a result of the strategy instruction at awareness-raising level by increasing the frequency with which they used either cognitive or metacognitive strategies. That’s to say, one of the students increased his metacognitive strategy use to high frequency of use from a medium frequency of use, and another one from low to medium frequency of use as regards cognitive strategy use.

Table 20: The Frequency of Use of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies from SILL 1 and SILL 2 for Group A

	SILL 1		SILL 2	
STUDENT	COG 1	COG 2	META 1	META 2
1	*M	M	M	M
2	*H	M	M	L
3	H	H	M	H
4	M	M	M	L
5	M	M	L	L
6	M	M	M	L
7	*L	M	M	M
8	M	M	M	M
9	H	H	H	H
10	H	M	M	M
11	M	M	M	M

N=11

H= High Frequency of Use, M= Medium Frequency of Use, L= Low Frequency of Use

Finally, the third statistical analysis was conducted using the information gained from the SILL (see Tables 21 and 22 for Part B) Thus, regarding SILL 1, when the answers given by 11 subjects for the cognitive strategies in Group a were looked at, it was seen that the most frequent answer was 3, which indicated that the subjects made use of the relevant cognitive strategies about half the time. The least frequent answer was 1, which meant that the subjects very rarely used some of the cognitive strategies. As for the metacognitive strategy use, again a majority of the subjects opted for 3; and the least frequent score was 5, which meant the relevant strategies were almost always used. When the answers in SILL 2 were looked at, the figures revealed that the most frequent answer for the cognitive strategies was 3. The least frequent answer, on the other hand, was 1, like in SILL 1. Similarly, in the metacognitive strategy use, the most frequent option was 3, and the least frequent option was 5, reflecting a similar tendency like in SILL 1 (see Tables 23 and 24 for Part D).

Table 21: The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 1 for Cognitive Strategies in Group A

	SILL 1									
	1		**2**		**3**		**4**		**5**	
Part B	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**
10. I say or write new English words several times.	0	0	3	27.3	6	54.5	1	9.1	1	9.1
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	2	18.2	0	0	5	45.5	2	18.2	2	18.2
12. I practice the sounds of English.	0	0	3	27.3	4	36.4	3	27.3	1	9.1
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	0	0	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2	0	0
14. I start conversations in English.	1	9.1	6	54.5	1	9.1	1	9.1	2	18.2
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies…	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.2	5	27.3	2	18.2
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3	27.3	3	27.3	4	36.4	1	9.1	0	0
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	2	18.2	3	27.3	5	45.5	1	9.1	0	0
18. I first skim an English then go back and read carefully.	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.2	4	36.4
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	0	0	2	18.2	3	27.3	4	36.4	2	18.2
20. I try to find patterns in English.	1	9.1	3	27.3	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	9.1
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.2	4	36.4	1	9.1
22. I try not to translate …	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	6	54.5	2	18.2
23. I make summaries of information …	1	9.1	6	54.5	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	9.1

Table 22: The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 2 for Cognitive Strategies in Group A

	SILL 2									
	1		2		3		4		5	
Part B	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**
10. I say or write new English words several times.	0	0	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	9.1	2	18.2
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	0	0	1	9.1	6	54.5	1	9.1	4	36.4
12. I practice the sounds of English.	0	0	3	27.3	4	36.4	5	45.5	0	0
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	0	0	0	0	8	72.7	3	27.3	1	9.1
14. I start conversations in English.	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	54.5	2	18.2	0	0
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies…	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	6	54.5	1	9.1
16. I read for pleasure in English.	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	0	0
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	2	18.2	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	2	18.2
18. I first skim an English then go back and read carefully.	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	0	0	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	1	9.1
20. I try to find patterns in English.	0	0	4	36.4	5	45.5	3	27.3	0	0
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	0	0	3	27.3	6	54.5	1	9.1	2	18.2
22. I try not to translate …	1	9.1	0	0	4	36.4	6	54.5	1	9.1
23. I make summaries of information …	0	0	0	0	6	54.5	4	36.4	2	18.2

Table 23: The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 1 for Metacognitive Strategies in Group A

	SILL 1									
	1		**2**		**3**		**4**		**5**	
Part D	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	1	9.1	6	54.5	2	18.2	2	18.2	0	
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	0	0	3	27.3	4	36.4	3	27.3	1	
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	0	0	1	9.1	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	0	0	1	9.1	6	54.5	3	27.3	1	
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3	27.3	5	45.5	1	9.1	2	18.2	0	
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	5	45.5	2	18.2	4	36.4	0	0	0	
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	27.3	3	27.3	5	45.5	0	0	0	
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	18.2	5	45.5	2	18.2	2	18.2	0	
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	9.1	0	0	3	27.3	6	54.5	1	

Table 24: The Frequency and Percentage of the Answers in SILL 2 for Metacognitive Strategies in Group A

	SILL 2									
	1		**2**		**3**		**4**		**5**	
Part D	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**	**FR**	**%**
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	0	0	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	9.1	2	18.2
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	0	0	1	9.1	6	54.5	1	9.1	4	36.4
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	0	0	3	27.3	4	36.4	5	45.5	0	0
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	0	0	0	0	8	72.7	3	27.3	1	9.1
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	54.5	2	18.2	0	0
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	6	54.5	1	9.1
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	0	0
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	18.2	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	2	18.2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.0 Presentation

This chapter starts with the summary of the study. Then, the discussion of the results reached by the study is followed by some pedagogical implications. Before the evaluation of the study, steps for an effective strategy instruction program are offered by the help of a model. To conclude the chapter, implications and future directions for further research are considered.

5.1 Summary of the Study

So as to observe the possible effects of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness raising level on the reading proficiency of students as well as to see if such an instruction would affect the type and frequency of reading strategy use, the present study was conducted. One of the groups involved in the study received an intensive 2-week cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness raising level. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected for the study.

5.2 Discussion

The wealth of research learning strategies have seen for more than thirty years points to the significance of strategies and their instruction. Thus, as more

and more research is conducted in the light of the earlier studies the field will benefit from it further.

Thus, the present study was carried out having acknowledged the importance of the phenomenon and having read about the positive effects of strategy training in various contexts, which have been dealt with extensively in the former chapters. To cite but a few here, Brown and Palincsar (1982), Chamot and O'Malley's (1985), Carrell (1998), Wenden and Rubin (1987) and Akyel and Salataci (2002).

When the data were analyzed, however, the findings of the present study indicated that the cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy instruction at awareness raising level did not result in significant gains on the part of the learners who had received the strategy instruction. For instance, the mean ratings in COPE were not much different; in Group A the average was 29,2 and in Group B it was 28,7. Thus, the participants in Group B were almost as successful as the ones in Group A. Yet, in line with other research studies, it was observed that the participants who had received the strategy instruction at awareness raising level used more cognitive strategies than the ones who hadn't. Thus, when the qualitative data were looked into, some differences were observed between the groups in terms of the type and frequency of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use. The data, that came from the learning diaries for instance, supported the above fact as it was observed that Group A mentioned using more cognitive strategies than the other party. Thus, although the difference between the two groups in terms of reading

proficiency was not statistically significant, the participants in Group A were utilizing more strategies.

Another finding which was significant was the fact that neither of the groups applied rules in L1 to L2, as was indicated by the TAP analysis. According to relevant research (Carrell, Pharis & Liberto, 1989; Cotterall, (1990), Palincsar & Brown, (1984), proficient readers in L1 transfer their strategies to L2 to aid them in the reading process. However, none of the participants involved in the TAPs were seen to be utilizing this cognitive strategy. This may surely be due to the fact that this cognitive strategy had become automatic and the participants were using it without attending to it.

Although the present study did not give rise to statistically significant results, it would be unwise to cast aside strategy instruction owing to the fact that the research literature is full of studies that have proved otherwise. What should be pondered on, then, is the reasons for these insignificant results. One of the factors to think about is the strategy instruction which was offered at an awareness raising level. The significance of awareness raising has been accepted by almost all of the researchers in the relevant field, and they have emphasized its benefits by means of integrating it into their strategy training models. For instance, Chamot and O'Malley (1990) in their program named CALLA incorporated the element of consciousness raising by means of small group retrospective interviews, thinking aloud, or by carrying out interviews. However, their program was not limited merely to awareness raising training. That is to say, after raising the awareness of the learners on the strategies under

focus, they modeled the strategies and made the learners engage in cooperative learning tasks like peer tutoring or group discussions. What's more, Chamot and O'Malley also integrated regular evaluation and expansion, so that students would be able to transfer what they have learnt to other learning contexts.

The implication of the above remarks is that the strategy instruction offered at awareness raising level for only a period of two weeks for four blocks-each block lasting 50 minutes- was not sufficient for students to improve and foster the use of the relevant cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. Thus, this may be one of the reasons for the insignificant differences between the two groups involved in the study.

One other reason for the findings of this study may be the limitations as regards the intensive nature of the instruction program. That is to say, although the instruction program was originally designed to span a period of four weeks, due to some constraints beyond the control of the researcher, it
was offered in two weeks. This had serious implications, and posed a threat, particularly to the metacognitive aspect of the reading strategy instruction. That is to say, the participants were asked to keep learning diaries and record their reflections regarding the strategy instruction session, right after each session, or as soon as possible. Yet, the intensive nature of the strategy instruction caused some of the participants to be reluctant in reflecting in their diaries on their strategy use. Unfortunately, most of the participants in Group A kept diaries for the sake of keeping them.

One other reason, in relation to the intensive nature of the instruction program, might be the fact that the strategies focused on in the course of the strategy instruction program were not practiced enough and that there was no room for transfer to take place. In other words, participants did not have enough time to practice the strategies focused on during the instruction sessions.

Another reason for the insignificant difference between the groups involved in the study may be the timing of the strategy instruction. In other words, the strategy instruction took place three weeks before the COPE exam and all the participants were worried about this upcoming exam. Thus, the participants being exam-oriented- due to the Turkish educational system- insisted on doing only exam practice and as a result, some of them did not concentrate on the strategy instruction.

Besides the former points, the insignificant result may also be related to the level of the students. What I mean is, the group with which the instruction was carried out was at an advanced level and they had never been taught strategies explicitly at all. Thus, they found it difficult to adapt to the fact that although they were advanced level students, who were not weak in reading, they had to receive the reading strategy instruction. What I mean is, if these students were offered strategy instruction when they first started learning English, at lower levels, they would be more willing to receive it. What's more, in relation to the former point, the participants' perception might have affected the results considerably. In research literature, it is widely accepted that

unless the participants are motivated enough and believe in the benefits of strategy instruction, it is almost impossible for any treatment to have the desired effect. To exemplify, Wenden (as cited in Wenden & Rubin, 1987) found out by means of a questionnaire that most learners in one of her studies thought the strategy instruction wasn't useful. Wenden, thus concluded that motivation and attitude were vital in producing favorable results.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

It would be apt to reiterate the fact that although the results of the strategy instruction was not statistically significant, it would be unwise to cast aside strategy training unless it was proved to be harmful. Let alone being cast aside, the strategy instruction should be incorporated as much as possible because all the research discussed in the earlier chapters point to the benefits of it.

What's more, although the present study cannot be generalized to other EFL contexts, the design and the findings, to a certain extent, can provide researchers, and anyone interested, with ideas to ponder about.

5.4 A Model for Strategy Instruction

The following model was suggested by Oxford (1990) and it may be useful for anyone who may be planning to incorporate strategy instruction in their classrooms. The model consists of eight steps, each of which will be explained in detail in the following paragraphs. Before the explication of the steps, however, it may be worthwhile to note that the model assumes that a kind of needs analysis has already taken place to identify the types of strategies

deployed by the learners. This needs analysis can be undertaken by means of questionnaires, thinking aloud procedures, group discussions or interviews.

Having completed the needs analysis stage, the steps listed in Table ? are followed. The first step in the model suggested by Oxford (1990) is to carefully analyse the findings from the needs analysis conducted earlier. Thus, in this step the teacher should try to identify which strategies students lack in line with the results of the needs analysis. Besides, the teacher should also consider how much time is available for the strategy instruction and when it can be carried out. Another significant consideration at this point is whether the instruction could be carried out in relation to the language tasks "already under way", in Oxford's terms (1990, p.204), which would enable the students to make immediate use of the strategies they have learnt. After theses initial considerations, the second step is to select the strategies which your strategy instruction program will focus on. During the selection process, strategies which are related to the needs of the learners should be prioritized. What's more, try to choose more than one kind of strategy and consider whether the strategies you have chosen are transferable to other language situations and tasks. What the third step entails is the consideration of the integration of strategy training, as it is most helpful to aim at integrating the strategies with the tasks, objectives and materials which are used in the classroom. The next step is to consider motivational issues. No one can deny the significance of motivation in the language learning context, thus, it is worthwhile to consider it for the sake of strategy instruction as well. For instance, the teacher can give

grades or partial course credit for successfully using the strategies. Or, the importance of strategies could be made explicit to the learners, which may act as the motivational force. Having considered the motivational factors, the following step is to prepare materials and activities. The materials and activities to be deployed in the strategy training program could be the same materials you are using for language instruction. That's to say you can exploit the materials you use in class by adding a strategy training focus to them. Another equally important step is the necessity of conducting completely informed, "direct" in other words, training. It is absolutely crucial for students to know that they are being trained on the use of strategies, because as Oxford (1990) stated:

> Research shows that strategy training which fully informs the learner by indicating why the strategy is useful, how it can be transferred to different tasks, and how learners can evaluate the success of the strategy is more successful than training that does not (p.207).

The other important step which precedes the revision of the strategy training is the evaluation of the strategy training. What is significant in this step is for the students to be well aware of their strategy use and to be able evaluate their performance. Students can evaluate their performance by means of task improvement, general improvement they observe in their use of skills, maintaining the new strategy over time and the ability to transfer the strategy to other contexts and tasks. This component of the model is particularly important since it aims at fostering the metacognitive aspect of learning, which has been proved to lead to autonomy-a much-desired outcome. Finally, the revision of

the strategy instruction program constitutes the final step, which will be guided, to some extent, by the insights gained from the preceding step. This will enable the teacher to make revisions and alterations to the strategy training program to better meet the needs of the students.

Table 25: Steps in the Strategy Training Model (Oxford, 1990)

1. Determine the learners' needs and the time available.
2. Select strategies well.
3. Consider integration of strategy training.
4. Consider motivational issues.
5. Prepare materials and activities.
6. Conduct completely informed (direct) training.
7. Evaluate the strategy instruction.
8. Revise the strategy instruction.

5.5 Evaluation of the Study

If I were to conduct the study again, I would carry out the strategy instruction for a longer period of time, and provide the participants with the necessary opportunities to practice and strengthen the strategies they learned before teaching them the new ones. This would provide the participants with more time to transfer what they have learned to the new tasks and demands.

What the above ideas also reiterate is the fact that strategy instruction should not be left at awareness raising level. This can be achieved by applying the steps implemented in their research studies by researchers like Chamot and

O'Malley (1990), Hosenfeld et al (1981) and Jones et al (1985), whose models accommodate much more than awareness raising like modeling, extensive practice, regular scaffolding and continuous evaluation.

What's more, I'd incorporate the strategy instruction in my research study to all the other skills. For instance, listening strategies, speaking strategies, writing and vocabulary learning strategies could be focused on equally and at the same time. Since all the skills constitute a whole, it might be reasonable to treat them with the same amount of emphasis for maximum gains.

Furthermore, for diagnostic purposes, I would conduct the TAPs with *all* the relevant participants, not just with a representative sample to see the needs and wants of all the participants that were too receive the instruction to cater for their needs more effectively. This would provide the researcher with a fuller and richer insight as to the weaknesses and strengths of the participants.

To safeguard against the problem of validity and reliability, making use of more participants would be the right solution. Thus, if the study was to be replicated, it would be much better to involve more participants.

In addition, the learning diaries which were intended to foster metacognition could be used in a more interactive way. What is meant is, after the student reflected about his strengths as well as weaknesses, the teacher could reply and write responses to the diary entries. This might encourage the keeping of the learning diaries and students may take it much more seriously and wouldn't regard it as a burden, and wouldn't do it for the sake of doing it.

Finally, just like in Carrell's study (1985), to encourage the use of strategies taught during the strategy instruction session, after each session, participants could be asked to apply what they had learnt to all the reading tasks they did until the next session. This, as Carrell noted would "get the students to use the strategy outside of their ESL reading classroom, in other non-teacher-supported situations"(as cited by Carrell, 1998).

5.5.1 Implications for Further Research

The field can benefit from research which would shed light on strategy use and other variables like affective factors, learner characteristics, socio-economic status, motivation, and learning styles. Thus, it would be quite beneficial if the future studies focused on the relationship between the above listed variables and strategy instruction.

Another very important issue as regards strategy instruction is the training of the teachers. As Chamot and O'Malley (1987) mentioned, it is not only students who should be made aware of the benefits of strategy use but also teachers should be illuminated as regards the importance of strategies so that they could accommodate them and treat them effectively in class. Hence, for strategy training to become an integral part of second and foreign language settings, teachers should not only see the benefit of such instruction but also to develop skills for its implementation (Chamot and O'Malley 1990, 182). To further reiterate the point, Chamot and O'Malley's 1988 study which was conducted as a part of the study of learning strategies in FL classrooms, sought to answer whether classroom teachers would and could provide learning

strategy instruction as part of their regular classes. The findings indicated that not all teachers have the necessary motivation and skills to add learning strategy instruction to their classes. Besides, it was also observed that considerable training may be necessary to both to convince teachers of the benefits of the learning strategy training and to develop their instructional techniques to help students become more autonomous learners.

Another area which begs further research is when strategy instruction should be started. That is to say, should the strategy instruction start early, in the elementary level, or in the intermediate, or should it be postponed to the advanced levels must be worked on in the future. Or better still, should it be incorporated to the curriculum of all levels? Thus, in order to find the best possible alternative, some more research is needed.

As another area which might benefit strategy research, metacognition can be cited. The significance of metacognition should be stressed further. As was explained by Chamot and O'Malley (1987) "students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to review their progress, accomplishments and future directions" (as cited in Chamot and O'Malley, 1990).

Finally, further research needs to be conducted to see the development, implementation and evaluation of a curriculum that incorporated strategy instruction so that anyone who wants to make strategy instruction an integral part of their curriculum can make informed decisions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aebersold, J. A. & Field, M. L. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Akyel, A. & Salatacı, R. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*. Retrieved October 30, 2002, from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2002/salataci/salataci.html

Allen, E. D. & Valette, R. M. (1977). *Classroom techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a second language.* NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 460-472.

Auerbach, E. R. & Paxton, D. (1997). "It's not the English thing: bringing reading research into the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 237-261.

Bailey, K.M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: looking at and through the diary studies. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*.

Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. Baker, L. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. (ed.), *Handbook of reading research, 1*, 353-394.

Barnett, M. A. (1988). Reading through context: how real and perceived strategies use affects L2 comprehension. *Modern Language Journal*, *72*, 150-162.

Bialystok, E. (1979). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency.. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 35,* 372-394.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal, 65*, 24-35.

Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 463-494.

Brown, A. L. , Armbruster, B. B. , & Baker, L. (1986). The role of metacognition in reading and studying. In J. Orasanu (ed.), *Reading Comprehension: From research to practice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brown, A. L. , Bransford, J. D. , Ferrara, R. A., & Campione, J. C. (1983) . Learning, remembering, and understanding. In J. H. Flavell & M. Markham (eds.) *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology. (Vol.3)* New York: Wiley.

Brown, A. L. & Palincsar, A. S. (1982). Inducing strategies learning from texts by means of informed, self-controlled training. *Topics in Learning and Learning Disabilities, 2*, 1-17.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. 3rd. ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Campione, J. C. & Armbruster, B. B. (1985). Acquiring information from texts:an analysis of four approaches. In S.F. Chipman, J.W. Segal, and R. Glaser (eds.), *Thinking and learning skills, 1*, 297-317.

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 727-752.

Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 120-134.

Carrell, P. L. (1990). Introduction: Interactive approaches to second language reading. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey, (eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Carrell, P. L. (1998). Can reading strategies be successfully taught? *The Language Teacher Online, 22*, 1-17. Retrieved November 11, 2002, from http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/98/mar/carrell.html

Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B. G. & Liberto, J. C. (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 647-678.

Chamot, A. U. & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: a bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 227-249.

Chamot, A. U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 22*, 13-24.

Chamot, A. U. & O'Malley, J. M. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Cohen, A. & Aphek, E. (1980). Retention of second language vocabulary over time: investigating the role of mnemonic associations. *System, 8*, 221-235.

Cohen, A. & Aphek, E. (1981). Easifying secong language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3*, 221-236.

Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language Learning: insights for learners, teachers and researchers*. NY: Newbury House.

Cotterall, S. (1990). Developing reading strategies through small group interaction. *RELC Journal, 21*, 55-59.

Dansereau, D. F. et al (1984). *Development and evaluation of computer-based learning strategy training models: final report.* Contract MDA 903-82-E-0169. U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences, Alexandria.

Dansereau, D. F. (1985). Learning strategy research. In J. Segal, S. Chipman, and R. Glaser (eds.), *Thinking and Learning Skills: relating Learning to Basic Research, Vol.1.* Hillsdale, N. J. Erlbaum.

Derry, S. J. & Murphy, D. A. (1986). Designing systems that train learning ability: from theory to practice. *Review of Educational Research, 56*, 1-39.

Devine, J. (1984). ESL reader's internalized models of the reading process. In J. Handscombe, R. Orem, & B. P. Taylor (eds.) *TESOL,* 95-108.

Dutcher, P. (1990). Authentic reading assessment [Electronic version]. *ERIC Digest, 73*, 1-4. Retrieved March 22, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed328607.html

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1980). Verbal reports on data. *Psychological Review, 87*, 215-51.

Eskey, D. E. (1986). Theoretical foundations. In F. Dubin, D. E. Eskey, and W. Grabe (eds.), *Teaching second language reading for academic purposes.* Reading, MA: Addison – Wesley.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1987). From product to process-introspective methods in second language research. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.) *Introspection in second language research.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Multilingual Matters.

Flaitz, J. J. & Feyten, C. M. (1996). Two-phase study involving consciousness raising and strategy use for foreign language learners. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learner strategies around the world: Cross cultural perspectives.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Flaitz, J. J., Feyten, C. M. & LaRocca, M. A. (1999). Consciousness-raising and strategy use. *Applied Language Learning, 10*, 1-2.

Garner, R. (1980). Monitoring of understanding: An investigation of good and poor reader's awareness of induced miscomprehension of text. *Journal of Reading Behaviour, 12*, 55-63.

Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension.* Norwood: Ablex Publishing.

Gilette, B. (1987). Two successful language learners: An introspective approach. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds.) *Introspection in second language research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Grellet, F. (1994). *Developing reading skills.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grenfell, M. & Harris, V. (1999). *Modern languages and learning strategies.* London: Heinemann.

Hartman, H. J. (2001). (ed.) *Metacognition in learning and instruction: theory , research and practice.* The Netherlands: Klower Academic Publishers.

Hauptman, P. C. (1979). A comparison of first and second language reading strategies among English-speaking university students. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 4*, 173-201.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful second language learners. *System, 5*, 110-123.

Hosenfeld, C. (1979). Cindy: A learner in today's foreign language classrooms. In W. Born (ed.) *The Foreign Language Learner in Today's Classroom Environment.* Montpelier, Vermont: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Hosenfeld, C. , Arnold, V. , Kirchofer, J. , Laciura, J. , & Wilson, L. (1981). Second language reading: a curricular sequence for teaching reading strategies. *Foreign Language Annals, 4*, 415-422.

Hosenfeld, C. (1992). Case studies on ninth grade readers. In Alderson, J. C. and A.H. Urquhart (eds.) *Reading in a foreign language.* NY: Longman.

Jones, B. F. (1983). Integrating learning strategies and text research to teach high order thinking skills in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Jones, B. F. , Amiran, M. , & Katims, M. (1985). Teaching cognitive strategies and text structures within language arts programs. In J. W. Segal, S. F. Chipman, and R. Glaser (eds.), *Thinking and Learning Skills, 1*, 259-297).

Jones, B. F., Palincsar, A. S., Ogle, D. S., & Carr, E. G. (1987). *Strategic teaching and learning: cognitive instruction in the content areas.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Knight, S. L. , Padron, Y. N. & Waxman, H. C. (1985). The cognitive reading strategies of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 789-792.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research.* NY: Longman.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Language learning strategies: an overview for L2 teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal, 3*. Retrieved November 7, 2002 from http://itelj.org/Articles/Lessard-Clouston-Strategy.html

Maguire, T. (1997). *Modelling efficient reading strategies.* Retrieved July 25, 2003 from http://www.xtec.es/sgfp/llicencies/199798/memories/TMcguire.pdf

Naiman, N. , Frohlich, M. , Stern, H. H. & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for studies in Education.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2000, October). Autonomy in language learning. Plenary resentation presented at ASOCOPI 2000, Cartegena, Colombia.

Nuttall, C. (1989). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. London: Heinemann.

Omaggio, A. C. (1986). *Teaching Language in Context.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should now.* NY: Newbury House/Harper and Row.

Oxford, R. L. (1992). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: update and ESL suggestions. *TESOL Journal*, 18-22

Oxford, R. L. (1994). Language learning strategies: an update. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved March 22, 2002, from http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/oxford01.html

Oxford, R. L. & Sokolik, M. E. (2000). *Tapestry.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Paris, S. G. , Wasik, B. A. & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (eds.) *Handbook of Reading Research, 2*, 609-640.

Reiss, M. A. (1985). The good language learner: Another look. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *41*, 511-523.

Redfern, S. & Weil, N. (1996). Two activities for raising consciousness of language learners' strategies. *The Internet TESL Journal, 5*. Retrieved December 12, 2002 from http://itelj.org/Lessons/RedfernStrategies.html

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language learner can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*, 41-51.

Rubin, J. (1981). The study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 2*, 117-131.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce and W.F. Brewer (eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sarig, G. (1985). Comprehension of academic texts in the mother tongue and in a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Song, M. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in an ongoing EFL university reading classroom. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8*, 41-54.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*, 304-318.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In H.D. Brown et al. (eds.) , On *TESOL 1977.* Washington, D.C: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (1981). Decoding a primary language: the crucial role of strategic competence. Paper presented at the conference on Interpretive Strategies in Language Learning, University of Lancaster.

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centeredness as language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vann, R. & Abraham, R. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 177-198.

Weinstein, C. E. & Mayer, R. E. (1985). The teaching of learning strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. NY: Macmillan.

Weinstein, C. E. & Underwood, V. L. (1985). Learning strategies: the how of learning. In J.Segal, S.Chipman, and R. Glaser (eds.), *Relating instruction to research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wenden, A. (1982). The process of self-directed learning: a study of adult language learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Colombia University.

Wenden, A. (1986). Helping L2 learners think about learning. *English language teaching journal. 40*, 3-12.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). (eds.). *Learner strategies in language learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wesche, M. B. (1975). *The good adult language learner: a study of learning strategies and personality factors in an intensive course.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Zupnik, Y. (1985). A*A comparison of cognitive processes in foreign language and first language responses.* Seminar Paper, School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

READING TEXT FOR TAP 1

That cool, clean water we take for granted doesn't reach

many millions of people living in other parts of the world.

UNICEF are working to try to remedy that.

Turn on a tap, and out comes clean water. Simple. Well, it is for us, who take clean drinking water for granted. Had you been born somewhere else in the world, you might not even know what clean water looks like. Indeed, four out of every five children in the rural areas of the Third World do not have access to an adequate water supply.

The estimated costs of providing this to everyone in the world by the year 1990 is £5 a year-a vast sum only put into perspective when you realize that the industrialized world spends well over £50 a year on alcoholic drinks alone.

Few of us will know what it is like to live without water in our homes; many will have traveled to countries where it is not advisable to drink tap water and maybe suffered the consequences with a tummy bug-uncomfortable and demoralizing while it is happening, but transitory and easily coped with by medication. Imagine what it would be like to feel that ill all your life. Or watch your baby die of it.

So little is fresh

It seems that while three-quarters of the world's surface is covered with water, getting an adequate supply of it that's fresh, clean and safe to use for drinking, cooking and washing, is one of the most pressing problems that faces humanity. Most of the earth's water is salt water in the ocean's; only three per cent is fresh and only a small part of that is accessible. It may be trapped deep underground, in polar ice caps and anyway is unequally distributed around the globe, hence the occurrence of droughts and floods. Of the remaining fresh water, much is polluted and dangerous to use.

A large part of UNICEF's work is involved in bringing safe water to people and educating them in basic health care, hygiene and nutrition. Diarrhoeal and enteric diseases spread by polluted water and lack of hygiene are the most common causes of death and illness in transmit disease, from cholera and typhoid to leprosy and trachoma-a leading cause of blindness among children. Mosquitoes and flies that breed in water bring yellow fever and sleeping sickness in their wake, so adequate piped water supplies are needed to eliminate the need for people to gather in an infested area.

In rural areas, women and children spend a major part of their time going out to collect water, often walking many miles each day to provide just the minimum family needs for cooking, washing and drinking. And they can't carry vast amounts while walking over rough terrain bearing a heavy bucket.

Because children have to play their part in family life, and that includes getting water, they may be unable to go to school, or be so tired when they get there that they have difficulty learning. They may even have to spend the whole day without a drink as there may not be any clean water there, either.

Last year, UNICEF aimed to get almost 90,000 water systems installed, to benefit 20 million people, working where it is most desperately needed, often just to ensure survival. A well may mean the difference between life and death.

children under five in the developing world.

Although water gives life, it can also

Comprehension Questions

1. How much would it cost to provide clean water for everyone on the world by 1990?
2. How much of the world's surface is covered by water?
3. In the developing world getting clean water is a problem for
    a. more than 80% of the children.
    b. 80% of the children in rural areas.
    c. the majority of children.
    d. fewer than 20% of the children in rural areas.
4. Why are the world's supplies of fresh water limited?
    a. Most of it is extremely difficult to obtain.
    b. We do not have the technology to obtain it.
    c. Most of it is polluted.
    d. There is not enough rain in some parts of the world.
5. What does "tummy bug" in line 18 mean?

APPENDIX B

READING TEXT FOR TAP 2

Why pupils take in little from TV

CHILDREN learn almost nothing from television, and the
More they watch the less they remember. They regard tele-vision purely as entertainment, recent programs that make demands on them and are surprised that anybody should take the medium seriously. Far from being over-excited by programmes, they are mildly bored with the whole thing.

These are the main conclusions from a new study of children and television. To be published later this month.

The author-Cedric Cullingford, dean of educational studies at Oxford Polytechnic-confirms that the modern child is a dedicated viewer. Out of 5,000 under-13s interviewed, only six did not have a television set at home (four of these lived in rural areas without electricity), 93 per cent had "goggled" the night before they were interviewed, two-thirds of whom had watched four or more programmes.

Their viewing was not in the least selective. They did not wait for their favourite programmes to switch on nor did they switch off after them. Some watched solidly from tea-time until the early hours of the morning.

Cullingford reports "almost unanimous indifference to children's programmes". From the age seven upwards, children show an overwhelming preference for supposedly adult television-mainly thrillers along predictable lines, such as the Professional, and the situation comedies such as Open All Hours.

The study suggests that there is little point in the television companies' attempts to "quarantine" adult viewing in the later hours. More than a third of the children regularly watched their r favorite programmes after 9 p.m. All 11-year-olds, more than half the eight –year-olds, had watched programmes after midnight. Series such as Appointment with Fear and For Adults Only apparently have significant child audiences.

Apart from the prodigious waste of time involved, however, it seems that all this viewing has little effect. Children do not pay close attention, says Cullingford, and they can recall few details. "The very idea of trying to recall features of programmes they have seen seems rather odd to children…They do not expect to provide anything memorable."

They can remember which programmes they have seen and recall the "essential imagery" of popular serials, but they can rarely explain the elements of a particular plot. Recall was in "inverse proportion to the amount they had watched". Those who had seen three programmes the previous night could give a "fair account" of them; those who had watched six could provide only"rudimentary" detail. Younger children were the more likely to remember the details.

It is precisely because television, unlike a teacher, demands so little attention and response that children like it, argues Cullingford. Programmes seeking to put over serious messages-news or documentaries-are strongly disliked. So are people who frequently talk on screen. Clement Freud and Muhammad Ali fall into this category, as so newsreaders and politicians.

What children like most, and remember best, are the advertisements. They see them as short programmes in their own right, and particularly enjoy humorous presentation. But, again, they react strongly against high pressure advertisements that attempt openly to influence them. These include washing powder ads, and those for toothpaste that play on fears of tooth decay.

According to Cullingford, children are too sophisticated to be manipulated. "There is no evidence that consistently supports the notion that children copy what they see, mirroring the violence, seduced into the love of particular objects, terrified by horror and manipulated into certain beliefs".

They recognize that the heroes and stunts of television thrillers are fantasies; they are not emotionally involved in the programmes. If they admire stars, it is because the actors lead glamorous lives and earn a lot of money, not because of their fictional skills with fast cars and shooting villains. They are perfectly clear about the functions of advertisements; by the age of 12, only one in 10 children believes what even favourite ads say about the product. And says Cullingford, educational television is probably least successful of all in imparting attitudes or information.

Far from being an exciting medium, television is associated by a large proportion of children with tiredness and boredom. "The part it plays in their lives is a minor if pervasive one; fitting in to other events, knowing its place and rarely of such high salience that children approach it with awed anticipation".

Comprehension Questions

1. What are the names of two TV programs mentioned in the text?

a.

b.

2. Give one finding of the research conducted by Cullingford.
3. Out of the 5,000 under-thirteen-year-old children interviewed,
    a. 93% had watched 4 or more programs the night before.
    b. about 60% had watched up to 3 programs the night before.
    c. 7% has not watched TV the night before.
    d. 6% did not have a TV set at home.
4. The evidence suggests that advertisers who wish to reach children should
    a. avoid too much talking.
    b. make their advertisements humorous.
    c. keep their advertisements short.
    d. try to influence them openly.
5. What does "solidly" in line 36 mean?

APPENDIX C

COGNITIVE AND METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGY INVENTORY

COGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES	METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES
1. Rereads a section if meaning isn't clear.	1. Overviews the text before reading to activate schemata.
2. Recognizes formulas and patterns.	2. Identifies the purpose of the task.
3. Reads title (makes inferences).	3. Reconsiders and revises hypothesis about the meaning of text based on text content.
4. Identifies main ideas.	4. Changes the reading strategies when comprehension is blocked.
5. Skims and scans as needed.	5. Attempts to relate important points in the text to one another to understand the text as a whole.
6. Summarizes, makes notes, paraphrases, highlights, etc to remember what has been stated in the text.	6. Evaluates guesses.
7. Compares L1 with L2.	7. Highlights important information (by underlining, circling, etc.)
8. Translates into native language.	8. Tries to activate content schemata.
9.Attempts to infer information from context.	
10. Looks for markers of cohesion (i.e. reference words, linkers).	
11. Analyzes grammatical category of words.	
12. Applies rules in L1 to the L2 context.	
13. Tries to guess meaning of vocabulary from context.	
14. Pays attention to text structure.	
15. Uses visual clues (punctuation marks, bolded or italicized parts)	
16. Employs top down approach.	
17. Employs bottom up approach.	
18. Identifies key words and figures (i.e numbers).	
19. Makes use of cognates.	
20. Uses personalization.	
21. Attempts to link sound and visual imagery.	
22. Uses visualization.	
23. Acknowledges the importance of concentration.	

APPENDIX D

STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL)

EFL VERSION

© R.OXFORD, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate worksheet, write the response (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. *Never or almost never true of me*
2. *Usually not true of me*
3. *Somewhat true of me*
4. *Usually true of me*
5. *Always or almost always true of me*

1. NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.
2. USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.
3. SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.
4. USUALLY TRUE OF ME means the statement is true more than half the time.
5. ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true almost always.

Please answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate worksheet. Please try to answer in 20-30 minutes. If you have any questions, please let the teacher know immediately.

1. *Never or almost never true of me*
2. *Usually not true of me*
3. *Somewhat true of me*
4. *Usually true of me*
5. *Always or almost always true of me*

PART A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board or on a street sign.

PART B

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
14. I start conversations in English.

15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

1. *Never or almost never true of me*
2. *Usually not true of me*
3. *Somewhat true of me*
4. *Usually true of me*
5. *Always or almost always true of me*

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

PART C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

PART D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

1. *Never or almost never true of me*
2. *Usually not true of me*
3. *Somewhat true of me*
4. *Usually true of me*
5. *Always or almost always true of me*

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
43. I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

PART F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

WORKSHEET FOR ANSWERING AND SCORING

THE STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL)
© R. OXFORD, 1989

1. The blanks (_____) are numbered for each item on the SILL.
2. Write your response to each item (that is, write 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) in each of the blanks.
3. Add up each column. Put the results on the line marked SUM.
4. Divide by the number under SUM to get the average for each column. Round this average off to the nearest tenth, as in 3.4.
5. Figure out your overall average. To do this, add up all the SUMs for the different parts of the SILL. Then divide by 50.
6. When you have finished, your teacher will give you the profile result. Copy your averages (for each part and for the whole SILL) from the Worksheet to the profile.

PART A	PART B	PART C	PART D	PART E	PART F	*WHOLE SILL*
1.___	10.___	24. ___	30. ___	39. ___	45. ___	SUM PART A ___
2. __	11___	25. ___	31. ___	40. ___	46. ___	SUM PART B ___
3. __	12. __	26. ___	32. ___	41. ___	47. ___	SUM PART C ___
4. __	13.___	27. ___	33. ___	42. ___	48. ___	SUM PART D ___
5. __	14___	28. ___	34. ___	43. ___	49. ___	SUM PART E ___
6. __	15.___	29. ___	35. ___	44. ___	50. ___	SUM PART F ____
7. __	16. __		36. ___			
8. __	17. __		37. ___			
9. __	18. __		38. ___			
	19. __					
	20. __					
	21. __					
	22. __					
	23. __					
SUM __	SUM _	SUM __	SUM ____	SUM ____	SUM ____	SUM ____
/ 9= ___	/ 14= __	/ 6= __	/ 9= ___	/ 6= __	/ 6= __	/ 50 = (OVERALL AVERAGE)

NAME_____ **DATE**_____

PROFILE OF RESULTS ON THE STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL)

© R. OXFORD, 1989

You will receive this profile after you have completed the Worksheet. This profile will show your SILL results. These results will tell you the kinds of strategies you are using in learning English. There are no right or wrong answers.

To complete this profile, transfer your averages for each part of the SILL, and your overall average for the whole SILL. These averages are found on the Worksheet.

PART	WHAT STRATEGIES ARE	YOUR AVERAGE ON THIS

	COVERED	PART
A	Remembering more effectively	_____
B	Using all your mental processes	_____
C	Compensation for missing knowledge	_____
D	Organizing and evaluating your learning	_____
E	Managing your emotions	_____
F	Learning with others	_____
YOUR OVERALL AVERAGE:		_____

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE THINK-ALOUD TRANSCRIPT

TAP 1 Emre Ciftci

Resmi gördükten sonra baştaki yazıya bakıyorum ve UNICEF büyük harfle yazıldığını gördükten sonra resimlede alakalı olarak UNICEF le alakalı birşeyler olacağını düşündüm...
Ne düşünüyorsun şu anda?
Çocuklarla karşılaştırma yapılacak gibi kendimizle...Öyle bir başlangıç var galiba, yani...
Sayılar vererek, para veriliyor, yani paraları belirterek bilgi veriyor.
Suyla galiba daha çok şey verilmiş,
Hmm, ne verilmiş, suyla?
Suya birazcık bahsedilmiş yani sudan...
HıHı, nereden anladın?

Wate...Üstte demiş işte... who take clean drinking water (*Hı Hı)* dedi, aşağıda baktım tekrar bahsetti *(water)* ...err...without water la ilgili. Ondan sonra aklımda oluştuki...galiba UNICEF in temiz suyla alakalı bir parçası yani. Daha sonra suyla ilgili bilgi veriyor, suyun dünyadaki durumu ve yani, temizliği açısından içmekte ve yemekte gereken temiz suyla ilgili bilgi veriyor.

Peki o cümle biraz uzun bir cümle...Okurken mesela, ne tip şeyleri düşündün?

Bir kısmını okuduktan sonra bilgi veriyor onu farkettim hani suyla ilgili alakalı bir bilgi verecek. Suyun neye gerektiği... Önce dünyadaki şeyini suyun dünyada çok büyük yer kapladığını veriyor daha sonrada temiz suyun öneminden bahsediyor yani..*(Tamam)*.
Yine temiz suya daha çok önem veriyor yani. Suyun temizliği açısından... UNICEF in bu temizlik açısından bir işler yaptığını...Bununda çocuklar için çok önemli olduğunu, hastalıklar açısından...*(hı Hı)*
Peki o anlama ulaşırken neleri düşündün? Yani çocuklar için önemli tamam temiz su, bu anlama ulaşırken kafandan neler geçti?Mesela hangi kelimeleri hemen gördün, mesela?
Illness la children dedim yani causes of death and illness in the children, in children under five diyor yani küçük çocuklardaki önemini belirtiyor yani direk yani ilk olarak gözüme bu çarptı yani...(Tamam)
Peki, mesela bir alt cümlede, şu cümlede, bu cümleyi okurken, belirli olarak senin dikkatini çeken kelimeler var mı?Gramer olarak olabilir, veya kelime olarak olabilir...
Yani transmit disease diyor yani.. yani hem hayat veriyor burada avantaj ve dezavantajların dan da bahsediyor yani hayat vermesiyle birlikte hastalıkların geçmesinede bir yol olarak gösteriyor yani. Bu yüzden temizliğinin, yukarıda bahsedilen temizlik olayının yani bağlama gibi bir şey açıkçası yani öyle...
Yani suda ki, suda çoğalan canlıların burda önemini belirtiyor hastalıkların geçip geçmeyeceği açısından. Daha sonra women and chidren ilk olarak bunu gördüğüm zaman rural area da eeee bunun insanlar üzerindeki etkisinin anlatılacağını düşündüm.
Peki rural kelimesinden ne anladın?
*Rural görmüştükte(hahaha), yani o yüzden direk(güzel) yani kırsal kesimolarak hani görmemiş olsam belki ileriden çıkarıcam ama yani (*Güzel, yani rural ın kırsal olduğunu tamam...)
Kırsal kesimde bunun daha önem kazandiğını belirtiyor. Yine burada temiz suyun yani herşeye etki ettiğini, herşeyde önemli olduğunu...Daha sonrada UNICEF in bu amaçla ne tür çalışmaları, yani ne kadar para ayırmış, bu konu üzerindeki çalışmalarını belirtiyor.
Peki, text i okuduktan sonra mesela bir yeri anlamadın, ne yapıyorsun?Bir bölümü anlamadın mesela,?
İlk başta okurken kafamda aşağı yukarı hangi nerede neyin anlatıldığı hakkında hafif bir plan gibi oluşuyor mesela başta suyun önemini anlattı daha sonra suyun insanlar üzerindeki önemini anlattı. Daha sonrada son parçada kişiler üzerindeki etkileri ve UNICEF in bu konu üzerinde ne yaptığını yani belli bir hafif bir plan oluşturmaya çalışıyorum (outline gibi...) *Çünkü zaten okurken dikkatim hep tam olmadığı için*

devamlı kaçırıyorum, o yüzden o plana gerek kalıyor çünkü baktım burada bir şey kaçırdım, neyle ilgiliydi, hemen aşağı yukarı yeri belli olduğu zaman birde hep baştan okumamak için mesela belirli tip yerleri..
Peki, mesela 18. satırda tummy bug diye bir kelime var onun anlamını sana sorsam...
Bunun anlamını bulurken ne tip işlemler yapıyorsun şimdi kafanda bana onu söyle.
Yani cümleyi o paragrafta fazla büyük olmadığı için baştan okuyarak daha iyi anlarım galiba
diye düşündüm. (Tamam) *Galiba su taşımada kullanılan birşey gibi (*Haha, peki suffer kelimesi falan var uncomfortable, demoralizing. O kelimelere tekrar bir bakarsan acaba fikrin değişirmi?
Yani suffer derken bunun yani iyi olmayan birşey olduğunu yani...Eee uncomfortable, demoralizing zarar veren birşey olduğuda, o zaman suyun içindeki bir ... zararlı birşey...sudan dolayı oluşabilecek zararlı birşey olabilir, bir canlı mesela (hıhı, güzel...) *Zaten sonrada medication la ilgili de birşeyler diyor. Yani bununda bayağı zararlı birşey çünkü...ill all your life diyor yani, hatta çocukların da ölmesi açısından dikkat edilmesi gerekli, demekki gerçekten ciddi bir hastalık. Tummy bug da sanki böyle, isme bakarak yani...*(kötü birşey...) *birşey böceği gibisinden* (Hahaha) *yani öyle birşey çağrıştırıyor yani* (Güzel, bug kelimesinden...) *Tummy bug yani tombul böcek gibi mesela yani öyle birşeyi var mesela çağrıştırımı...Öyle yani...*
Peki, ee ilk texti sana verdiğimde direk ilk paragrafamı fokuslandın yoksa şöyle bir hani bir baktınmı?
Önce resme baktım ondan sonra başlığa baktım (başlığa) *başlıkta ilk önce UNICEF i gördüm büyük harfle yazıldığı için ondan sonra yani bir bağlantı kurmaya çalıştım, resim filan UNICEF dedim...Burda birşey taşıyor eerr yiyecekle ilgili bir şey olabilir düşünmüştüm yani...Yiyecek içecek, o tip birşey düşünmüştüm*(Olabilir) *yani... Taşıdığı birşeyi...*
Güzel, err, peki şimdi parçada 3. dünya ülkelerindeki su yoksulluğundan bahsediliyor, UNICEF te buna yardım ediyormuş. Bu yardım yapmak tabiiki finansal olarak büyük bir yük oluyor, acaba err ne kadar bu külfet, finansal külfet?Textte söylendiği kadarıyla, ne kadar?
Yani...
Şimdi ne yapıyorsun mesela? Ne Kafandan ne geçiyor?
Kafamdan textte gördüğüm daha önce sayıları yani değer veren yerler (tamam). *İlk paragrafta ve son paragrafta sayılar şey yapıyorum yani* (güzel) *hatırladığım yerler*
Yani bütün text i okumadın...
Yok..
Direk o kısımlara gittin...
Yok bütün text i okumadım yani son kısımda ve başta bir (tamam) *fiyat belirdi. Baktım burada err people diyor water sistem diyor, o zaman direk öbür tarafa atladım çünkü pound falan var...*
Güzel... Cevap neymiş?
Errr 50 billion pound a year diyor. Spend yani o harcanıyor.
Güzel.

Peki genelde reading yaparken bir yeri anlamadın mesela başka ne tip stratejiler uyguluyorsun? Veya neler yapıyorsun?Aklından neler geçiyor?
Yani bir noktayı anlamadığım zaman çok takmıyorum çünkü asıl amacım texteki, text in bana ne anlatmak istediği yani...Ben sonuçta şeyi anladım burada mesela bir paragrafı anlamadıysamda suyun önemli olduğunu, suyun hastalıkları geçirip geçirmediğini ne kadar gerekli olduğu falan o tip şeyleri anladığım için çokta yormuyorum yani (Takılmıyorsun)
Hıhı güzel.Peki tamam Emre. Çok teşekkür ediyorum.

APPENDIX F

DIARY GUIDELINES

Please reply either in Turkish or in English.

Think about the reading text _____ on page _____.

1. What kinds of strategies did you use (for e.g. skimming, scanning, guessing meaning from context, etc)

   a. before reading the text?

   b. while reading the text?

c. after reading the text?

2. Which activity did you find most useful?

3. What problems did you have with the reading text?

4. Why do you think you had these problems?

5. How can you solve these problems?

6. Any other comments.

APPENDIX G
DIARY COLLATION CHARTS FOR GROUP A

Table 26: Diary Collation Charts for Group A

TALKING HORSES AND FEATHERLESS CHICKENS				
	IZZET	**YUCEL**	**GULSAH**	**AYCA**
1.What kinds of strategies did you use: a. before reading the text?	Scanning Skimming	Brainstorming	Brainstorming	Guessing
b. while reading the text?	Guessing	Skimming Scanning	Scanning	Finding the main ideas
c. after reading the text?	Guessing meaning from context	Assembling knowledge	Referencing exercises	Making inferences
2. Which	Brainstorming activity	-	Brainstorming	Scanning

activity did you find most useful?	because we can already remember some keywords			exercise using a dictionary page and the brainstorming activity before reading
3. What problems did you have with the reading text?	Already knows about the subject so did not find it difficult to understand.	Complex sentences	Doesn't like scanning,	No problems but sometimes during exams she is confused
4.Why do you think you had these problems?	No problems.	Laziness about reading	Because prefers intensive reading	Because of concentration difficulties
5. How can you solve these problems?	Reading a lot of things	By reading more	-	She doesn't know.
6. Any other comments.	-	It's better to take down notes while reading or underlining is possible and it is best to listen to our teacher	-	She hopes this is the last exercise.

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE												
	IZZET	YUCEL	GULSAH	AYCA	*HAKKI*	*KAAN*	*EMRE*	MEHMET	HATICE	SEMIH	ALP	MURAT HAN
What kinds of strategies did you use: a. before reading the text?	Looking at the title and the picture if any.	Looking at the title	Brainstorming and scanning	Overviewing the text, identifying main ideas	Concentration is very important. Brainstorming. Scanning.	Looking at the title, subtitle and pictures	Brainstorming	Concentration	Brainstorming	Didn't use many strategies	Reading in general	Reading the title and making inferences
b. while reading the text?	Guessing meaning from context	Highlighting imp information in the text	-	Reading intensively and answering the comprehension questions at the same time	Paying attention, concentration, willingness	skimming	Connecting the subject with the ideas which we made before (i.e during the brainstorming)	Identifying key words and main ideas, rereading a section if meaning is not clear	Trying to understand	Didn't use many strategies	Identifying main ideas	Trying to remember the key words so that he remembers the info in the text after reading
c. after reading the text?	Identifying the purpose of the task before answering any questions	Relating what is understood to one another	Reference questions		Asks himself what he understands and he rereads a section if he doesn't understand it.	Answering the questions	Making a conclusion in his mind	-	Reference exercises	Didn't use many strategies	Combining main points	
2. Which activity did you find most useful?	Brainstorming	Brainstorming	Brainstorming	Brainstorming	Brainstorming	-	Skimming and making an outline in his head (this is useful because he finds it difficult to concentrate	COPE type activities are the most useful	None is useful. Looking up the meanings of unknown words before reading the text is imp	Brainstorming	Vocabulary quizzes	Note-taking because it's easier to answer

							and the outline helps him remember where various information is in the text) Then intensive reading. Identifying the main idea. Rereading parts he doesn't understand					the question shaving taken down notes
3. What problems did you have with the reading text?	Not knowing the meaning of some words	Not knowing the meaning of some words and complex sentences	The length of the text and unknown vocabulary	Sometimes reading intensively bores me	Sometimes vocabulary is a problem	He finds it difficult to scan a text	Not knowing the meaning of some words	Doing discourse cloze and matching heading s with the paragrapsh	Not knowing the meaning of some words	Not knowing the meaning of some words but he tried to tackle this problem by guessin g meaning from context	Concentrati on	Text length. If too long, he is bored. The topic should be related to his areas of interest
4.Why do you think you had these problems ?	Not knowing the meanings of some words is because he doesn't study much and this in return leads to boredom and sometimes the topic puts him off.	Not studying enough	She doesn't know		He doesn't know.	He gets bored and cannot concentrate. Starts thinking about other things	Not reading more books	He doesn't know	Because of the system of education in Turkey (not having English lessons for about 3 years and thus having problems with vocab)	Becaus e of not revising	He says he's very active	He's not used to reading much
5. How can you	By studying more and by being	By studying more and by reading	By reading magazines		By reading more	He doesn't know	By reading more books and texts,		Studying upper words	Studyin g more	He thinks it's	He must be

solve these problems ?	willing	more books	and books at home				etc			and learning more vocabulary	impossible	careful and do a lot of exercises about reading
6. Any other comments .	-									Everything was enjoyable		-

THE LIGHTER SIDE OF EDUCATION							
	IZZET	YUCEL	GULSAH	AYCA	*EMRE*	MEHMET	MURATHAN
What kinds of strategies did you use: a. before reading the text?	Skimming and scanning	Skimming and scanning		Doing an exercise on complex sentences Brainstorming	Skimming	Being willing to read	Scanning
b. while reading the text?	Guessing	Highlighting (underlining) imp information in the text Identifying key words	-	Doing COPE type questions	Guessing meaning from context	Concentration	Identifying main ideas
c. after reading the text?	Meaning	Relating what is understood to one another and thinking about them	Reference questions	Reference questions	Scanning again to understand	Trying to remember	Thinking and concluding (i.e evaluating guesses)
2. Which activity did you find most useful?	Guessing	Guessing	Complex sentences and finding the subject and the object of sentences	Complex sentences	Guessing meaning from context and identifying the main idea when the details are not necessary	Reading	Summarizing
3. What problems did you	Not knowing the meaning of some	Not knowing the meaning of some words and complex sentences	-	The matching activity on page 253 was difficult	He was bored by the topic and just looked for the specific ideas	Understanding	Concentration problems

have with the reading text?	words						
4.Why do you think you had these problems?	Looking them up from the dictionary	Because they need a good background	-	Because the vocabulary was difficult	-	He doesn't know	He's not used to reading very much
5. How can you solve these problems?	Guessing andworking for the unknown words	By studying more, taking down notes and by guessing the meaning of words	By reading magazines and books in English	Looking up the words in the dictionary	By reading more English texts	By the help of the teacher	Doing more reading exercises
6. Any other comments.	-	Reading texts can be understtod by more reading so the reading habit is imp		-	My problem is always about not reading much.	Nothing	-

LAUGHTER IS THE BEST MEDICINE												
	IZZET	YUCEL	GULSAH	AYCA	*HAKKI*	*KAAN*	*EMRE*	MEHMET	HATICE	SEMIH	ALP	MURATHAN
What kinds of strategies did you use: a. before reading the text?	Scanning	Brainstorming	Brainstorming and skimming	Scanning and outline	Overviewing the text to find out about the length, content. Looking at the title	Brainstorming	Making an outline	Willingness to read Skimming to identify main ideas	Brainstorming	Skimming and checking outline to get the main points	Skimming and guessing meaning from text	Reading the title and thinking about the title
b. while reading the text?	Guessing	"We looked at the first sentence of the paragraphs and studied only one paragraph personally."	Identifying main ideas and making an outline	Note taking	Trying to concentrate ad guess the meaning of unknown vocab. Trying to understand the subject	Note taking	-	Thinking about the text	Outlining	Tried to find the relationships between the outlines and the text	Scanning the text and identifying main ideas	Guessing the words according o sentences
c. after reading the	Guessing meaning from	Making an outline and	Answering T/F questions and	-	Asks himself what he	-	-	Trying to remember and		Comparing the outline and	Focusing on the main points	Summarising the whole text

text?	context	answering some questions	guessing meaning		understands from the text and tries o identify the purpose of the text.			to criticize what you read		what he understood Rereading the parts he didn't understand		
2. Which activity did you find most useful?	Numbering activity	Studying one paragraph in detail	Finding main ideas and identifying which ideas are for and which are against	Note taking	Scanning	Note taking activity is very useful	-	Skimming and making an outline	Note taking on each paragraph and trying o understand the text	Paraphrasing and note taking activity was useful	-	Skimming
3. What problems did you have with the reading text?	Not knowing the meaning of some words and not paying enough attention	Some parts were hard to understand and he had some concentration problems	Difficult to identify for and against ideas in the text	No problems with this text	Unknown words	Concentration and insomnia	-	Vocabulary	Vocabulary	Vocabulary problems	Concentration and focusing	Text length. If too long, he is bored.
4.Why do you think you had these problems?	Staying up late and not having enough sleep	Because of the difficult vocab and sentences	Difficulty in scanning and skimming		"It is normal."	-	-	Not reading enough	Because I am not good at memorizing the meaning of words	Because of not studying enoough	"It's from my childhood. I don't know."	He can't be careful
5. How can you solve these problems?	By taking enough sleep and asking the help of the teacher and by using the dictionary	By studying more and by reading more	By reading magazines and books in English		Use a dictionary	He doesn't know	-	Reading books, magazines and newspapers	Not having enough time	"I have to try to guess the meaning of words which I don't know."	"I make myself relaxed and don't care when I faced with these kinds of situations happen."	He must be do more reading exercises

6. Any other comments.	-	Guessing is very imp, finding the main idea is very necessary.				Wish we could always do similar activities	Making an outline is useful and I think when we are reading, not detail needed text, making outline is enough to understand the main ideas. However, when we are reading detail needed text carefully, it is a necessity. We can understand all the main parts of the text with the outline.	-	I am bored with classes and Bilkent. But studying for COPE is better	Paraphrasing and outline technique was useful. Thanks for it		-

APPENDIX H
SILL COLLATION CHART FOR GROUP A

CAGLAR KAAN KOC		SILL 1	SILL 2
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES			
10.	I say or write new English words several times.	3	3
11.	I try to talk like native English speakers.	3	5
12.	I practice the sounds of English.	3	4
13.	I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	4
14.	I start conversations in English.	2	2
15.	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3	4
16.	I read for pleasure in English.	2	1
17.	I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	3	4
18.	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3	2
19.	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	4	4
20.	I try to find patterns in English.	2	2
21.	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3	3
22.	I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	4
23.	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	4
		Total: 23 Av: 2.8	Total: 24 Av: 3
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES			
30.	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	3	3
31.	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4	4
32.	I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	4	4
33.	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	2
34.	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	1
35.	I look for people I can talk to in English.	3	3
36.	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	2	2
37.	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	4
38.	I think about my progress in learning English.	3	3
		Total: 19 Av: 2.7	Total: 19 Av: 2.7

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

SEMIH BINGOL	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2	4
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3	5
12. I practice the sounds of English.	4	4
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	4
14. I start conversations in English.	5	4
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	4	4
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3	4
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	3	5
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	5	5
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3	4
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3	4
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3	5
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	3	4
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	5	5
	Total: 28 Av: 3.5	Total: 35 **Av: 4.3**
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	4	4
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	5	5
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	4	5
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3	5
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	3	5
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	4
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3	4
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	4
	Total: 33 Av: 3.7	Total: **39** Av: 4.3

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

MEHMET IZZET HACIALIOGLU	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2	3
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	2	3
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	3
14. I start conversations in English.	2	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2	3
16. I read for pleasure in English.	2	3
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	3	3
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	4	3
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	4	3
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3	3
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4	2
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	5	4
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	3	4
	Total: 28 Av: 3.5	Total: 25 Av: 3.1
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	3
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4	3
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	3	3
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	4	3
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	3	3
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	3
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	4
	Total: 22 Av: 3.1	Total: 21 Av: 3

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

YUCEL CIMTAY	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2	3
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	1	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	2	2
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	2	3
14. I start conversations in English.	3	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	1	2
16. I read for pleasure in English.	2	1
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	4	4
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	4	3
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3	4
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3	3
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2	3
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	3
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	3
	Total: 22 Av: 2.7	Total: 23 Av: 2.8
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	3
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3	3
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	4	2
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	5	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	2
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	3
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1	3
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	4	3
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	3
	Total: 21 **Av: 3**	Total: 20 Av: 2.8

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

HATICE BASBUG	SILL 1	SILL 2
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	4	3
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	4	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	4	4
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	2	3
14. I start conversations in English.	2	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2	4
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1	2
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	1	3
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	1	2
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2	4
20. I try to find patterns in English.	4	4
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4	2
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	3
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	1	3
	Total: 19 Av: 2.3	Total: 23 Av: 2.8
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	2
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3	5
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	4	5
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	4
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	4	3
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	3	4
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	3
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	2
	Total: 21 Av: 3	Total: 21 Av: 3

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)

2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

EMRE CIFTCI	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3	2
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	4	4
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3	3
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	3
14. I start conversations in English.	2	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	4	5
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1	1
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	2	2
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	5	4
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	4	3
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3	3
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2	2
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	5	5
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	3
	Total: 25 Av: 3.1	Total: 24 Av: 3
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	4
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4	2
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	5	4
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1	1
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	2
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1	1
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	3
	Total: 18 Av: 2.5	Total: 16 Av: 2.2

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

AYCA ATAY	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3	2
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	1	2
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3	2
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	3
14. I start conversations in English.	1	1
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	4	4
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1	
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	2	1
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	5	5
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3	2
20. I try to find patterns in English.	1	2
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	1	4
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	4
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	4	4
	Total: 22 Av: 2.7	Total: 25 Av: 3.1
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	1	2
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2	2
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	2	3
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	2	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1	1
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	1
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1	1
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	2
	Total: 9 Av: 1.2	Total: 13 Av: 1.8

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

GULSAH CUMURCU	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3	3
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	2	2
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	4
14. I start conversations in English.	2	1
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2	1
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3	3
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	1	1
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	2	1
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	4	3
20. I try to find patterns in English.	2	2
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2	3
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	3	1
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	3
	Total: 21 Av: 2.6	Total: 20 Av: 2.5
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	1
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3	3
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	3	2
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	2
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	1
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	2	1
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	2	3
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	3	1
	Total: 18 Av: 2.5	Total: 13 Av: 1.8

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

HAKKI OZSALIH	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3	2
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3	3
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3	3
14. I start conversations in English.	2	2
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3	3
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3	2
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	2	2
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3	3
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	5	5
20. I try to find patterns in English.	4	4
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4	3
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	3
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	3
	Total: 28 Av: 3.5	Total: 26 Av: 3.25
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2	2
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3	3
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	4	3
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	2
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	2
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	1
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	2	2
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	2
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4	3
	Total: 18 Av: 2.57	Total: 16 Av: 2.28

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

MEHMET OKAN KISACIK	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	5	5
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	5	5
12. I practice the sounds of English.	5	4
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	4	3
14. I start conversations in English.	5	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	5	4
16. I read for pleasure in English.	3	3
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	3	4
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3	5
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	5	4
20. I try to find patterns in English.	5	3
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	4	3
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	4	3
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	4	4
	Total: 32 Av: 4	Total: 28 Av: 3.5
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	4	5
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2	4
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	3	4
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	4
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2	4
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	2	2
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	4
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2	3
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	3	4
	Total: 19 Av: 2.7	Total: 28 Av: 3.5

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

ALP YONCA	**SILL 1**	**SILL 2**
PART B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3	2
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	5	3
12. I practice the sounds of English.	4	3
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	4	3
14. I start conversations in English.	4	3
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	5	4
16. I read for pleasure in English.	4	4
17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.	3	3
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	5	3
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2	3
20. I try to find patterns in English.	2	2
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	5	3
22. I try not to translate word-for- word.	2	4
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2	3
	Total: 26 Av: 3.25	Total: 25 Av: 3.12
PART D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES		
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	3	3
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2	3
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking in English.	3	3
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3	3
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1	2
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	2
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3	3
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	4	3
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	5	3
	Total: 21 Av: 3	Total: 20 Av: 2.8

3.50 to 5.00: HIGH (always or almost always used)
2.50 to 3.50: MEDIUM (sometimes used)
1.50 to 2.50: LOW (generally not used)

APPENDIX I
Diary Analysis for Group A and Group B

GROUP A

1. What kinds of strategies did you use:
a. before reading the text?
-scanning ♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦= 8
- skimming ♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦= 8
- brainstorming ♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦= 11
- guessing ♦♦=2
- looking at the title /subtitle♦♦♦♦♦♦=6
- looking at the picture♦♦=2
- overviewing the text♦♦=2
- identifying main ideas♦♦♦=3
- concentration♦♦=2
- making an outline♦♦=2
- making inferences ♦♦=2
b. while reading the text?
- guessing♦♦♦=3
- highlighting important information in the text♦♦=2
- identifying key words♦♦♦=3
- guessing meaning from context♦♦♦♦=4
- identifying main ideas♦♦♦♦♦♦=6
- reading intensively♦=1
- concentration♦♦♦=3
- skimming ♦♦=2
- scanning♦♦♦=3
- connecting the subject with the ideas generated during the brainstorming♦=1
- rereading a section if meaning is not clear♦=1
- didn't use many strategies♦=1
- note taking♦=1
- outlining♦=1
c. after reading the text?
- guessing meaning from context♦♦♦=3
- referencing ♦♦♦♦♦=5
- making inferences♦♦=2
- identifying the purpose of the task before answering questions♦♦=2
- rereading a section if meaning is not clear♦♦=2
- evaluating guesses♦♦=2
- combining main ideas♦♦♦♦=4
- scanning ♦=1
- making an outline♦=1
- criticizing what is read♦=1
- summarizing♦=1
- focusing on the main points♦=1
- didn't use many strategies ♦=1
2. Which activity did you find most useful?
- numbering activity♦=1
- studying one paragraph in detail♦=1
- finding main ideas♦♦=2
- identifying which ideas are for and which are against♦=1
- scanning ♦♦=2
- skimming♦♦♦=3
- note taking activity♦♦♦♦♦=5
- making an outline♦♦=2
- paraphrasing♦=1
- guessing meaning from context♦♦♦=3
- working on complex sentences♦♦=2
- summarizing♦=1

GROUP B

1. What kinds of strategies did you use:
a. before reading the text?
- scanning ♣♣ ♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣= 14
- skimming ♣ ♣=2
- brainstorming ♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣ ♣ ♣♣♣♣♣=13
- guessing activity ♣=1
- looking at the title /subtitle ♣♣♣♣ ♣♣=6
- looking at bolded / highlighted sections ♣♣♣ ♣=4
- overviewing the text ♣ ♣=2
- predicting content by given clues ♣ ♣=2
- looking at the questions ♣♣=2
- finding the meaning of some proper nouns in Turkish ♣=1
b. while reading the text?
- focusing on highlighted sections in the text ♣=1
- brainstorming ♣=1
- guessing meaning from context ♣♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣=23
- trying to understand ♣♣ ♣=3
- identifying main ideas ♣=1
- reading intensively(for detail) ♣♣♣♣ ♣=5
- employ top-down approach ♣ ♣=2
- employ bottom up approach♣ ♣=2
- scanning ♣ ♣=2
- skimming ♣=1
c. after reading the text?
- answering questions ♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣=8
- rethinking about the things that have been read to remember them ♣♣=2
- forming a general idea about the text ♣♣ ♣=3
- scanning ♣=1
- looking up words in the dictionary ♣ ♣♣=3
- rereading a section if meaning is not clear ♣=1
- guessing meaning from context ♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣=9
- identifying main ideas ♣♣=2
- discussing about the text ♣=1
2. Which activity did you find most useful?
- guessing meaning from context ♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣=12
- identifying the purpose of the task ♣=1
- matching activity♣ ♣=2
- guessing activity ♣=1
- scanning ♣♣ ♣=3
- discussion section in the pre activity ♣=1
- brainstorming ♣ ♣=2
- vocabulary activity ♣=1
- reading intensively ♣ ♣♣♣♣ ♣=6
3. What problems did you have with the reading text?
- no problems ♣♣=2
- not knowing the meaning of some words ♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣ ♣♣♣♣♣♣=23
- specific and advanced grammar structures ♣=1
- concentration ♣=1
- not reading carefully ♣=1
- pronouns/referencing ♣=1
knowledge about
the topic♣ ♣♣=3

4. Why do you think you had these problems?
not having enough background

- brainstorming♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦=9
- doing exam type activities♦=1
- none♦=1
- vocabulary quizzes♦=1
- finding keywords♦=1

3. What problems did you have with the reading text?

- no problems♦♦♦=3
- complex sentences♦♦♦=3
- scanning♦♦=2
- not knowing the meaning of some words♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦=14
- length of the text♦♦♦=3
- reading intensively♦=1
- concentration♦♦♦♦♦♦=6
- bored by the topic♦♦=2

4. Why do you think you had these problems?

- because they need a good background♦=1
- difficult vocabulary / not knowing the meaning of some words♦♦♦=3
- don't know♦♦♦♦=4
- not used to reading much♦♦=2
- boring topic ♦=1
- lack of concentration♦♦=2
- not reading more books♦♦=2
- system of education in Turkey♦=1
- not revising/ studying vocabulary much♦♦♦♦=4
- don't have any problems ♦♦=2
- not getting enough sleep♦=1
- difficulty in skimming / scanning♦=1
- prefers intensive reading♦=1

5. How can you solve these problems?

- by sleeping enough♦=1
- asking for help from the teacher♦♦=2
- using a dictionary♦♦♦=3
- studying more♦♦♦♦♦♦=6
- reading more♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦=10
- don't know♦♦♦=3
- learning how to guess the meaning of vocabulary♦♦=2
- relaxing♦=1
- doing more reading exercises♦♦♦=3
- being willing♦=1
- studying upper intermediate vocabulary♦=1
- learning more vocabulary♦=1
- impossible♦=1
- being careful♦=1

6. Any other comments.

- habit of reading is important♦=1
- everything was enjoyable♦=1
- it's better to take down notes while reading♦=1
- listening to the teacher♦=1
- guessing is very important♦=1
- finding the main idea is very necessary♦=1
- wish we could always do similar activities♦=1
- making an outline is useful♦=1
- bored with classes ♦=1
- studying for the COPE is the best♦=1
- paraphrasing was useful♦=1

- not having any background info about the text topic ♣♣♣=3
- difficult vocabulary / not knowing the meaning of some words♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣♣=11
- don't know♣=1
- not knowing enough grammar♣=1
- not knowing the purpose of reading before reading the text ♣=1
- lack of motivation♣=1
- not reading carefully♣ ♣=2
- not reading more ♣ ♣♣=3
- not studying vocabulary much ♣♣ ♣=3
- not speaking enough in English ♣=1
- not knowing how to study vocabulary ♣ ♣=2

5. How can you solve these problems?

- studying more ♣♣ ♣ ♣♣=5
- learning how to guess meaning from context ♣♣ ♣ ♣=4
- using a dictionary ♣ ♣=2
- reading more ♣♣♣♣ ♣ ♣♣=7
- reading more carefully ♣ ♣ ♣=3
- don't know♣=1
- using different methods to learn vocabulary ♣=1
- studying/memorizing more vocabulary ♣ ♣ ♣♣♣ ♣♣=7
- studying more grammar ♣=1
- motivation / being willing ♣=1
- identifying the purpose of reading♣=1
- speaking more in English♣=1

6. Any other comments.

- need to study more vocabulary♣=1
- need to know how to study vocabulary♣=1
- If I pass the COPE everything will be OK♣=1
- exciting topics attract more attention♣=1
- I want to p[ass the COPE exam♣=1
- interesting and it wasn't boring♣=1