

Using Metacognitive and Cognitive Strategies in Teaching Reading

Egamberdiyeva Umida

Student of Tashkent State University of Uzbek language and literature Named after Alisher Navai

Abstract. This study is an attempt to understand the experiences and expectations of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in teaching reading to students. This research has been done on the impact of coherent and cohesion skills of EFL learners. This concept of learning is also rarely utilized in Uzbekistan, especially in TSUULL education. Therefore, we decided to do a specific study on the practical impacts of using cognitive and metacognitive strategies on English learners - specifically English majors - TSUULL of Pedagogy.

Key words: cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy, coherent and cohesion skills.

Introduction

Reading is regarded as an important skill in education, particularly in the teaching of second and foreign languages, in addition to the significant role it plays in one's daily life in the first language. In an effort to better understand the processes involved in reading in a second language, numerous studies have been conducted. Despite the fact that there is still much to learn about the nature of second language reading comprehension, many aspects of SL reading have been examined and revisited.

In order to succeed in the more common international communication, travel, and study abroad, students must develop the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, one of the most crucial aspects of their English language development is reading comprehension. According to research, reading comprehension is a complex procedure, and students typically trouble to infer meaning from written text. According to general research, those who begin learning English are most likely to experience significant difficulties inferring meaning from texts and comprehending them. Researchers have long worked on this issue, and in recent years, they have proposed that readers' use of metacognitive reading strategies is a key element in boosting reading comprehension.

Even after years of mastering the English language, many EFL/ESL students still struggle with reading comprehension in English. They frequently experience issues as a result, such having trouble getting a job or one that pays higher. They are able to read a text, but they frequently have trouble identifying or comprehending the author's message or messages. Reading comprehension is a crucial component of the EFL/ESL learning process and should

be emphasized at various educational levels. For instance, research shows that after completing elementary English courses, reading comprehension is a major concern and one of the top priorities for ESL/EFL students. In spite of this, teaching reading comprehension strategies is still grossly underutilized in the field of teaching English.

The researchers in this study explore reading comprehension myths as well as elements influencing comprehension improvement. The demands of students are then reviewed, along with ideas for teaching metacognitive and cognitive theory reading strategies.

Several studies have attempted to teach or train learning strategies, but the majority of learning strategy research in second language acquisition and learning has been concentrated on the identification, description, and classification of learning strategies. The purpose of the current paper is to teach some TEFL students some cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in order to demonstrate the significant benefits of learning strategy training for language learners as well as to identify the most effective methods for implementing learning strategy training.

Literature Review

Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies

Reading comprehension, according to Dole et al. (1991), is a process that helps readers improve their comprehension of a text by combining both cognitive and metacognitive skills. Cognitive strategies use the target language and a variety of techniques, including summarizing, deducing, forecasting, organizing, noting the most important details, drawing on prior knowledge, and inferring meaning from context (Oxford, 1990). The use of metacognitive methods, sometimes known as "thinking about thinking" strategies, enables readers to regulate their own reading. (1990; Oxford). In other words, readers are aware of when and how to apply these techniques and can adapt them to their reading needs. Metacognitive techniques entail organizing, assessing, and controlling one's own abilities. These include abilities like identifying the reading task, assessing the predictions, concentrating on crucial information, connecting crucial information, ignoring unimportant new words, assessing the accuracy of guessing meaning, rereading crucial information when understanding is poor, and assessing the accuracy of completing the entire reading task.

Numerous studies on teaching reading strategies Duffy (2002) cites Salataci and Akyel (2002) who claim that teaching pupils metacognitive strategies enhances their reading comprehension. It allows pupils the option to construct their own rules, plan ahead before reading, control the reading process, and assess themselves. The purpose of reading is to develop independent readers, which metacognitive strategy training helps pupils achieve. As a result, in reading classes, students should be taught how to employ metacognitive techniques to better understand texts. One way to teaching reading that incorporates both cognitive and metacognitive skills is known as reciprocal teaching. It helps students increase their reading comprehension and develop into independent readers. The teachers instruct when and how to adopt the appropriate tactics and point pupils in their direction. After that, while reading books, the pupils will create their own rules and build their own knowledge. In the end, kids will be able to use these techniques and, as a result of their use in cooperative groups, complete reading assignments independently.

According to Brown (1978), there are three different categories of cognitive knowledge:

declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge. Declarative knowledge is defined by Jacob & Paris (1987) as propositional knowledge that readers possess when doing a certain activity, such as "knowing" that engaging in post-reading strategy will enable readers to reflect on their reading abilities. While in this context, procedural knowledge refers to how one really implements the technique they are familiar with. Regarding conditional knowledge, it discusses being aware of elements that might influence one's learning achievement, such as understanding the requirements for putting a post-reading technique into practice. When teaching reading, teachers must impart these three forms of information to their students.

Teachers can use the six strategies suggested by Brown, Palinscar, and Armbruster (1984) to improve students' text comprehension while teaching the three categories of knowledge: Understanding the objective of reading is step one. Background knowledge is step two. Paying attention to major concepts is step three. Critical evaluation is step four. Monitoring comprehension is step five. Inferences are step six. The researcher is going to use these six metacognitive reading instruction tactics in this study.

Achievements by using metacognitive and cognitive strategies in teaching reading

Researchers (teachers)	Strategies in teaching reading	Percentages of improvement
Phakiti/ Zabrocky /Ratner	Metacognitive & Cognitive	25%
Grable & Stoller		68%
Flayell		70%
Winne & Hadwin		71%
Pintrich		76%
Dole et al		80%
Duffy Salataci		83%
Brown, Palinscar, Armbruster		86%

According to the results of the scientists who worked on the metacognitive strategy, the use of the metacognitive strategy in teaching and learning increased the level of comprehension. However, there was no mention of why some researchers (Phakiti/ Zabrocky /Ratner) were unable to achieve them or what caused them to be unable to achieve them after mention many useful aspects of strategy. Therefore, in this research paper, will conduct research on this issue, exactly what factors affect negatively to the improvement of metacognitive and cognitive strategy.

Methodology

Research Design

There are several studies investigating the role of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in language learning, particularly on reading comprehension. However, little research has been conducted on reason of these strategies can not be higher results. The present study focuses on the impact of general reading comprehension of university first-year students and their relevant views about using strategies in the classroom for improving reading skills.

Participants

The department of Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State university of Uzbek language and literature is where the current research is being done. The program offers a four-year undergraduate degree in simultaneous interpretation and English Language Teacher Education. In the first year of the program, students take foundational language development courses such theory and practice of translation, integrative skills reading, listening, speaking, and scientific and creative writing. The teaching of pedagogy and pedagogic content knowledge will take place in the ensuing years. 30 first-year students that are enrolled in this program are the participants. The participants were between the ages of 18 and 22.

Data Collection and Analysis

There are many ways to gather information from participants, including interviews, group projects, observation, audio, video, and documents.

However, the researcher in this study distributed questionnaires to gather the data. The English teacher education students' use of metacognitive reading methods to understand the text was the major emphasis of the questionnaire, and the students were then provided interview questions as additional information to help them understand the reading learning process. The following are the specific procedures for data collection:

Data on the most popular reading strategies employed by the students were gathered using a questionnaire. It was the primary tool used to track the reading process, including what happened before, during, and after reading to determine how the pupils behaved. The three techniques' statements—global reading strategies, problem-solving strategies, and support reading strategies—were put in the questionnaire in a random order. The participants are required to answer 30 questions on the entire questionnaire. Based on their methods for understanding literature, participants are required to fill out a checklist on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 (never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4), and always (5)).

Materials

Most students understand the IELTS test or the questions in it by the reading task. For this reason, 2 reading passages were selected from the "Cambridge 16" book to develop students' reading comprehension skills for research. Understanding the first passage or the words in it was not complicated, but the words in the second passage were complicated. The first article is about polar bears, and the second one is called "Future job".

Underlying reasons for the preference of these two articles were:

- These are not longer for in-class reading (students can do each task in 20minutes).
- The stories were interesting for the university-level EFL students.
- These were measured to be suitable for the current level of the participants for freshmen.

Procedure

Three stages can be identified in the training in this study:

Stage1: Before the training. Following the administration of a multiple-choice reading comprehension test to the experimental group of students, they were immediately given a cognitive and metacognitive reading strategy questionnaire.

Stage 2: While training. Four of the methods identified in the questionnaire will be trained every two weeks using a combination of the teacher's explanation and demonstration, the students' practice on a reading quiz, and an evaluation of the strategies through their written reports. Nearly 12 weeks were spent on the training period as a whole.

Stage3: After instruction. The last test for this semester will take place after training. Before turning in their papers, students from the experimental and control groups were required to complete a questionnaire interview that was done in conjunction with the final test.

Discussion

The results that students from the experimental and control groups receive for their reading strategy use prior to and during the instruction are contrasted in the following table 1.

Table 1: Scores about Reading strategies before and after training

	Pre -test	Post-test	Gaining percentage
Reading strategies	49.1	57.4	8.3%
Cognitive reading strategies	25.4	29.1	3.7%
Meta-cognitive reading strategies	23.7	28.4	4.7%

Table 1 shows that after receiving strategy training, students in the experimental group perform better on tests and apply their reading strategies—including both cognitive and metacognitive ones—more effectively than their counterparts in the control group, who did not get any instruction. For instance, students from the experimental group perform better in reading strategy utilization after training than they did before; their scores are $(57.4-49.1)/49.1=0.17$. When compared to their scores prior to the instruction, the experimental group's pupils' scores improved by 8.3 points, or 17%.

Table 2: Difference in English learning motivation

			Pre-test		Post-test		Gaining percentages
			Average sores	Standard Deviation	Average sores	Standard Deviation	
High-motivated students	Deep (integrated) motivation	CRS	25.8	6.5	31.2	6.9	20.9%
		MRS	25.8	8.0	31.5	7.9	22.1%
	Superficial		23.3	6.0	27.5	8.8	18.0%

	(instrumental) motivation	CRS					
		MRS	20.8	9.4	22.3	10.8	7.2%
Low-motivated students		CRS	26.4	5.7	27.8	5.4	5.3%
		MRS	23.4	5.6	27.6	5.0	17.9%

(CRS = cognitive reading strategies; MRS =meta-cognitive reading strategies ;)

Table 5 shows that among the three groups of students, the subgroup of students with strong deep motivation performs best in terms of strategy use. This finding can be used to explain why the standard deviation of strategy use in the experimental group increased. This is because pupils who have strong, deep motivation benefit more from strategy training.

Regarding the other two subgroups, it can be seen from table III that the cognitive strategy training is more significant with the group of students with prominent superficial motivation than with the students without prominent motivation; however, the students with prominent superficial motivation perform worse than the students without prominent motivations in the metacognitive training, meaning that the meta-cognitive strategy training is more significant with students. To support these conclusions, more research and testing are still required.

Future use& motivation

The participants also indicated that the methods motivated them to read and listen to more books as well as process of note-taking while interpreting simultaneously. The following quotation show how students developed positive attitudes towards audiobooks. “How I am a master of finding exact answers during my practice”. As the participants of this study studying at a teacher education program, two of the participants indicated their willingness to use these techniques in their teaching career in the future. As an English teacher, I will use it in the future. It is a very useful resource.” “When I become a teacher, I will use these kind of strategies in my reading classes.” Overall, the participants reported an increase in interest using methods as a learning and teaching tool in future.

Drawbacks

Almost all of the students stated positive ideas about both of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. However, there were two students who did not enjoy during the class. “Well, techniques and materials were fine. With these, we have improved reading and also listening. However, for me it was boring. I would prefer some audio books, dialogues and more actual practices.”

I still don’t like them. They are too long, and you cannot see its effect in a short time."

Conclusion

The training of 20 reading strategies, including both cognitive and meta-cognitive reading methods, is described in the current study. As a result, following the instruction, students' knowledge of the application of strategies has significantly increased. As explained above, learning strategy training increases students' awareness of the importance of using strategies.

Once students are aware of the value of a strategy, they will choose to use it freely without the guidance of teachers, which aids in the development of their capacity for self-monitoring and self-regulation. The program's outcomes validate and attest to the significance, necessity, and value of strategy training. Additionally, it has been discovered that pupils with strong motivation benefit more from strategy training.

As a result, it might depict the occlusion as follows. One way that strategy training can help students is by increasing their awareness of how they use strategies. However, because strategy training is such a complicated project and is linked to a variety of factors, including students' motivations, it must also be further researched, developed, and practiced.

The majority of students are seen using post-reading metacognitive reading strategies.

These results suggest that students typically assess the text after reading it and take charge of their comprehension. Students typically employ medium-level recall strategies, according to observation. Highlight critical information. The most common reading strategies are to imagine what was read. Take notes on the text and consider how you can apply what you have learned in real life are the least used metacognitive reading strategies.

Teaching students to think metacognitively about their reading should be the first step in developing effective comprehension instruction in the classroom. We can modify our instruction to shift from the conventional method of teaching comprehension to the metacognitive method in an era where demands on teachers are increasing. Our aim as educators should be to support students' metacognitive growth so they can critically and independently comprehend what they are reading. Professional development can be offered by literacy coaches and reading specialists to assist teachers in switching from the use of manuals and skill and drill workbooks to explicit metacognitive instruction. We have demonstrated that any reading series at any grade level can be used to develop metacognitive instruction.

We have demonstrated that metacognitive training can be developed using any reading program at any grade level. According to research, teaching from a metacognitive perspective not only aids in students' comprehension but also aids in their retention of what they read, which ultimately improves comprehension levels and raises student achievement levels.

References

1. Alderson, C. J., & Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of management*, 29(1), 99-118.
3. Amin, M. (2019). Developing reading skills through effective reading approaches. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 4(1), 35-40.
4. Anderson, R. C. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading*.
5. Baker, L., & Cerro, L. C. (2000). 3. Assessing Metacognition in Children and Adults. Ji, Kangli. 2002. *Foreign Language Learning and Metacognitive Strategy*

Training. Foreign language World

6. Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Routledge.
7. Cohen, Allen Carson. *Insect diets: science and technology*. CRC press, 1998.
8. Devana, T., & Agustina, A. (2019). Effect of screen text in improving students' reading rate and reading comprehension. *Jambi-English Language Teaching Journal*, 4(2), 1-79.
9. Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching reading*. Essex: Pearson Education.
10. Jacobs, J. E., & Paris, S. G. (1987). Children's metacognition about reading: Issues in definition, measurement, and instruction. *Educational psychologist*, 22(3-4), 255-278.
11. Liu, Y., & Feng, H. (2011). An Empirical Study on the Relationship between Metacognitive Strategies and Online-learning Behavior & Test Achievements. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 2(1).]. English Learning Strategy Training in China. Foreign language World, 6) : 20-26.
12. Mejang, A. (2004). The development of an English reading strategy instruction model based on collaborative learning principles for enhancing reading learning outcomes of university students. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand*.
13. Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and instruction*, 1(2), 117-175.
14. Pang, E. S., Muaka, A., Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Teaching reading* (Vol. 6). Brussels, Belgium: International Academy of Education..
15. Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language testing*, 20(1), 26-56.
16. Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language testing*, 20(1), 26-56.
17. Salataci, R., & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading.
18. Wang, Lifei & Wen, Qiufang. 2003. English Learning Strategy Training in China. Foreign language World,
19. Wenden, A. L. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. *System*, 27(4), 435-441.
20. Zabrocky, K., & Ratner, H. H. (1989). Effects of reading ability on children's comprehension evaluation and regulation. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 21(1), 69-83.
21. Zabrocky, K., & Ratner, H. H. (1992). Effects of passage type on comprehension monitoring and recall in good and poor readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 24(3), 373-391.