УДК 372:028.4(397) + 004.072.2:159.922

DOI 10.31483/r-105300

Мусема Аман

Джеремью Лему

ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ МЕЖДУ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕМ СТРАТЕГИИ ЧТЕНИЯ И ПРОДУКТИВНОСТЬЮ ЧТЕНИЯ У СТУДЕНТОВ

Аннотация*: цель исследования состояла в изучении взаимосвязи между использованием стратегий чтения и продуктивностью чтения между студентами с высоким и низким уровнем владения иностранным языком в университетах Эфиопии. С этой целью было отобрано шестьдесят учащихся (30 наиболее успевающих и 30 наименее успевающих) с использованием метода стратифицированной выборки. Было выявлено, что студенты использовали глобальные, проблемные и поддерживающие стратегии чтения. Глобальная стратегия характеризуется, например, действием: «Я просматриваю текст в целом, чтобы понять, о чем он, прежде чем читать его». Проблемная стратегия – «Я пытаюсь представить информацию, чтобы лучше запомнить прочитанное». Поддерживающая стратегия подразумевает использование вспомогательных средств при чтении, например, словарей. Вместе с этим был проведен тест на понимание прочитанного. Собранные данные были подвергнуты статистическому анализу с помощью описательной статистики, t-критерия независимых выборок и корреляции Пирсона. Результаты исследования показали, что существует взаимосвязь между использованием учащимися всех трех основных стратегий (т. е. глобальной, проблемной и поддерживающей) и продуктивностью их чтения. Чем больше студент использует разнообразных стратегий чтения, тем выше уровень понимания прочитанного. Основываясь на полученных данных, рекомендуется повысить осведомленность учащихся о существовании различных стратегий чтения, чтобы они чаще их использовали. Слабоуспевающим студентам рекомендуется чаще использовать стратегии чтения в целом и глобальную стратегию в частности.*

Ключевые слова*: стратегии чтения, глобальная стратегия чтения, проблемная стратегия чтения, поддерживающая стратегия чтения, продуктивность чтения.*

Musema Aman

Geremew Lemu

THE RELATION BETWEEN READING STRATEGY USE AND READING PERFORMANCE AMONG STUDENTS

Abstract*: the purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between the use of reading strategies and reading achievement between high and low EFL university students in Ethiopia. To this effect, sixty students were selected (30 top high achievers and 30 least low achievers) using stratified sampling technique. The Survey of Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension Test were employed to discover students' reading strategy use, and to measure their reading ability respectively. Thus, thirty reading strategies of the survey and fifty reading comprehension questions were administered to students. The data gathered was statistically analyzed through descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test and Pearson correlation. The findings of the study revealed that High achievers adopted a diverse and more reading strategies in higher frequency compared to low achievers. This difference between the groups was significant. The result also showed that there was a relationship between students' three main strategies use (i.e., global, problem-solving and support reading strategies and their reading achievement). Based on the findings, it was recommended to raise awareness to enhance students' use of various strategies at higher frequency and the low achievers must be encouraged to use the reading strategies more frequently in general and global reading strategies in particular.*

Keywords*: global, problem-solving and support reading strategies, correlational study and reading achievement.*

Мусема Аман

Джеремью Лему

СТУДЕНТСЕМ СУЙЛАСА ИЛНĔ ВУЛАВ СТРАТЕГИЙĔПЕ ВУЛАВ ПРОДУКТИВЛĂХĔН ÇЫХĂНĂВĔ

***Аннотаци**: тĕпчев тĕллевĕ – Эфиопи университечĕсенче тăван мар чĕлхене лайăх пĕлекен тата янăх пĕлекен студентсен ют чĕлхепе çырнă ĕççене вуланă чухнехи вулав стратегийĕпе вулав продуктивлăхĕ хушшинчи çыхăнăвне тĕпчесе пĕлесси. Çак тĕллевпе стратификациленĕ суйлав мелĕпе усă курса утмăл студента (30 чи лайăх вĕренекен тата 30 кая юлса пыракан) суйласа илнĕ. Студентсем пĕтĕмĕшле, проблемăллă тата пулăшуллă вулав стратегийĕсемпе усă курни палăрнă. Пĕтĕмĕшле стратеги, сăмахран, çакăн пек йĕркеленет: «Эпĕ текста пĕтĕмĕшле пăхса тухатăп, вăл мĕн çинчен пулнине вуличчен малтан ăнланас тетĕп». Проблемăллă стратеги: «Эпĕ вуласа тухнине лайăхрах астуса юлас тесе информацие ăсра ӳкеретĕп». Пулăшуллă стратеги вуланă чухне пулăшу хатĕрĕпе, сăмахран, словарьпе, усă курнине пĕлтерет. Çакăнпа пĕрлех вуланине мĕнле ăнланнине уçăмлатакан тест ирттернĕ. Пухнă даннăйсене сăнласа кăтартакан статистика пулăшнипе, t-критерипе ирĕклĕ суйласа илсе тата Пирсон корреляцийĕ пулăшнипе статистика анализĕ тунă. Тĕпчев результачĕсем виçĕ тĕп стратегипе (пĕтĕмĕшле, проблемăллă тата пулăшуллă вулав) усă курни тата студентсен вулавĕн тухăçлăхĕ пĕр-пĕринпе çыхăннине кăтартса панă. Студент вулавăн тĕрлĕ стратегийĕсемпе мĕн чухлĕ ытларах усă курать, вуланине çавăн чухлĕ лайăхрах ăнланать. Пухнă даннăйсене тĕпе хурса вуламалли тĕрлĕ стратеги пурри çинчен вĕренекенсен тĕплĕнрех каласа памалла, вĕсемпе час-часах усă курма сĕнмелле. Начар вĕренекен студентсене нумайрах вуламалли стратегипе, уйрăмах, пĕтĕмĕшле стратегипе усă курма сĕнеççĕ.*

***Тĕп сăмахсем:** вулав стратегийĕ, пĕтĕмĕшле вулав стратегийĕ, проблемăллă вулав стратегийĕ, пулăшуллă вулав стратегийĕ, вулав продуктивлăхĕ.*

Introduction

Reading is a basic need in the modern world of science and technology, and improving the quality of students' learning is not possible without the activity of reading. Thus, the ability to Read large amounts of academic text in a fast, efficient and effective manner is a critical skill for students. However, most EFL university students have not

yet mastered it; consequently, they are slow readers and they do not understand what they read (Trudell, 2019). In Ethiopia, many university students are unable to infer and catch the implied, and sometimes, stated meaning of a sentence. They have difficulties with the course and fall below the course material requirements.

The poor reading performance of the students may be due to different reasons. However, the researchers of this study feel that this could happen partly because these students have problems with using appropriate reading strategies which fit the nature of tasks and activities given. Reading strategies are a cognitive related factor, learners choose and use them to ameliorate reading comprehension (Bernhardt, 2011; Grabe, 2009). They are often considered as one of the major causes for the difference of the students' reading success.

However, only certain studies have been conducted concerning high and low achievers in terms of reading strategies use (i.e., Shang, 2018; Muijselaar, et al., 2017; Kim, 2016; Belilew, 2015; Huang & Nisbet, 2014). The area has thus received very little attention both in and outside Ethiopia. To address this problem at some degree, the ensuing research questions are formulated.

1. What reading strategies do high and low achievers employ when reading?

2. Is there any significant difference between the two groups in reading strategy use?

3. Is there any relationship between students' reading strategy use and their reading performance?

Material and Method

The study is descriptive correlational in design. It was conducted at Wollo University situated in the north East part of Ethiopia.

The participants were selected from Freshman students enrolled in the college of social science of the university in 2022 academic year. After the participants were divided into two groups according to the scores, they got from the reading exam, the top 30 students were designated as high-proficiency students while the bottom 30 students were designated as low-proficiency students using stratified sampling technique. A total of 60 students were included as a sample of this study. This sample size fits with suggestion of Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun, (2012 p. 103) who state that for correlational

studies, a sample of at least 50 is deemed necessary to establish the existence of a relationship.

The Instruments. The instrument used in this study was Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) of Sheorey and Mokhtari, (2002) to probe students' use of reading strategies. SORS comprises thirty items that are divided into three reading strategy categories namely: global, problem-solving and supporting reading strategies. Global reading strategy is referring to intentional techniques that help readers to prepare for their reading (e.g., setting purpose). Problem-solving describes actions and procedures that readers take when reading difficult parts of a text (e.g., guessing meaning). And support reading strategies are devices or techniques that support readers to understand a text (e.g., dictionary). The internal estimate reliability of the SORS instrument using Cronbach's coefficient alpha was.89, and it is suitable, consistent and valid for conducting this study.

The study also used reading comprehension test. The major aim of administering of the reading test was to determine students' reading comprehension level. The reading comprehension test comprises 50 questions each of which holds four choices.

Method of Data Analysis. In order to identify what FL reading strategies participants employed, SORS scores for each subscale were calculated by using scoring guidelines provided by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2002). First, students' responses to each item of the questionnaire were measured through 5-point, Likert-type scale. Second, students' responses to each of the three categories (i.e., global reading strategies, problem solving strategies and supportive reading strategies. along with their preference for each item was computed by mean and standard deviation in terms of their frequency distribution. Means and standard deviations were computed to determine the students' overall reading strategy use. These values showed the profile of learners as they are low, medium or high strategy users. These responses the students gave were indicators of the level of awareness they have towards reading strategies. Moreover, in measuring the students reading achievement, they were given the Reading Comprehension Test.

Then, the data (elicited through the questionnaire and test) were analyzed using different inferential statistical methods. Using SPSS 26 version, two main inferential

tests: an independent t-test and Pearson product moment correlation were run. The former was used to determine whether there were any differences between high and low proficiency level participants' use of reading strategies and the latter was run to determine the strength and direction of association between learners reading proficiency and reading strategies. To interpret the strength of the correlation, we used the guide suggested by Evans (1996). Accordingly, the closer the Pearson correlation (r) is to 1, the more significant is the correlation between the two variables. If it is closer to 0, it means that the two variables are insignificantly correlated.

Results and Discussions. To answer the first research question «What reading strategies do high and low achievers employ when reading?», analyzing data about the frequency of the strategy use employed by the group in Table 1 below is helpful.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on the Reading Strategy Use of High and Low Achiever Students

Таблица 1

Описательная статистика использования стратегий чтения студентов с высокой и низкой успеваемостью

	High Achievers		Low Achievers	
Strategies	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Global	3.98	0.708	1.987	0.899
Problem-solving	4.45	0.591	2.967	0.923
Support	3.41	1.085	2.533	1.007
Overall mean	3.93	0.904	2.41	1.023

As the overall mean result revealed that the high achievers reported to employ reading strategy in high usage (M = 3.93 SD = 0.904), whereas the low achievers claimed to use these strategies in low usage (M = 2.41 SD = 1.023). The former mean value indicates that the strategies were most frequently employed by the high achievers, and the latter mean value indicates that the strategies were used occasionally by low achievers. This implies that high achieving and low achieving students applied these strategies in their reading on a different frequency level.

Regarding the result of each category of reading strategies, problem-solving strategies were favored most by high achievers with a mean of (4.45 SD = 0.59) which fell in the high usage frequency. This denotes that high achievers were using the problem-solving reading strategies most frequently to settle their comprehension failure. They, however, reported to use support reading strategies least (with average of 3.41 SD = 1.08) which fell in medium usage indicating the participants were using the strategies sometimes.

Conversely, low achievers claimed to employ problem-solving reading strategies (with a mean of 2.97 SD = 0.92) most; that is, they employed these strategies with medium frequency scale. So that they employed these strategies sometimes. Yet, they reported to use global reading strategies with (M =1.99 SD = 0.89) least. This mean value of global strategy use is considered to be an indication of the students' low use of the strategy. Thus, the global reading strategies were underused by the majority of low achieving students. These students seemed like they lacked the opportunities they could obtain from using the global reading strategies when reading.

In response to the second research question which sought to find whether there was a significant difference in strategy use between high and low achievers, an independent samples t-test was executed. Table 2 below shows the result of an independent samples t-test.

Table 2

Independent Samples Test on Significance Difference on the use of Strategy by high and low achieving students

Таблица 2

Независимый выборочный тест на значимость различий в использовании стратегии студентами с высокими и низкими достижениями

Strategies	F	sig	T	DF	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	STD Error Difference
Global	.713	.402	22.732	58	.000	25.8667	1.1379
Problem-solving	1.447	.234	23.648	58	.000	11.8667	.5018
Support	1.702	.197	11.094	58	.000	7.8667	.7091
Total	2.773	.101	8.307	58	.000	1.5080	.1815

Notes: ** p <.01 (significant at.01 level)

As shown in the table above, the statistical significance value of global, problem-solving and support reading strategies is less than the significance p-value cutoff (0.000<0.05). This implies that there is a significant difference in using these three strategies among high and low achiever students. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is a relationship between students' strategy use and their reading achievements. This is because high achievers not only use these strategies more frequently, but also with significant difference than their counterparts.

In answering the third research question which sought to find whether there is significant relationship between students' reading strategy use and their reading achievement, a Pearson Product Moment correlation was run.

Table 3

Analysis of Correlation Among Reading Strategies Use
and Reading Comprehension Scores

Таблица 3

Анализ корреляции между использованием стратегий чтения
и оценками понимания прочитанного

Reading Strategy Variables	r	P
Global Reading Strategy	.945	.000
Problem-solving Reading Strategy	.895	.000
Support Reading Strategy	.754	.000
Total	.947	.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As data in Table 3 above depicts, there is strong positive relationship between each of the subjects' use of global, problem-solving or support reading strategies and their reading achievement with a correlation coefficient of (0.945, 0.895 and 0.754 respectively. The significance value of (0.00) for each is less than (0.01). This result shows that there is a positive relationship between each of students' use of global, problem-solving and support reading strategies and their reading scores. The more the global, problem-solving or support reading strategies the students use while reading,

their reading comprehension scores increases or vice versa. That is, the two variables move in the same direction, for they are positively related. One increases so does the other, and one decreases so does the other. In strength, however, reading achievement and global reading strategy use coefficient point is a little beat greater than the other two. So that the relationship between the reading achievement and their use of global reading strategy is a little bit stronger than the other two.

Discussions. As the overall mean results of the current study revealed, high and low achiever students reported to use EFL reading strategies with different degree of frequency. In addition to using most frequently, high achievers seem to adopt diverse and more of strategies in almost all the strategies than the low proficiency students. This finding is consistent with the result of other studies (Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001; Zhang, 2001). A possible explanation to the difference in reading behavior between high and low proficient students is associated with the fact that High achievers know the importance of the strategies, how to use them, and when they are best employed, which often is not the case with poor readers (Alexander and Jetton, 2000; Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2002).

The rationale why high achievers use only problem-solving and global strategies most frequently is that they pondered these strategies as key for reading comprehension. Such students, according to Mokhtari and Sheorey, (2008), are those who are globally conscious and who were able to think about the reading process.

As Problem-solving strategies relate to how to learning, they are more directly related to their specific learning tasks. Thus, the use of these strategies helps the high achievers to understand the linguistic input, get knowledge and settle their reading problems. The result is in line with the studies of Mokhtari and Reichard, (2002); Sheorey and Mokhtari, (2002) who reported that more successful readers adopted problem-solving reading strategies more often to simplify comprehension difficulty.

The reason why high-achievers adopt global or Metacognitive reading strategies more frequently than low achievers is that they come to reading materials already knowing how global reading strategies use to monitor their reading comprehension, how to organize their thoughts, analyze and evaluate the text faster of what they read, which they use to develop their efficiency in reading comprehension (Mokhtari and Sheorey,

2008). Particularly, in an EFL context, successful learners realize that it is their duty to employ global or metacognitive strategies than the other strategies because they may not have much exposure to the target language to get chance for picking up the target language consciously. This finding coincides with Para (2020) and Phakiti's (2003) who reported that successful readers use global reading strategies most in EFL context.

However, low achievers employ the global reading strategies at low level. These students are very poor in setting purpose, previewing, monitoring and evaluating … which Sheorey and Mokhtari, (2002) think them as useful to enhance students' reading performance. This significance is not, however, known by these students, for their teachers might not have taught them what these strategies are and how to use them according to their needs. Students who are not able to monitor comprehension during reading can constitute poor comprehension (phakiti, 2003). Hence, low achievers require practicing global or meta-cognitive reading strategies as frequently as possible in their reading classes, for these strategies are crucial in helping them improve their performance, particularly in problem-solving and successful language learning (Alexander et al., 2000).

Regarding the correlational result, students' problem-solving and global reading strategies showed a strong, positive relationship with their reading achievements. Many students assume problem solving strategies are of crucial importance to their language learning. They frequently use these strategies, and hence they are significantly related to their reading performance. According to Sheorey and Mokhtari, (2002) these strategies are closely connected to specific reading tasks and exert direct impact on comprehension. This finding is in agreement with results of Huang & Nisbet, (2014) and Madhumathi & Ghosh, (2012).

Moreover, since global reading strategies are advanced reading strategies that are often associated with skilled readers, the awareness and use of these strategies are hallmarks of good reading ability. So, it is very likely to see students' global strategies and their reading achievement are positively related. That is, the two variables move in the same direction. As the frequency of strategy use increases, the reading comprehension scores increase and vice versa. This finding is in agreement with Zhang and Seepho,

(2013) who discovered that students who chose using global or metacognitive strategies tended to score higher on the reading comprehension test.

Conclusion

This study has attempted to provide a picture of the strategies preferred by high and low achiever students in the Social Sciences at Wollo university in Ethiopia. The results revealed four major findings as follows.

First, it was found out that the frequency of using reading strategies used by high achievers outstripped low achievers in terms of global, problem-solving and support reading strategy use.

Second, the groups are significantly different in their use of reading strategies.

Third, the proficient students also have an enhanced metacognitive awareness of their own use of strategies, which in turn leads to greater reading ability and proficiency. Thus, it can be concluded that students who employed more strategies and use them as frequently as possible would show higher success in reading comprehension. And this finding has contributed to the growth of research in this area by confirming indeed that more proficient students use a wide range of strategies.

Fourth, reading strategies are positively correlated to reading achievements and the correlation is significant.

Recommendation. Based on the above conclusions the following recommendations were made:

− as reading strategy use leads into improved reading proficiency, it is of utmost importance for the language instructors to incorporate reading strategies into their teaching reading, investigate their students' reading techniques and attempt to realize and identify these strategies to support low achieving student to attain success and master the reading skills.

− moreover, although many researchers verified that less-proficient learners may benefit even more from the use of global reading strategies, low achievers in this study were not aware about these strategies. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers should raise awareness of these types of reading strategies by teaching why and how to apply them into reading tasks. The proposal of Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) in this

regard is of much help i.e., teachers should follow the following steps to teach the global strategies: «(a) describe what the strategy is, (2) explain why the strategy should be learned and used, and (c) provide examples of the circumstances under which the strategies should be used» (p. 6).

References

1. Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). *Learning from text: A multidimensional developmental perspective.* In Kamil, M. L., & Mosenthal, P. B., & Pearson, P. D., & Barr R. (Eds.) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

2. Belilew, M. (2015). The relationship between reading strategy use and reading comprehension among Ethiopian EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 3*(9), 34–41.

3. Bernhardt, E. B. (2011). *Understanding Advanced Second-Language Reading.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203852408

4. Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences.* Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

5. Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (Eds.). (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.).* McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

6. Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice.* Cambridge University Press.

7. Huang, J., & Nisbet, D. (2014). The relationship between reading proficiency and reading strategy use: A study of adult ESL learners. *Journal of Adult Education, 43*(2), 1–11.

8. Kim, H. (2016). The relationships between Korean university students' reading attitude, reading strategy use, and reading proficiency. *Reading Psychology, 37*(8), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2016.1193581.

9. Madhumathi, P., & Ghosh, A. (2012). Awareness of reading strategy use of Indian ESL students and the relationship with reading comprehension achievement. *English Language Teaching, 5*(12), 131–140. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n12p131

10. Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Assessing Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(2), 249–259.

11. Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL Students' Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education, 25*(3), 2–10.

12. Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (Eds.) (2008). *Reading Strategies of First and Second-Language Learners: See how they read.* Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.02.009

13. Muijselaar, M. M. L., Swart, N. M., Steenbeek-Planting, E. G., Droop, M., Verhoeven, L., & de Jong, P. F. (2017). Developmental relations between reading comprehension and reading strategies. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 21*(3), 194–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1278763.

14. Par, L. (2020). The Relationship between Reading Strategies and Reading Achievement of the EFL Students. *International Journal of Instruction, 13*(2), 223–238. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13216a

15. Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of problem-solving and global strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing, 20*(1), 26–56.

16. Shang, H. (2018). EFL medical students' metacognitive strategy use for hypertext reading comprehension. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 30*(2), 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528–017–9156-y.

17. Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System, 29*(4), 431–449.

18. Trudell, B. (2019). Reading in the classroom and society: An examination of «reading culture» in African contexts. *International Review of Education, 65*, 427–442.

19. Zhang, L. J. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. *Language Awareness, 10*(4), 268–288.

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

Список литературы

1. Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. Learning from text: A multidimensional developmental perspective. In Kamil, M. L., & Mosenthal, P. B., & Pearson, P. D., & Barr R. (Eds.) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. 2000.

2. Belilew, M. The relationship between reading strategy use and reading comprehension among Ethiopian EFL learners. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL). 2015. №3(9). P 34–41.

3. Bernhardt, E. B. Understanding Advanced Second-Language Reading. Routledge. 2011. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203852408

4. Evans, J. D. Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. 1996.

5. Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (Eds.). How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.). McGraw Hill Companies, Inc. 2012.

6. Grabe, W. Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice. Cambridge University Press. 2009.

7. Huang, J., & Nisbet, D. The relationship between reading proficiency and reading strategy use: A study of adult ESL learners. Journal of Adult Education. 2014. №43(2). P 1–11.

8. Kim, H. The relationships between Korean university students' reading attitude, reading strategy use, and reading proficiency. Reading Psychology. 2016. №37(8). P 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2016.1193581.

9. Madhumathi, P., & Ghosh, A. Awareness of reading strategy use of Indian ESL students and the relationship with reading comprehension achievement. English Language Teaching. 2012. №5(12). P 131–140. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n12p131

10. Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. Assessing Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. Journal of Educational Psychology. 2002. № 94(2). P 249–259.

11. Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. Measuring ESL Students' Aware-ness of Reading Strategies. Journal of Developmental Education. 2002. №25(3). P 2–10.

12. Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (Eds.) Reading Strategies of First and Second-Language Learners: See how they read. Christopher-Gordon Pub-lishers, Inc. 2008. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.02.009

13. Muijselaar, M. M. L., Swart, N. M., Steenbeek-Planting, E. G., Droop, M., Verhoeven, L., & de Jong, P. F. Developmental relations between reading comprehension and reading strategies. Scientific Studies of Reading. 2017. №21(3). P 194–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1278763.

14. Par, L. The Relationship between Reading Strategies and Read-ing Achievement of the EFL Students. International Journal of Instruction. 2020. №13(2). P 223–238. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13216a

15. Phakiti, A. A closer look at the relationship of problem-solving and global strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. Language Testing. 2003. №20(1). P 26–56.

16. Shang, H. EFL medical students' metacognitive strategy use for hypertext reading comprehension. Journal of Computing in Higher Education. 2018. №30(2). P 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528–017–9156-y.

17. Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. System. 2001. №29(4). P 431–449.

18. Trudell, B. Reading in the classroom and society: An examination of «reading culture» in African contexts. International Review of Education. 2019. №65. P 427–442.

19. Zhang, L. J. Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. Language Awareness. 2001. №10(4). P 268–288.

20. Zhang, L., & Seepho, S. Metacognitive strategy use and academic reading achievement: Insights from a Chinese context. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching. 2013. №10(1). P 54–69.

Мусема Аман – магистр, аспирант, Аддис-Абебский университет, Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопия

Джеремью Лему – д-р пед. наук, инструктор, Аддис-Абебский университет, Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопия

Musema Aman – master's degree, postgraduate student, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Geremew Lemu – doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, instructor, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Мусема Аман – магистр, аспирант, Аддис-Абеба университечӗ, Аддис-Абеба хули, Эфиопи.

Джеремью Лему – педагогика ăслăлăхĕн докторĕ, инструктор, Аддис-Абеба университечӗ, Аддис-Абеба хули, Эфиопи.