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INTRODUCTION

Reading is an active process where readers need to understand direct and indirect meaning of a reading passage. Karbalei (2010) proposes that to comprehend a reading passage, readers should be able to connect their background knowledge with their linguistic knowledge. This shows that in order to comprehend reading passages, readers must develop their reading skill. Grellet (1981) points out that developing reading skill not only help readers to improve their reading performance but also help readers to improve their language proficiency.

In developing the readers’ reading skill, they need to develop their reading strategies. If readers know strategies which suit to their learning style, it will bring them to be a successful reader. According to Ismail and Tawalbeh (2015), readers are required to apply effective reading strategies to improve their reading comprehension. Effective reading strategies help readers to understand content of reading passages.

However, it seems that students have not known how to develop their reading strategy. If they find difficulties in reading comprehension they tend to seek assistance from someone or other sources to help them to comprehend texts. Yet, this strategy seems ineffective because it requires more time. Phichard (2008) states that using dictionary is helpful for the low-achieving students in comprehending reading text, but she emphasized that the use of dictionary in reading classes can lead readers to have shallow interpretation because the reader will only focus on the part they read rather than comprehending the whole text. On the other hand, students who have developed their reading strategies usually tend to use their background information and make a hypothesis during the reading process. However, sometimes those students are not aware of their own reading strategies.

In language learning, there are so many reading strategies used by the students; one of them is metacognitive strategy. In this strategy, readers need to connect all of the information
such as background, cultural and linguistic information during the reading activity. McTavis (2008, 406) states “metacognition is the process of thinking about one’s own thinking.” This means that metacognition is an individual thinking process to comprehend direct and indirect ideas using our background knowledge, linguistic knowledge and other knowledge.

The research question of this study is “what kind of metacognitive strategy used by students in Academic writing class?” The context of the study is English Language Education Program of Satya Wacana Christian University students who have already took Academic writing course. This course was chosen as the context of the study because in this class the students were required to read academic text to develop their knowledge about academic paper. Therefore, in order to produce a good academic paper, it was important for the students to comprehend content and know structures of academic papers. Since the students’ comprehension in reading activity played important role in this course, this study was aimed to investigate on what kind of reading strategy applied by the students.

Through this research, it is hoped that the students and teachers will be aware of metacognitive reading strategy. The awareness of this strategy will improve the students’ comprehension in reading a text. Besides that, the teacher could also realize the importance of metacognitive reading strategy so they can motivate the students to use the strategy to support their learning process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Metacognition: thinking beyond thinking

Metacognition was first introduced by Flavell in 1976. Flavell (1976) as cited in Iwai (2011) defines metacognition as individual knowledge concerning in the individual cognitive process. This definition is similar with Zhang’s (2013) who states that metacognitive strategies are “regarded as high order executive skills that make use of knowledge of
cognitive processes and constitute an attempt to regulate ones’ own learning by means of planning, monitoring, and evaluating” (p. 55). Then Hatami and Moghaddam (2014) add that metacognition is people’s awareness of their knowledge about what they know and what they do not know. They also propose that metacognition is an ability in understanding, controlling and planning their cognitive process. Therefore, metacognition in here is defined as people awareness of the process of their thinking. It refers to the process of planning, understanding and monitoring their thoughts during process of thinking.

**The use of metacognitive strategy in reading**

Many researchers have defined metacognition as a higher level of individual thinking. In reading, metacognition strategy refers to the reading strategies which are planned to achieve the readers’ goal with considering individual prior knowledge (Zhang, 2013). Alsheikh (2011) points out that the use metacognitive activities such as planning, checking, evaluating, understanding, monitoring and reasoning are helpful for the learners to improve their reading comprehension. Ahmadi, Ismail, and Abdullah (2013) states that to develop metacognitive awareness in reading activity, the learners should not only focus on getting the ideas of a text, but also focus on designing effective reading strategy to grasp the information. Thus, metacognitive strategies are important in reading comprehension because it will assist the students to improve their reading comprehension. Zhang (2001) as cited in Iwai (2011) found out that advance learners tend to use metacognitive reading strategies to achieve their reading goal. Therefore, the use of metacognitive strategies is very important in developing students reading comprehension.

**Classification of metacognitive strategies**

Oxford (1990) classifies metacognitive strategy into three main classifications. Those strategies are centering your learning, arranging or planning your learning, and evaluating your learning.
1. Centering your learning

This classification focuses on how learners find important points of a text. This classification is divided into three strategies, which are:

a. Overviewing and Linking with already Known Material
   
   In this strategy, learners connect their existing knowledge and background information to comprehend the text.

b. Paying attention
   
   In this strategy, learners pay attention to information which is useful for achieving their reading goal.

c. Delaying speech production focus on listening
   
   This strategy is applied more in speaking and listening class. The idea of this strategy is students can develop their speaking skill through listening activities.

2. Arranging and planning your learning

This classification focuses on the strategies concerning on learning process, organizing, and setting learning goal.

a. Finding out about language learning
   
   This strategy focus on how learners look for the information that will help them to accomplish their task

b. Organizing
   
   In this strategy, learners set comfortable environment that will help them focus on comprehending the task.

c. Setting goals and objectives
   
   In this strategy, learners set their goal and objective when they do their task.

d. Identify the purpose of language task
Learners need to identify the aim of the task so they are able to accomplish their task.

e. Planning for language task

In this strategy, learners predict what kind of task that may occur in the future and plan strategies to accomplish their prediction tasks.

f. Seeking practice opportunities

This strategy usually used in writing and speaking activity. In this strategy, learners were required to practice their language skill to improve their language ability.

3. Evaluating your learning

a. Self-monitoring

This strategy is a strategy in which learners focus on monitoring their performance in doing the task.

b. Self-evaluation

Through this strategy, learners evaluate their progress in language learning.


1. Planning

Planning in metacognitive strategy refers to strategy which happens before the main reading. This strategy focuses on planning the learning strategy and setting goal of language learning. In this strategy there are four categories which are Advance Organizer, Organizational Planning, Selective Attention and Self-management.
2. Monitoring

Strategies included in this monitoring category are strategies which are used in the process of learning. In this strategy, the learners need to check and try to understand the content of the task. The strategies included in this classification are Comprehend Monitoring, and Produce Monitoring.

3. Evaluation

Evaluation is classification of strategies which are applied after doing the main learning activity. In this strategy, learners tries to evaluate and asses themselves in doing their task. The strategies included in this classification are Self-assessment, Self-evaluation, and Self-reflection.

Comparing both of classification, Oxford’s (1990) and O’Malley’s and Chamot’s (1990) classifications are actually sharing almost the same idea. Vlcova, Berger and Volke (2013) points out that both of the classification has similar idea. However, in the Oxford’s (1990) classification it looks more focus on strategies in comprehending tasks. This is different with O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification which focus on the strategy used during learning processes. According to Zhang and Seepho (2013), Chamot and O’Malley’s (1990) classification allowed the students to comprehend their task in more systematic way. Since this research will discuss about what kind of metacognitive strategies which were applied by the students in the process of learning. This research focuses on the Chamot and O’Malley’s (1990) classification.

Result from previous studies

Ismail and Tawalbeh (2015) found that metacognitive strategy helped the students to improve their English language reading comprehension. This finding was found through comparing two groups of low-achieving EFL students. One of the groups was a control group where the students only practiced reading comprehension without being introduced to reading
strategies. On the other hand, another group was an experimental group which was introduced to metacognitive reading strategies. The result of the experiment showed that the experimental group was more aware of the reading strategy and was able to plan their reading strategy during the reading session. A similar finding was also presented by Zhang and Wu (2013) who discovered that the students’ reading strategies were positively correlated to the EFL students’ achievement in reading comprehension.

Another research that investigated metacognitive strategy was the research by Nguyen and Trinh (2011) who found that high achieving EFL students were good at planning and providing themselves with possible aids to increase their understanding. This research also found that low-achieving EFL students tend to use monitoring strategy but not as often as the high-achieving students.

THE STUDY

The context of the study

This study took place in the Academic Writing course of the English Language Education Program of Satya Wacana Christian University. There were five classes of this course with four different lecturers. This course was intended to prepare the students to produce a good academic paper. In this class, the students practiced to write academic papers. Besides writing the academic papers, the students were also required to read some journal articles to learn more about academic essays. Through this reading activity, it was hoped that the students would know how organize an academic text and how to deliver their ideas into an academic text.

Participants

The total participants in this research were 60 students of English Language Education Program who took academic writing this semester. The participants were from
batch 2014. Most of the participants stated that the English text that they usually read was stories or novel, news and course material. Most of them were reported to spent approximately 5 -8 hours per week to read. In the table below the demographic information of the participants will be presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>&gt;20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the age and the gender, the demographic information also reveals that most of the students had started to learn English since primary school. There were 50 students who stated that they learned English for the first time in the primary school and there were 8 participants who stated that they started learning English during their kindergarten. There were also 2 participants who started learning English when they entered Junior High school. This shows that most of the participants have similar periods of learning English.

**Instrument**

This research tried to answer the research question “what kind of metacognitive study that is used by Academic writing students? For answering that question, this research decided to use Metacognitive Strategy Questionnaire (MSQ) to gather the data. The questionnaire was adapted from Zhang and Seepho (2013) because this questionnaire interpreted Chamot and O’Malleys’ classification of metacognitive strategy in more systematic way. The question also presented detailed strategies which the students probably used. The questionnaire were likert-scale questionnaire with five answers but for gathering the data this research used four answers which were never, rarely, frequently, and always. Zang and Seepho’s (2013) questionnaire consists of 40 question items but I decided to only used 25 items of question which dealing with metacognitive strategies that probably used by the participants of this
study. The items 1-7 were classified as planning strategy. Items 8-17 were classified into monitoring strategy and item 18-25 were classified into evaluating strategy.

**Data Collection Procedures**

For the first step of gathering the data, I selected the question items of the questionnaire and simplify the language so the participants understand all of the questions. Then, to validate and to ensure the entire question items were understood by the participants, I did piloting with 14 participants in one of academic writing class. Then, I checked the participants’ answers of the questionnaire. The result of the piloting showed that most of the participants understood all of the question items. However there were two participants who did not give their answer to one of the question item. The question item was “I could come up with list of reading strategies, I would probably use.” To make the students have better understanding to this question. I decided to put example of reading strategies so the students can understand the question. Besides that I also decided to clarify the demographic information asking about the participants’ period of learning English. Some of piloting participants were confused weather it asked about the period learning English in the Faculty Language and Literature or the whole period they study English. To clarify this question I changed it into a question which asked how long they study English. After revising the questionnaire I went to four different classes to distribute the questionnaire.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

After distributing the questionnaire, the data were transferred into Microsoft Excel. Then, I counted the percentages of the participants’ answers to know the majority of the participants answer. After counting the percentages, each question items was categorized into Chamot and O’Malley’s (1990) classifications. Next, the data was interpreted according the classification to discover what kind of metacognitive strategies used by the students of Academic Writing Class.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-reading strategies: Planning

Planning is a category for strategies which are applied before the reading activity. There are four strategies which belong to this category. The First one was Advance Organizer which focuses on determining nature of reading tasks and setting reading goals for target tasks (Chamot and O’Malley’s, 1990). Figure 1 displayed students’ responses to two questionnaire items aimed to investigate on their use of Advance Organizer strategies (statement 1: I use my background knowledge to get general idea 2: I tried to predict the content of the text from title).

![Advance Organizer](image)

The majority of the participants, 88%, were shown to frequently or always apply strategies conveyed by statement 1. This finding reveals that the students had a positive attitude toward this statement. Alyousef (2005) proposed that background knowledge helps readers to comprehend information in a text. Hajikata, Nakatami, and Shimizu (2013) also points out that activating background information related to text’s topic would help readers to
grasp the information. Therefore, applying the background information to get general idea will be helpful to the reader to understand the content of the text.

Similar to statement 1, students responded positively to statement 2. Figure 1 demonstrate that most students, 88%, were frequently and always use strategy delivered by statement 2. According to Mistar, Zuhaire and Yanti (2016), prediction made the reading process become more active because the reader will constantly predict and check their prediction when they read reading materials. Therefore, predicting content from title will make readers read every passage of a text carefully to confirm their prediction.

The second category of planning strategy was Organizational Planning. This strategy focuses on how participants planning their reading strategy which will support their reading activity (Zhang & Seepho, 2013). Figure 2, shows students’ responses to two question items aimed to investigate the use of Organizational Planning strategies (statement 3 and statement 4).

![Organizational Planning](image)

As shown in Figure 2, there were 50% participants who frequently and 18% participants who always apply strategies conveyed by statement 3. The question of this item is “I could come up with list of reading strategies I would probably use.” Figure 2 also
reveals that as many as 73% participants responded positively toward statement 4 which asked “I read the text quickly first and focus on what I will read.”

The result of the finding indicates that participants are aware of Organizational Planning strategies. This finding has different result compare to Zhang and Seepho’s (2013) research which found that participants of their research did not apply Organizational Planning strategies. Zhang and Seepho (2013) point out that the participants avoided Organizational Planning strategy because the students were not aware and familiar with this strategy.

The third category of the planning stage was Selective Attention. In this category, the participants select appropriate strategies which support their goal in reading activity (Chamot and O’Malley’s, 1990). Figure 3 shows students’ responses to two questionnaire items aimed to investigate on their use of selective attention strategies (statement 5 and statement 6).

The majority of the participants, 66%, were shown to apply reading strategies conveyed by statement 5 “I determined the major points I would pay attention to, such as the headings and sub-headings, the topic sentence, and text structure”. Through this strategy, the students can comprehend their reading task easily. According to Ahmadi, Ismail and
Abdullah (2013), with paying attention to important points in a text, students can construct their own meaning of the text so they can comprehend the ideas of text.

Unlike statement 5, Most of the students responded negatively to statement 6 “I recalled my weak points in reading comprehension and tried to comprehend when reading began.” Figure 3 shows that as many as 62% students rarely use this strategy. Farell (2012) proposes that it is important for readers to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses to improve their reading performance. This finding shows that the participants did not seem to reflect on their difficulties in their previous reading activity to help them improve their reading activity.

The last category in this stage was self-management. Chamot and O’Malley (1990) define self-management as strategy which focuses on judging whether the reading strategies were able to help the students achieve their goal or not. Figure 4 demonstrate participants’ responses to one questionnaire items asking about the use of Self-management strategies (statement 7: “I planned before I read because I think it was helpful”).

![Self-Management](image)

**Figure 4**

The questionnaire responses showed that there were 65% participants who rarely used strategies conveyed in statements 7. There were also 13% participants who reported to never
plan their reading strategy. This result indicates that planning strategies for reading were rarely used by participants.

Finding of this research showed that although most of the students were aware of metacognitive reading strategy. Most of them think did not need to apply self-assessment strategy because they seemed to think that this strategy did not give significant impact to their reading performance. Vlcvova, Berger and Vokle (2013) stated that main idea of metacognitive awareness was self-control. Therefore, controlling our own reading strategy was important to achieve our reading goal.

**Whilst Reading Strategy: Monitoring**

Monitoring was category which is applied while participants or readers do their reading activity. There were two categories of strategies belong to this strategy. The first strategy was Comprehension Monitoring. Chamot and O’Malley (1990) stated that this strategy related to the participants strategies to monitor or check their reading comprehension during reading activity. Figure 5 shows students’ responses to 8 questionnaire items which are used to check students’ response toward comprehension monitoring strategies (statement 8 – statement 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 I first read the general ideas of the text</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I paid selective attention to the information predicted and required in the task</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I verified my interference of the previous paragraph and predicted what would come in the next paragraph</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I could find ways to overcome the problems when I got stuck with difficult vocabulary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I could find ways to concentrate on my reading even when there were many distractions around me.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I kept reading even I had difficulty and constantly checked my understanding of the text.  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I translated sentence by sentence while reading.  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I focused on one specific goal at a time. For example, first I concerned with the general ideas of the text. Next, I read for the key words or implied meaning of the sentences  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in figure 5, most of questionnaire responses for Comprehension Monitoring were reported to have similar result. Figure 5 demonstrate that more than 60% participants responded positively to statement 8 “I first read the general ideas of the text,” statement 9 “I paid selective attention to the information predicted and required in the task,” statement 10 “I paid selective attention to the information predicted and required in the task,” statement 11 “I verified my interference of the previous paragraph and predicted what would come in the next paragraph,” statement 13 “I could find ways to concentrate on my reading even when there were many distractions around me,” and statement 15 “I could find ways to concentrate on my reading even when there were many distractions around me.” In other words, most of the participants reported to apply Comprehension Monitoring strategies. According to Ghafournia and Afgani (2013) the monitoring strategy refers to the readers’ ability to monitor their comprehension and performance during the reading process. Zhang and Seepho (2013) states the students or reading with lower proficiency is unable monitor their own reading performance because lack of linguistic knowledge will make the students have poor metacognitive awareness. Similar finding is also delivered by Nguyen and Trinh (2011) who discover that low-achieving readers did not have enough metacognitive knowledge and it made them face difficulties in applying the monitoring strategy during the reading activity.
Though most of the questions for this strategy show similar results, there were also questions that have different responses. Figure 5 shows that only 50% of the participants respond positively toward statement 12 “I could find ways to overcome the problems when I got stuck with difficult vocabulary.” This indicates that the half of the participants were still able to focus on the reading comprehension though there were distraction around them. According to Oxford (1990), readers should set comfortable environment so they can concentrate to their reading activity. The students who are able to find their way to focus on reading activities show that they can overcome distractor around them easily.

The next item which has a different result is statement 14, which asked about translating strategy in reading. As many as 64% participants claimed that they rarely translate sentence by sentence during their reading activity. This shows that this strategy has been left by the students. Liao (2006) states that though translation strategies can facilitate the students to comprehend the learning strategy, more proficient readers responded negatively toward this strategy because the students thought that the use of translating strategy will infer their English comprehension.

The second category in this stage was Production Monitoring. This strategy focuses on monitoring reading comprehension to check readers understanding toward reading materials. Figure 6 shows students’ responses to two questionnaire items which aimed to investigate on their use of production monitoring (statement 16 and statement 17).
The majority of the participants, 78%, were reported to respond positively to statement 16 “I considered whether I understood the beginning and the ending of the text correctly.” This indicates that most participants check their understanding toward the text. Figure 6 also shows that there were 55% who responded positively to statement 17 “I could choose appropriate reading strategies to solve my immediate reading problems.” Though most of the participants responded positively to statement 17, 45% participants responded negatively to this statement. This indicates that there were still a lot of participants who are not aware to this strategy.

According to Chamot and O’Malley (1990), the idea of production monitoring refers to the monitoring process before starting to produce something. Students need to comprehend their reading task in order to re-produce their reading text as a source. The purpose of this stage is also to check whether strategies learned by students are useful to produce a certain text or not. Therefore, it is important to familiarize students with Production Monitoring strategy, because through this strategy helps students to transfer their reading information to produce new materials.
**Post reading strategy: Evaluating**

Evaluating is post reading activity where readers evaluate their own reading performance. This stage is divided into three different categories. The first category for this stage is Self-Assessment. In this category, participants assess themselves whether they have accomplished their reading goal or not (Zhang and Seepho, 2013). The finding of the self-assessment strategy can be seen through figure 7.

**Figure 7**

Figure 7 shows students’ responses to two questionnaire items aimed to investigate on their use of Self-assessment strategies (statement 18- statement 20). 55% participants responded positively to statement 18 “I checked to see if my reading strategies were helpful for the text comprehension.” This finding reveals that the majority of the participants assess whether their reading strategies are helpful or not. Similar with statement 18, statement 19 “I enjoyed discussing with my classmates for the difficult points and exchanging the reading experience to get a more effective reading method to achieve my goal” also receive positive responses from the participants. Figure 7 shows that most participants, 68%, frequently or always discuss their difficulties to their classmate. Unlike other strategy, the third strategy of this category gets more negative responses from most participants. 60% of them are reported to rarely or never use the strategies delivered by statement 20 “I used my own reading plan for judging how well I read.”
From the data finding, it can be seen that most of the participants seemed to be aware of the need to assess themselves to improve their reading performance. Baniabdelrahman (2010) states that self-assessment helps the students to be aware of their performance. The students who are aware of their reading performance can motivate themselves to set higher goal to improve their performance when do other task.

The next evaluation category is Self-evaluation. In this category, the participants are asked to evaluate their reading strategy and reading performance (Zhang & Seepho, 2013). Figure 8 shows students’ responses to two questionnaire items which were aimed to investigate on their use of Self-evaluation strategies (statement 21 and statement 22).

![Self-evaluation](image)

**Figure 8**

The majority of the students, 57%, were shown to give negative responses to statement 21 “I referred to the reading goal to evaluate if I achieve it.” This finding indicates that the students do not seem to reflect on their reading goal to ensure that they have achieved all of their reading goals. On the other hand, 57% participants were reported to set higher goal and reflect on their strengths and weakness after doing the reading activity. This reveals that the majority of the students respond positively toward statement 22 “I set a higher reading goal such as comprehension level for next time based on what worked best this time and what I think I should keep or change.”
The finding shows that there is only little gap between students who apply strategies and students who do not apply strategies conveyed by the statements. Zhang and Sheepho (2013) state that for some of EFL students, self-evaluating is unfamiliar because they believe only teachers who have authority to evaluate their performance. The data finding which shows little gap indicates that participants start aware of self-evaluation. Yet, they seem hesitated to apply this strategy because of their belief.

The last strategy of evaluating category is self-reflection. In this strategy, the participants reflect on challenges in the reading process. Figure 9 demonstrates students’ responses to three questionnaire items which asked about self-reflection strategies (statement 23, statement 24 and statement 25.)

The majority of the students, 60%, were shown give negative responses to statement 23 “I spent time to motivate myself to improve the reading even I found that I do a poor job.” This finding reveals that the students might not motivate themselves to improve their reading performance. Most students 60% also did not give positive reaction to statement 24 “I spent time reflecting on my reading performance.” This shows that students did not seem spend their time to reflect to their reading performance. The last statement of this category also did not receive positive responses from most participants. There were 61% participants who
reported to rarely and frequently use the strategy conveyed by statement 25 “I recalled and summarized the reading strategies to see what might I keep or change to make an improvement on my reading next time.”

Referring to Zhang and Seepho (2013), self-reflection strategy has strong relation with the students’ cultural background. The result of the data which shows that most of the students rarely used self-reflection indicates that students might not familiar with this strategy. Therefore, teachers should encourage students to do self-reflection after finishing their reading activity.

**CONCLUSION**

The aim of the study is to investigate the use of metacognitive strategies in Academic Writing course. This research found that most of the planning strategies were applied by the majority of the participants. In this category, there were two strategies which were less used. Those strategies were recalling their past weaknesses of their reading activity and planning reading strategy to help their reading activity. Through this study, it was found out that students still lacked awareness of reflecting to their past mistake so it seems difficult for them to plan strategies to improve their reading performance. This study also reveals that the majority of the participants did not seem to realize the importance of planning their reading strategy to improve their reading comprehension.

The second finding shows that most of the monitoring strategies were applied by the participants. In this study, there were two strategies which were less used by the participants. One of those strategies was translating strategy which helped the students to monitor their understanding toward the reading text. However, it seems to take more time to use this strategy so this strategy was not applied by students in their reading activity. Besides that strategy, there were 50% participants who stated that they could not find ways if there were too many distractions around them.
The third finding showed that the participants responded negatively to the evaluation strategy. In this category, the participants only showed positive reaction on three questions items. The first items asked whether the students can find the strategies to keep focus in their reading activity even though they have many distractions. The second one asked whether the participants discuss their reading material with their friends. The last one asked about the participants’ reflection toward their goal.

From the result of the study, it can be concluded that the planning and monitoring strategies had already received attention from the participants though not all the strategies were applied by them. On the other hand, the evaluating strategies were less used. Therefore the implication of the study showed that the teacher should introduce the students how to evaluate themselves in the reading activity. Through self-assessment, self-evaluation and self-reflection, the students can know their progress in comprehending a text. Besides that, the students also can improve their reading performance. To introduce evaluation strategies to the students, the teachers can guide students with giving some question that require the students to reflect on their reading activity. Questions like “what can you learn from the text?” or just asking about their opinion about the material they read will encourage students to reflect to their reading performance weather they have already comprehend the reading material or not.

The result and finding of this study cannot be generalized, because this research only held on a particular context which is the Academic Writing class. Moreover the participants were less than 100 participants. For further research, the study can used more participants and the future researcher can add more instruments like semi-structured interview to find out the reason of why they used or did not use certain strategy. Through the semi-structured interview, it can also help the researcher to find weather the metacognitive reading strategy were helpful or not.
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Appendix: the instrument of the research

### Before I started reading an English text, …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>content</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I used my background knowledge to get general idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I tried to predict the content of the text from title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I could come up with list of reading strategies I would probably use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(skimming: look up important information in a text; scanning: read the text quickly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I read the text quickly first and focus on what I will read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I determined the major points I would pay attention to, such as the headings and sub-headings, the topic sentence, and text structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I recalled my weak points in reading comprehension and tried to comprehend when reading began</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I planned before I read because I think it was helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### While reading an English text,…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>content</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I first read the general ideas of the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I paid selective attention to the information predicted and required in the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I verified my interference of the previous paragraph and predicted what would come in the next paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I could find ways to overcome the problems when I got stuck with difficult vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I could find ways to concentrate on my reading even when there were many distractions around me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I kept reading even I had difficulty and constantly checked my understanding of the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I translated sentence by sentence while reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I focused on one specific goal at a time. For example, first I concerned with the general ideas of the text. Next, I read for the key words or implied meaning of the sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I considered whether I understood the beginning and the ending of the text correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I could choose appropriate reading strategies to solve my immediate reading problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After reading an English text, ...*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I checked to see if my reading strategies were helpful for the text comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I enjoyed discussing with my classmates for the difficult points and exchanging the reading experience to get a more effective reading method to achieve my goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I used my own reading plan for judging how well I read.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I referred to the reading goal to evaluate if I achieve it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I set a higher reading goal such as comprehension level for next time based on what worked best this time and what I think I should keep or change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I spent time to motivate myself to improve the reading even I found that I do a poor job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I spent time reflecting on my reading performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I recalled and summarized the reading strategies to see what might I keep or change to make an improvement on my reading next time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>