The metacognitive reading strategy awareness of KET, PET, & FCE of Waha Oil Company employees in Libya, Spring 2018.

Bashir Ghit Mahfoud

Technical College of Civil Aviation & Meteorology, Tripoli, Libya.

Bashir_mahfouz79@yahoo.com

الملخص

كان الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو التعرف على درجة الوعي باستراتيجيات القراءة ما وراء المعرفية لموظفي شركة الواحة الليبية الذين كانوا يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كجزء من تدريبهم أثناء العمل في ربيع عام 2018. مجموعه من 45 موظفا من ثلاث مجموعات مختلفة في KET، PET & FCEاستجابوا لاستبيان من 21 بند من استراتيجيات القراءة. تم تصنيف الاستراتيجيات إلى أربع فئات: التخطيط والتقييم ، والاهتمام المباشر ، والدعم ، وحل المشكلات. أظهرت النتائج أن المجموعات الثلاث أفادت باستخدام فئات الاستراتيجيات الأربع على مستويات تردد مختلفة. اتضح ان مجموعة FCEاستخدمت الفئات الأربع من استراتيجيات القراءة على مستوى التردد العالي. اتضح ايضا ان المجموعات PET & KET قد استخدمت 4 فئات من الاستراتيجيات على مستوى التردد المتوسط. ايض اظهرت الدراسة بوجود علاقة بين الوعي باستراتيجيات القراءة والتأثير الرئيسي لإتقان المتعلمين عبر المجموعات الثلاث. تفوقت المجموعة المتوسطة العليا FCEعلى مجموعة PETالمتوسطة و KETقبل المتوسط في الاستخدام العام للفئات الأربع من استراتيجيات القراءة. وفقا لمجموعتي PET & KET، تبين أن استراتيجيات التخطيط والتقييم هي الأقل استخدامًا. اظهرت الدراسة ان استراتيجيات الانتباه والدعم المقدمة هي الأقل استخدامًا بين مجموعات FCE. هذا يشير إلى أنه كلما زاد وعيهم باستراتيجيات القراءة ، كانت قدراتهم في القراءة أفضل وفق طرق البحث المستخدمة في هذه الدراسة (الاستبيان و امتحان القراءة).

الكلمات الدلالية: KET، PET، FCE، CAE، CPE، استراتيجيات ما وراء المعرفة ، والقراءة.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of awareness of metacognitive reading strategies of the Libyan Waha Oil Company's employees who were doing English courses as part of their on-job training in Spring 2018. A total of 45 employees of three different proficiency groups in KET, PET & FCE responded to a 21 item questionnaire of reading strategies. The strategies were classified into 4 categories: planning & evaluation, directed attention, support, and problem- solving . The findings showed that the three groups reported using the 4 categories of strategies at different frequency levels. The FCE group were found to use the 4 categories of reading strategies at a high frequency level. The PET & KET groups were reported using the 4 categories of strategies at a medium frequency level. Both the relationship between the awareness of reading strategies and the main effect for learners' proficiency were established across the three groups. The FCE upper-intermediate group outperformed the PET intermediate group and the KET pre-intermediate in the overall use of the 4categories of reading strategies. According to the PET & KET groups, planning & evaluation strategies were found to be the least often used. Directed attention and Support strategies tended to be the least often used among the FCE groups. This suggests that the higher their awareness of reading strategies, the better their reading ability/proficiency was, according to the two data collection tools used in this study (questionnaire and reading test).

Key words: KET, PET, FCE,CAE, CPE, metacognitive, reading strategies

Background information

Waha Oil Company is a Libyan-American company and is one of the biggest exporting producers in North Africa. The training & development department is one of several other departments in

Waha Oil Company. It recruits language teachers from all over the world. The language education & training program adopted is based on the Cambridge ESOL examination framework which is graded according to the proficiency of language learners into eight levels: Starters, Beginners, Elementary, Pre-intermediate KET, Intermediate, PET, Upper-intermediate FCE, Advanced CAE, & the Proficiency level CPE. These courses are given to Waha employees as part of their on-job training. The main purpose of this language training is to develop the companies' employees in order to give presentations in English, to communicate with native speakers in English and to prepare the employees for overseas university entrance examinations for further education & overseas training. Waha oil company is a multi-national one where all the company transactions and its intra-correspondence operate in English. Also, the Cambridge curriculum employed at Waha is used to develop the employees' ability to use English in an exchange of information, to express ideas about work and education, social life. Although, there are many learning aims of the application of this Cambridge curriculum, yet, the employees' reading skills received some attention in this Cambridge program employed by Waha. In other words, based on the reading exam statements of results obtained, the researcher found that the Libyan employees' proficiency in the reading test has always been very low comparing with other language skills. This problem, according to the researcher, might be attributed to the employees' lack of reading strategy awareness. Thus, this research study will mainly investigate the awareness of reading strategies among KET, PET, & FCE learners as to why it is most difficult skill to be learned.

1. Introduction

Research in reading has not been given enough attention especially with regard to EFL readers' meta-cognitive knowledge of how they conceptualise their learning strategies when they read. The

reading process goes beyond understanding words, sentences or even long chunks of texts. It is a complex process in which learners attempt to make sense of what they read by employing their cognitive and meta-cognitive processes involving language proficiency, prior knowledge, and meta-cognitive strategies (i.e. strategies that involve knowledge about cognition and self-regulation).According to (Brown, 1983) these strategies are deliberate actions that direct readers how to comprehend a text, what clues they should use, and what strategies they should adopt when they don't understand.

Researchers have begun to recognize the significant role of meta-cognitive awareness in reading comprehension. For instance (Alderson, 1984) argues that the importance of reading for second language acquisition has been widely acknowledged, and that the use of reading strategies has been viewed as being conducive to successful reading comprehension proficiency in spite of the complex nature of the reading process, which involves both the L2 reader's language ability and reading ability. Thus, the researcher's understanding of reading strategies has been influenced significantly by research on what expert readers do. Many studies have revealed that successful comprehension does not occur automatically in a vacuum. Rather, as (Baker & Brown, 1984) put it, it depends on directed cognitive effort, referred to as meta-cognitive processing, which consists of knowledge about and regulation of cognitive processing. However, Carrell, (1989) also points out that good readers generally show a higher degree of meta-cognitive awareness, which enables them to use reading strategies more effectively and efficiently than their poor peers.

However, while learners' meta-cognitive awareness in reading has been recognized in the current literature to be critical to successful L2 reading, there are almost no research studies in this area that

have been conducted in the context of Arab learners of English, particularly in the vocational context. Moreover, there is a consensus view among researchers that strategic awareness and monitoring of the comprehension process are critically important aspects of successful reading. Such awareness and monitoring is often referred to in the literature as meta-cognition.

Most of the research in the reading strategies of second language learners has been conducted on students at low levels of language proficiency or those studying at the secondary school level or in the academic university contexts, where almost no research up to the researcher's knowledge, has dealt with students in the vocational context.

Cohen (1998) points out that the contexts of the learning situation may have a strong influence on learners' choice of language learning strategies. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill the gap by assessing the meta-cognitive awareness of Libyan FCE, PET, KET students and their perceived use of reading strategies through a questionnaire survey, and reading comprehension tests while they are engaged in reading English materials (e.g., textbooks, exam papers, and supplementary readings in stories, newspapers and magazines).

However, up to the researcher's knowledge, the present study is one of the first studies on using a survey questionnaire as well as standardised reading comprehension tests for assessing the degree of awareness of meta-cognitive reading strategies of Arab learners of English. The significance of this study springs from the fact that research literature on Arab readers' meta-cognition is almost rare, since the literature that the researcher reviewed which covered a wide range of articles, didn't include any research that deals will reading comprehension and meta-cognition in the Libyan Arab

context, particularly, the vocational context. Hopefully, this study will contribute to the understanding of L2 reading and provide new insights into the way Arab learners process language to direct and promote their reading comprehension.

Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to investigate the degree of the learners' awareness of reading strategies and to find out if there are any differences in their meta-cognitive reading strategies employed by the three different levels of learners, and whether or not there is a relationship between learners' responses on the instrument and their L2 reading comprehension proficiency (achievement), and to develop an assessment tool for measuring learners' use of meta-cognitive strategies for reading comprehension studying at the vocational level. This study will attempt to answer all the following research questions.

Research questions:

1.What are the most favoured reading strategies among KET, PET, and FCE learners, and how frequently are they used?

2. Are there any differences between the **KET**, **PET**, and **FCE** learners in their awareness of meta-cognitive reading strategies they employ?

3. Is there any relationship between learners' reported strategy use and their reading comprehension ability among KET, PET, and FCE groups?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical framework of meta-cognition

Over the past two decades, the study of meta-cognition has been the focus of recent investigations and an increasingly interesting topic of discussion in the area of language learning among linguists, theorists, researches, educators etc. According to

(Brown, 1983) the concept of meta-cognition is complicated and its definition is multifarious, and there is no clear cut definition of the term.
Meta-cognition is the knowledge or cognition and understanding, control and appropriate application of that knowledge to a given task. It involves both conscious awareness and conscious control of one's learning. In other words, it is the ability to observe one-self applying certain knowledge to a certain task.

Another definition of meta-cognition with a more detailed specification is offered by , (Flavell, 1987), who defined it as one's ability to reflect upon, understand, and control one's learning and manipulate his/her own cognitive processes to maximize learning. He also adds that Meta-cognition is part and parcel of cognitive development, and is both a product and producer of the latter. It enables learners to engage actively in regulating and controlling their own learning.

While meta-cognitive knowledge as is very awareness-focused, meta-cognitive regulation is procedural and executive in nature, working on the basis of the meta-cognitive knowledge and referring to a person's management of his cognitive processes to ensure the achievement of learning goals. This management involves planning, monitoring, evaluating, and manipulating the cognitive processes to obtain optimal learning outcomes. (ibid)

O'Malley & Chamot, (1990) defined meta-cognitive strategies as higher order executive tactics in nature which involve planning for learning, monitoring, and identifying, remediating causes of comprehension failure or evaluating the success of a learning activity.

However, most researchers in this area have made a clear distinction between two important construct components of meta-

cognition, namely knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition, which are as follows:

2.1.1 Knowledge of cognition

Knowledge of cognition, on the one hand, is what a person knows about his/her own cognition or about cognition in general. According to (Jacobs & Paris, 1987), there are often three different types of meta-cognitive awareness, which are referred to as declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge.

-Declarative knowledge refers to what someone knows about something. It encompasses knowledge about oneself as a learner and about factors that affect one's performance. For instance, a research study by (Baker, 1989), investigating what learners know about their own memory has found that adults have more knowledge than children about the cognitive processes associated with memory.

- Procedural knowledge is the person's knowledge about doing a specific task. Much of this knowledge is represented as heuristics and strategies. However, in a study by (Glaser & Chi, 1988) relating to this found that learners with a high degree of procedural knowledge perform tasks more automatically, are more likely to have a larger repertoire of strategies, to sequence strategies effectively, and use qualitatively different strategies to solve problems.

- Conditional knowledge refers to somebody's knowledge of why and when aspects of cognition. According to (Garner, 1990), conditional knowledge is the one which involves knowing when and why to use declarative and procedural knowledge. For instance, effective learners know when and what information to rehearse.

2.1.2 Regulation of cognition

Regulation of cognition, on the other hand, refers to a group of strategies that enable learners to control their learning. However, there are many research studies that support the view that meta-

cognitive regulation can enhance learners' performance in many different of ways, including better employment of attention resources, better use of existing strategies, and a greater awareness of comprehension problems.

Meta-cognitive strategies, according to (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990), are higher order executive tactics , which involve essential skills such as planning for learning, monitoring, identifying and remediating causes of comprehension failure or evaluating the success of a learning activity; the strategies of self-planning, self-monitoring, 'self-regulating, 'self-questioning' and 'self-reflecting.

- **Planning** involves the learner to select the appropriate strategies and to allocate his/her resources that affect their performance. Typical examples include how to make predictions before reading, strategy sequencing, and allocating time or attention selectively before beginning to perform a task. For instance, studies of successful and unsuccessful learners have revealed that the ability to "predict" involves reader's ability to connect their existing background knowledge to new information from a text in order to comprehend what they read.

- **Monitoring** refers to one's on-line awareness of comprehension and task performance. The ability to engage in periodic self-testing while learning is a good example. Research studies have shown that students who use meta-cognitive strategies monitor their reading comprehension, adjust their reading rates, and consider the objectives etc. tend to be better readers. For example a two-part language study by Paris and Meyers (1981) was conducted to investigate comprehension monitoring and strategies of good and poor readers. The first part of their study investigated the differences in comprehension monitoring between good and poor fourth grade readers during an oral reading of a story. In their study, the students' ability to monitor comprehension of difficult anomalous information was measured by spontaneous self-

corrections during oral reading, by directed underlining of incomprehensible words and phrases, and by study behaviours. The findings showed that poor readers did not engage in accurate monitoring as frequently as good readers.

- **Evaluating** or identifying refers to the process of estimating the products and capability of one's learning, and typical examples of evaluation include how learners re-assess their own aims and outcomes. Identifying the main idea requires a reader to distinguish between important textual information from supporting details and how to realise the overall meaning of text.

For example with regard to the strategy of identifying main idea in a text, a co-relational study by (Winograd, 1990) intended to find out whether readers' difficulties of writing a summary could be related to their lack in strategic skills. The findings of the study showed that good readers tended to be better judges of importance than poor readers. In contrast, good readers appeared to define importance more in terms of text, for instance when a piece of text was marked with an asterisk.

The study concluded that the skill to identify important elements in a passage is a strategic skill in itself underpinning both reading comprehension and summarization.

2.2 Meta-cognitive Awareness and Reading proficiency

The relationship between meta-cognitive awareness and reading proficiency within the domain of reading comprehension is still controversial among researchers for example, Baker & brown (1984) argue that meta-cognitive awareness is a prerequisite for self-regulation, the ability to monitor and check one's own cognitive activities while reading. However, other researchers such as Paris & Winograd (1990) cautioned that metacognition should not be seen as a final objective for learning or instruction, but it should be regarded as an opportunity to provide students with the knowledge and confidence that enables them to manage their own

learning and empowers them to be inquisitive and zealous In their pursuits.

Brown, (1983) pointed out meta-cognitive strategies enable readers to monitor and regulate their thoughts. These strategies are skills that can be used voluntarily and consciously and can become automatic due to practice. Research has, also shown that good readers are good strategic users who can automatically achieve their goals and are able to consciously recognize a problem and resort to certain problem-solving strategies. It can be argued that meta-cognition is an essential element in determining who proficient and less proficient readers are.

Block, (1986) also argues that good readers are more aware of the strategies they use, and are more flexible in adapting strategies than poor readers. He also adds that good readers are able to think aloud and verbalize their awareness of the meta-cognitive strategies they use. Recently, a large body of studies has been conducted to investigate the use of reading strategies as well as to assess and explore ESL learners' strategy use. For example, a study by Carrell (1989) to find out the meta-cognitive awareness of second language learners about their reading strategies in their L1 and L2 language, as well as the relationship between their meta-cognitive awareness and comprehension in both languages with two groups of subjects of different proficiency. A questionnaire was given to subjects to tap their meta-cognitive awareness about silent reading in both L1 & L2. Subjects were assessed in their L1 & L2 languages by reading a text in each language and then answering comprehension questions related to the given text. The findings of the study demonstrated that reading in the L1, local reading strategies such as focusing on grammatical structures, sound-letter, word meaning and, text details were to negatively related to reading performance. However, for reading in the L2,

differences between the Spanish L1 and the English L1 groups were observed. The more ESL advanced proficiency groups appeared to be more global strategic readers (i.e. using background knowledge, text gist, and textual organization) or top-down in their perceptions of effective and difficulty-causing reading strategies, while the Spanish-as-a-foreign language group, at lower proficiency levels were found to be more local or bottom-up strategic readers, probably due to their more dependence on bottom-up decoding skills.

In another similar study by Barnett (1988) on L2 reading including 278 French language students to investigate the relationships among reading strategies and perceived strategy use on reading comprehension. The first phase of the study required students to read an unfamiliar passage and write in English what they remembered. The second part of the study asked the students to answer a series of background knowledge questions before reading a text, and the third part of the study required students to continue the ending of a text. The final part required the subjects to answer a questionnaire of 17 items in English about the types of reading strategies they thought best described the way they read. The findings of the study showed that that learners who effectively consider and remember context as they read, (i.e. strategy use) understand more of what they read than students who apply this strategy less or less well. Moreover, learners who think they use those strategies considered most productive (i.e. perceived strategy use) actually do read through context better and understand more than do those who do not think they use such strategies.

2.3. Relationship between proficiency and strategy use and individual differences

Many research studies have been carried out in their attempt to identify what might be referred to as good language learning

strategies and to examine the nature of the link between language learning strategies and language proficiency. However, the term 'proficiency', as referred to here, can be interpreted as defined by Bachman, (1990), to mean in general the person's knowledge, competence or ability in the use of a language, regardless of how, where, or under what conditions it has been learned.

There is a large body of research studies have been found to maintain that learner's strategies are used more often by the successful learners, and that there is a strong link existing between strategy use and proficiency level. However, it can be argued and that this sort of cause-effect relationship should not be viewed as such, but rather as a way to achieve someone's function. As McIntyre, (I 994) has attempted to explain such type of relationship by stressing that we should be cautious when interpreting studies which suggest that more proficient learners can make more strategies: in other words, it can be interpreted to mean that either proficiency determines the choice of strategies or that strategy choice is simply a sign of proficiency level. However, Zhang (2003) pointed out strategies themselves are not inherently good or bad, but they have the potential to be used effectively or ineffectively in different contexts.

Therefore, it can be argued that strategies are not inherently the main contributor to proficiency, but they should be simply interpreted as a means to the end; in other words, only by using certain strategies, learners can achieve a certain task. Similarly, Skehan, (1989) argued that strategies do not determine proficiency per se, but are permitted by it.

However, Carrell (1989) conducted a study in order to investigate ESL learners' reading strategies in the USA. Her research findings suggested that there was some difference observed between

strategy awareness, which was linked to good L1 readers and those pertaining to good L2 readers. She also went on to state that such findings should not be taken as definitive proof but as a suggestive one, though there was a significant difference with regard to L2 proficiency level, and that low-proficiency readers tended to use more text-bound, local strategies than higher-proficiency readers.

Moreover, there have been recently some attempts made to investigate as well as to assess learners' meta-cognitive knowledge of L2 learning strategies in order to establish a potential relationship between learners' meta-cognitive knowledge and their use of strategies in different environments. For instance, a study by Zhang, (2001) to investigate Chinese EFL readers' meta-cognitive knowledge of strategies in learning to read EFL in an Acquisition-Poor Environment, a typical acquisition-poor area in China. However, the subjects' meta-cognitive awareness of reading strategies was analysed and interpreted from a broad meta-cognitive perspective using Flavell's model (1987). Therefore, the readers 'knowledge of reading strategies was examined and analysed through some retrospective interviews. The study findings demonstrated that the Chinese EFL readers' meta-cognitive knowledge of reading strategies had close and significant relationship to their language proficiency.

Also, a similar study by the same researcher Zhang's (2009) to assess meta-cognitive awareness and reading-strategy use of 270 Chinese senior high school students. These subjects responded to a survey questionnaire consisting of reading strategies of 28-items (SORS). The strategies were divided into 3 main types: global, problem-solving, and support. The study results displayed that the students reported using the 3 categories of strategies at a high-frequency level. However, the main effect for strategies and the main effect for learners' proficiency were significantly established.

In other words, students with the high-proficiency level outperformed the intermediate group and the low-proficiency group in 2 categories of reading strategies: global and problem-solving; but no statistically significant difference was observed among the 3 proficiency groups in using support strategies.

3. Methodology

3.1 Population & sample.

The population of this study were 45 Waha oil company employees (38 males and 7 females) who were doing intensive English language courses in the Cambridge, KET, PET, & FCE as part of their on job-training. Three different classes of three different proficiency levels were chosen randomly by the researcher. Before taking the Cambridge English language courses, the three classes had taken three English courses in the starters, beginners and elementary before conducting this study..

Prior to their Cambridge English courses in the KET, PET, &FCE, the three different proficiency groups were asked early in the morning to take a reading proficiency test in KET, PET, & FCE in order to obtain some data about their reading scores in order to compare their reading proficiency with their proficiency on the questionnaire instrument.

3.2 Research instruments

A: KET, PET, & FCE reading tests

The instruments used in this study were standardized KET, PET, & FCE reading tests as well as a questionnaire designed by the researcher. The purpose of these tests was to assess the reading ability of the three different groups . Based on the data obtained from the reading test results, participants' responses on the questionnaire were compared against their reading proficiency in

order to determine if there was a relationship between the learners' awareness of employing reading strategies and their reading ability. The aim of the questionnaire was to obtain some information and to get the three groups identify their favoured reading strategies.

B: Questionnaire

Construction of the questionnaire

For the purpose of this study, the research instrument used presents the theoretical framework in the area of meta-cognition, namely, planning & evaluation, knowledge regulation or (directed attention) , procedural knowledge (support strategies) and conditional knowledge (problem solving strategies). Therefore, the questionnaire used a four-point Likert scale of reading strategies. It consisted of four main categories of reading strategies, which included 21 strategy items. Each of the four categories of strategies assesses different types of strategies. For example, the first strategy category, PLANNING & EVALUATION strategies consisted of five items assessing learners' goals as they read, and their plans before, while and after reading. The second strategy category included in this scale was DIRECTED ATTENTION strategies. It consisted of four strategy items assessing what learners do when they have a difficulty understanding and/ or when they lose their attention as they read. The third type of strategy category called SUPPORT strategies. It consisted of six items of reading strategies assessing what learners do as they read such as translating, drawing diagrams, taking notes, underling, eliciting information, using a dictionary, paraphrasing, etc. the fourth type of strategy category included in this research instrument was referred to as a PROBEM-SOLVING strategies. It was made up of six items of reading strategies assessing what readers do as they read, such as guessing,

comparing, using their experience, using the gist of meaning, etc. the whole scale was ordered from 1 to 4 as follows:

1	=	I never do this	1.4 to 1.0
2	=	I do this only occasionally	1.5 to 1.9
3	=	I usually do this	2.0 to 2.9
4	=	I always do this	3.0 to 4.0

3.3 Data analysis

A: Reading test

KET & PET reading tests consisted of 25 question items. FCE reading test consists of only 20 question items.

45 students were given the reading tests. The reading test scores were worked out and checked against the subjects' responses on the questionnaire to investigate the employees' degree of reading strategy awareness and their reading test scores through the statistical use of Excel (means and standard deviations). However, KET & PET test takers with a score of 17 and above (out of a possible 25) were regarded as good readers and those with 12 and below were perceived as poor readers. Also, FCE learners with a score of 15 and above (out of 20) were regarded as good readers and those with 10 and below were referred to as poor readers.

B: Questionnaire

To investigate the degree of the employees' awareness of reading strategies, the means and standard deviations were analysed to determine the frequencies and variances of strategy use from the data collected in order to answer the first two research questions.

The patterns of strategy choice in relation to the individual strategies, types of strategy, and overall strategy use were also analysed by examining the means and the standard deviations within the whole three groups. Similar procedures were also used to maintain the variance of strategy use among the KET, PET & FCE groups. Moreover, the frequency mean averages of the employees' responses on the questionnaire, the means averages were analysed as follows:

for the purpose of precisely analysing the average means of the learners' responses on the questionnaire, the average means were interpreted as follows: Average means between 3.0 to 4.0 were rated as Always-usage level "High"; average means between 2.0 to 2.9 were regarded as Usually-usage level "Medium"; average means between 1.5 to 1.9 were referred to as Occasionally-usage level "Low", and average means between 1.4 to 1.0 were rated as a never-usage level "very low" in order to understand the frequency average of strategy use among KET, PET and FCE employees' reading strategies.

4.Findings

4.1 Research Question 1

What are the most favoured reading strategies among KET, PET, and FCE learners, and how frequently are they used?

The questionnaire conducted asked the three reading proficiency groups to indicate the degree of their awareness of English reading strategies using a four-point Likert scale. The questionnaire, as mentioned already, consisted of four types of reading strategies, which were as follows: (1) Planning & Evaluation Strategies, (2) Directed Attention strategies, (3) Support Strategies, and (4) Problem-solving strategies. Therefore, the scale was weighted according to the following criteria:

1	=	I always do this	3.0 to 4.0
2	=	I usually do this	2.0 to 2.9
3	=	I do this only occasionally	1.5 to 1.9
4	=	I never do this	1.4 to 1.0

Moreover, for the purpose of precisely analysing the average means of the learners' responses on the questionnaire, the average means were interpreted as follows: Average means between 3.0 to 4.0 were rated as Always-usage level "High"; average means between 2.0 to 2.9 were regarded as Usually-usage level "Medium"; average means between 1.5 to 1.9 were referred to as Occasionally-usage level "Low", and average means between 1.4 to 1.0 were rated as a never-usage level "very low" in order to understand the frequency average of strategy use among KET, PET and FCE employees' reading strategies.

4.1.1 Finding One

The use of reading strategies by KET learners

Table 1: KET learners' meta-cognitive reading strategies and their frequency of use (N=15)

Strategy Type	Strategy No	Mean	SD
1. Plan & evaluation	1	1.933	0.704
	2	1.733	0.704
	3	1.933	0.799
	4	2.267	0.799

	5	1.933	0.704
	Overall	1.960	0.192
2. Directed attention	6	2.933	0.594
	7	2.533	0.915
	8	2.800	0.862
	9	2.533	0.640
	Overall	2.700	0.200
3. Support strategies	10	3.600	0.507
	11	1.600	0.507
	12	2.467	0.834
	13	2.400	0.737
	14	3.800	0.414
	15	1.467	0.640
	Overall	2.556	0.977
4: problem solving	16	1.667	0.617
	17	1.933	0.594
	18	1.933	0.961
	19	1.867	0.640
	20	2.267	0.961
	21	2.333	0.724
	Overall	2.000	0.170

What are the most favoured reading strategies among KET learners? And how frequently are they used?

In table 1 above, it shows the average frequency of strategy use of KET employees. It presents descriptive statistics for the KET learners' use of individual strategies and the overall mean frequency of each of the four categories of strategies they employed. Generally, the findings showed that KET learners reported using reading strategies at a MEDIUM -frequency level (2.0) of Usually-usage. Among the 21 reading strategies, 2 strategies fell into the "high" level of Always-usage (M $\geq$3.5) and 9 strategies went to the Usually-usage level "medium" (M $\geq$2.5). Moreover, 8 strategies were reported at Occasionally-level usage "low" (M $\leq$1.7), and that only 1 strategy was found at the Never-level usage "very low" (M $\leq$ 1.4). As far as the four types of strategy categories are concerned, KET learners showed a low to medium usage, with Directed attention strategies (M =2.700, SD=0.200) as their most favourite choice, followed by support strategies (M=2.556, SD=0.977), problem-solving strategies (M =2.000, SD =0.170), and their last favourite choice was Planning& Evaluation strategies (M= 1.960, SD=0.192). However, the top five strategies that were most favoured by the KET employees were under the Directed attention and Support categories, while the bottom five strategies mainly fell into the Planning& Evaluation and Problem-solving categories.

From the finding 1, strategy category 2, Directed attention strategies, received the medium level of usage which shows that KET learners Usually used this group of strategies (average frequency= M= 2.700, SD=0.200). According to the highest mean (2.700), it shows that the group of strategies received the highest frequency of use whereas the least frequently used strategies were

those under strategy group 1 Planning & evaluation strategies (average frequency M=1.960, SD=0.192).

In conclusion, the KET groups used strategies at a "Medium" Usually level rather than High, in this study. The most frequently used group of strategies was Directed attention strategies which averaged in the "Usually use" range. Three of the other four strategies were also used at Medium level: Support and Problem-solving strategies, which were also averaged in the "Usually use" range. The least frequently used strategy group was Planning and Evaluation strategies which were averaged in the Low "Occasionally use" range. However, among the four groups of strategies, no strategy category was reported at the never-use range of "very low".

4.1.2 Finding 2

The use of reading strategies by PET learners

Table 2. PET learners' meta-cognitive reading strategies and their frequency of use (N=15)

Strategy Type	Strategy No	Mean	SD
1. Plan & evaluation	1	2.400	0.632
	2	2.467	0.640
	3	2.667	0.724
	4	2.733	0.594
	5	2.133	0.640
	Overall	2.480	0.238

2. Directed evaluation	6	2.867	0.834
	7	3.067	0.594
	8	2.933	0.594
	9	2.333	0.617
	Overall	2.800	0.322
3. Support strategies	10	3.733	0.458
	11	1.800	0.414
	12	3.000	0.535
	13	2.667	0.816
	14	4.000	0.000
	15	2.067	0.799
	Overall	2.878	0.880
4: problem solving	16	2.667	0.617
	17	2.200	0.676
	18	2.867	0.743
	19	2.000	0.756
	20	2.800	0.775
	21	2.933	0.594
	Overall	2.578	0.386

What are the most favoured reading strategies among PET learners? And how frequently are they used?

The table 2 above presents descriptive statistics about the average frequency of strategy use of PET employees. It shows the PET learners' use of individual strategies, which ranged from "High" Always-usage of (M=4.000, SD=0.000) to a "Low" Occasionally-use level of (M=1.800, SD=0.414), but no strategy was reported at the "Very Low" level of Never-use range. The overall mean frequency of each of the four categories of strategies ranged from a "Medium" Usually-use level of (M=2.878, SD0.880). Generally, the results showed that PET learners reported using reading strategies at a medium-frequency level (2.5) of Usually-usage. However, within the 21 reading strategies employed by the PET groups, 4 strategies fell into the Always-usage level "high" (M $\geq$3.5) and 16 strategies went to the Usually-usage level "medium" (M $\geq$2.5). Moreover, only 1 strategy was reported at Occasionally-level usage "low" (M $\leq$1.7), and that no strategy was found at the Never-level usage "very low" (M $\leq$ 1.4). As far as the four types of strategy categories are concerned, PET learners showed a medium to high usage, with Support strategies (M =2.878, SD=0.880) as their most favorite category, followed by Directed attention (M=2.800, SD=0.322), problem-solving strategies (M =2.578, SD=0.386), and their least favorite choice was Planning& Evaluation strategies (M=2.480, SD=0.238). However, the top five strategies that were most favored by the PET employees were under the Support categories and Directed attention, while the bottom five strategies mainly fell into the Problem-solving and Planning& Evaluation categories.

From the finding 2, strategy category 2, Support strategies, received the medium level of usage which shows that PET learners usually utilised this group of strategies (average frequency= M=2.878, SD=0.880). According to the highest mean (2.878), it shows that this group of strategies received the highest frequency of use whereas the least frequently used strategies were those

under strategy group 1 Planning & evaluation strategies (average frequency M=2.480, SD=0.238).

In conclusion, the PET groups used strategies at a medium level rather than a high level in this study. The most frequently used group of strategies was Support strategies which averaged in the "Usually use" range. Three of the other four strategies were also used at Medium level: Directed attention and Problem-solving strategies were also averaged in the "Usually use" range. The least frequently used strategy group was Planning and Evaluation strategies which were also averaged in the Medium" "Occasionally" use range. However, among the four groups of strategies, no strategy category was reported at the Occasionally or Never-use range of Low or Very Low level.

4.1.3 Finding 3

The use of reading strategies by FCE learners

Table 3: FCE learners' met-cognitive reading strategies and their frequency of use(N=15)

Strategy Type	Strategy No	Mean	SD
1. Plan & evaluation	1	3.200	0.775
	2	3.000	0.535
	3	3.067	0.594
	4	3.533	0.640
	5	3.000	0.535

	Overall	3.160	0.224
2. Directed evaluation	6	3.200	0.676
	7	3.600	0.632
	8	3.200	0.561
	9	1.667	0.617
	Overall	2.917	0.854
3. Support strategies	10	3.067	0.704
	11	1.800	0.676
	12	3.667	0.488
	13	3.467	0.640
	14	3.200	0.775
	15	3.600	0.507
	Overall	2.967	0.678
4: problem solving	16	3.267	0.458
	17	2.933	0.458
	18	3.667	0.617
	19	2.933	0.594
	20	3.533	0.640
	21	3.533	0.743
	Overall	3.311	0.111

What are the most favoured reading strategies among FCE learners? And how frequently are they used?

In table 3 shows the frequency average of strategy use of FCE employees. It presents descriptive statistics for the FCE learners' use of individual strategies and the overall mean frequency of each of the four categories of strategies they employed. Generally, the findings showed that FCE learners reported using reading strategies at a HIGH -frequency usage (2.0) of Always level. Among the 21 reading strategies, 17 strategies fell into the Always-usage level "high" (M $\geq$3.5) and 2 strategies went to the Medium-usage of usually level (M $\geq$2.5). Moreover, 2 strategies were reported at Occasionally-level usage "low" (M $\leq$1.7), and that no strategy was found at the Never-level usage of "very low" (M $\leq$ 1.4). As far as the four types of strategy categories are concerned, FCE learners showed a High usage, with Problem-solving strategies (M =3.311, SD=0.111) as their most favourite choice, followed by Planning & evaluation strategies (M=3.160, SD=0.224). However, Directed attention and Support strategies were found at a Medium level of Usually use with (M =2.917, SD=0.854, and M=2.967, SD=0.678) as their last favourite choice. The top five strategies that were most favoured by the FCE employees were under Problem-solving and Planning & evaluation strategies, while the bottom five strategies mainly fell into the Directed attention and Support strategies.

From the finding 3, strategy category 2, Problem-solving strategies, received the High level of usage which shows that PET learners Always used this group of strategies (average frequency= M=3.311, SD=0.111). According to the highest mean (3.311), it shows that this group of strategies received the highest frequency of use whereas the least frequently used strategies were those

under the strategy group 2 Directed attention strategies (average frequency=2.917, SD=0.854)

In conclusion, the FCE groups employed strategies at a "High" level of use in this study. The most frequently used group of strategies were Problem-solving and planning and evaluation strategies which averaged in the "Always use" range. The other 2 strategy groups, Support and Directed attention strategies were found at a Medium level of use, which were averaged in the "Usually use" range as the least frequently used strategy groups.

4.1.4 Finding 4

The use of reading strategies by KET, PET, & FCE learners

Table 4. The overall pattern of reading-strategy use by Waha Oil Company KET, PET, and FCE employees (N=45).

Strategy Type	Strategy No	Mean	SD
1. Plan & evaluation	1	2.511	0.869
	2	2.400	0.809
	3	2.556	0.841
	4	2.844	0.852
	5	2.356	0.773
	Overall	2.533	0.192
2. Directed attention	6	3.000	0.707
	7	3.067	0.837
	8	2.978	0.690

	9	2.178	0.716
	Overall	2.806	0.067
3. Support	10	3.467	0.625
	11	1.733	0.539
	12	3.044	0.796
	13	2.844	0.852
	14	3.667	0.603
	15	2.044	0.796
	Overall	2.800	0.770
4: problem-solving	16	2.533	0.869
	17	2.356	0.712
	18	2.822	1.051
	19	2.267	0.809
	20	2.867	0.944
	21	2.933	0.837
	Overall	2.630	0.283

Regarding the first research question (1), What are the most favoured reading strategies among KET, PET, and FCE learners and how frequently are they used?, table 4 above presents descriptive statistics for the KET, PET, and FCE employees' use

of reading strategies and the overall mean frequency of each of the four categories of reading strategies.

The findings showed that the three groups of KET, PET, and FCE learners on the whole reported using the available reading strategies at a Medium-frequency level (M = 2.5) Among the 21 strategies, 6 strategies fell into the high-usage level of Always usage (M ≥ 3.5), and 14 strategies went to the medium level of Usually usage (M ≥ 2.5). Only 1 strategy was reported at the Low level use of Occasionally usage ((M ≤ 1.9) but no strategy was reported at the very low-usage level of Never usage (M ≤ 1.4). As far as the four types of categories of strategies are concerned, the three proficiency groups altogether showed on the whole a medium usage of reading strategies, with Directed attention strategies (M =2.806 , SD =0.067 as their most favourite choice of strategies, followed by Support strategies (M = 2.800, SD=0.770) , Problem-solving strategies (M =2.630, SD=0.283), and Planning &evaluation strategies (2.533, SD=0.192). The top five strategies that were most favoured by the KET, PET, and FCE learners were under the Support and Directed attention categories, while the bottom five mainly went to the Planning &evaluation and Problem-solving categories. Based on the findings above, the three groups of KET, PET, & FCE demonstrated their lack of awareness of the use of PLANNING & EVALUATION strategies, which were seen at (M=2.533, SD=0.192) of Medium level of Usually usage.

4.2 Research Question Two

4.2.1Finding five

Are there any differences between the **KET**, **PET**, and **FCE** learners in their awareness of meta-cognitive reading strategies they employ?

Table 5. Means (standard deviations) for the FCE-, PET-, and KET employees' use of reading strategies (N = 45).

Strategy Type	KET	PET	FCE
Plan & evaluation (0.224)	1.960 (0.192)	2.480 (0.238)	3.160
Directed attention (0.854)	2.700 (0.200)	2.800 (0.322)	2.917
Support (0.678)	2.556 (0.977)	2.878 (0.882)	2.967
Problem solving (0.111)	2.000 (0.170)	2.578 (0.386)	3.311

As can be seen from table 5, the findings showed that there were indeed some differences observed across the KET, PET, & FCE groups in their awareness of reading strategies. On the whole, the FCE group outperformed the PET- and KET groups in overall strategy use. All the three proficiency groups differed in their choice of strategy use. In other words, the KET proficiency groups ranked Directed attention as the most important, followed by SUPPORT and PROBLEM solving. The PET groups rated SUPPORT strategies as the most important followed DIRECTED attention strategies. The FCE groups ranked PROBLEM-SOLVING as the most important followed by PLANNING & EVALUATION. However, despite the fact that all the three groups reported different frequent use of the four categories of strategies, the FCE group demonstrated the most frequent use of them indicating that they are more cognitively aware of the use of reading strategies than their KET, and PET learners. However,

based on the findings above, it was evident that the KET & PET groups demonstrated a lack of awareness of reading strategies especially the use of planning & evaluation strategies. Whereas the FCE groups almost tended to be quite unaware of the use of directed attention, and support strategies.

4.3 Research Question Three.

Finding six

Is there any relationship between learners' reported strategy use and their reading comprehension ability among KET, PET, and FCE groups?

Table 6: KET, PET, and FCE reading test scores

KET students	Reading scores (out of 25)	Mean average	PET learners	Reading scores (out of 25)	Mean average	FCE students	Reading scores (out of 20)	Mean average
1	18	2.000	1	16	2.714	1	13	3.429
2	17	2.190	2	19	3.286	2	16	3.381
3	22	2.000	3	18	2.619	3	14	3.286
4	15	2.000	4	22	3.048	4	17	3.429
5	20	2.619	5	15	2.048	5	10	3.286
6	16	2.143	6	21	2.143	6	17	3.143
7	23	2.762	7	22	2.762	7	11	3.143
8	20	1.810	8	14	1.571	8	16	3.286
9	22	2.762	9	17	2.571	9	10	3.467
10	14	1.810	10	20	2.952	10	17	3.095
11	21	2.905	11	19	2.333	11	12	2.857
12	20	2.667	12	20	2.905	12	15	3.286
13	18	1.762	13	16	2.762	13	9	2.619
14	24	2.905	14	17	2.619	14	16	3.000

In the table 6 presents descriptive statistics about the KET,PET & FCE learners' individual reading scores & strategy use mean averages. To find out if there was a relationship between learners' reported strategy use and their reading comprehension ability, the reading test scores were worked out and checked against the subjects' responses on the questionnaire through the statistical use of mean averages. However, KET & PET learners with a score 17 and above (out of a possible 25) were regarded as good readers

and those with 12 and below were perceived as poor readers. Also, FCE learners with a score of 15 and above (out of 20) were regarded as good readers and those with 10 and below were referred to as poor readers. Generally, within the KET groups, the findings revealed that the relationship between the learners' reading strategy awareness and reading comprehension ability was almost positive. However, as can be seen from the table 6 above, KET learners (5,7,9,11,12,14) who had the highest reading scores of 20 and above (20, 23,22,21,20,24) were also found to have the highest mean averages of (mean=2.619, 2.762, 2.762, 2.905, 2.667 and 2.905).

By comparison, KET learners whose reading scores were 18 and below were found to have the lowest mean averages. Those KET learners, 1,2,4,6,10, 13, and 15, were also found to have the lowest mean averages of (mean=2.000, 2.190, 2.000, 2.143, 1.810 and 1.762) indicating that their reading meta-cognitive strategy awareness was related to their reading ability in L2, which suggests that they were unaware of what constitutes efficient reading.

As far as PET groups are concerned, the findings showed that the PET learners whose reading scores were 17 and above had the highest mean averages as well. For example, PET learners, (2,3,4,67,9,10,11,12,14, and 15) whose reading scores were 17 and above were also found to have the highest mean averages of (mean=3.286, 2.619, 3.048, 3.143, 3.143, 2.762, 2.571, 2.952, 2.333, 2.905, 2.619, 2.905) suggesting that PET learners' knowledge of reading strategies was related to their L2 reading ability.

As for the FCE learners, the findings revealed that FCE learners' achievement in the reading tests was related to their high

awareness of reading strategies. For instance, FCE learners, (2,4,6,8,10,12 and 14) were found to have the highest mean averages of (mean = 3.381, 3.429, 3.143, 3.286, 3.095, 3.286, and 3.000) indicating that their reading strategy awareness was indeed related to their L2 reading proficiency. Based on this, it can be suggested that the higher their awareness of reading strategies, the better their reading ability/proficiency was.

5.Conclusion

Among the KET, PET, & FCE learners in general there appears to a discrepancy between the employees' awareness of reading strategies and their language proficiency. The findings revealed that there were differences in the choices and the frequency of strategy use among the KET,PET & FCE learners on the overall all use on the four groups of reading strategies. Also, the KET learners were found to use reading strategies less frequently that PET and FCE learners, which were averaged at a medium level of frequency usage. On the contrary, the FCE learners demonstrated the most frequent use of reading strategies at a high level of frequency use.

As for the relationship between the KET, PET and FCE learners' awareness of reading strategies and their reading proficiency, the findings showed that the learners' high metacognitive reading strategy awareness substantially contributed to their reading ability in L2, which suggest that they were aware of what really constitutes efficient reading.

References

Alderson, J.C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: a reading problem or a language problem? London: Longman.

Bachman, L.(1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: oxford university press.

Baker, L., & Brown,X., (1984) metacognitive skills and reading. In: Barr,R., Kamil, M., Mosenthal,P.,

Baker, L. (1989). Metacognition comprehension monitoring and the adult reader. Educational psychplogy review, 1,338-350.

Barnett, M.A. (1988). Reading through context: how real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension. Modern language journal,72: 150-162.

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

Brown et al (1983). Does perception of language learning factors relate to success. Rocky Mountain TESOL.

Carrell, P.L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. The modern language journal, 73 121-134.

Flavell, J. (1987). Metacognition & cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34, 906-911.

Garner, R.(1990(. When children and adults do not use learning strategies: toward a theory of settings. Review of educational research 60:517-529.

Glaser, R.& Chi, M. T. (1988) overview. In M. Chi, R. Glaser & M. Farr, eds., The nature of expertise. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McIntyre, P. D. (1994) toward a social psychological model of strategy use. Foreign language Annals, 27, 185-195.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990(. Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge, England: Cambridge university press.

Paris, S. G., & Meyer, M.(1981). Comprehension monitoring, memory and study strategies of good and poor readers. Journal of reading behaviour, 13, 5-22.

Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (1990). How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Skehan, P. (1989). Individual differences in second language learning. London. Edward Arnold.

Zhang, L. J. (2001) Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an acquisition poor environment. Language awareness, 100, 268-288.

Zhang, L. J. (2003). Research into Chinese EFL learner strategies: methods, findings and instructional issues. RELC Journal: a journal of language teaching and research, 34, 284-322.

Zhang, L. J. & Wu, A. (2009). Chinese senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use: reading in a foreign language 21, (1) 37-59.