

# Gender Differences in Using Metacognitive Strategies: A Study on Bangladeshi EFL Readers

**Firoz Ahmed**

Assistant Professor, Department of English

Comilla University

E-mail: firozahmed093@gmail.com

&

**Naqibun Nabi**

Assistant Professor, Department of English

Comilla University

## Abstract

*This study looked at how male and female Bangladeshi undergraduate EFL readers employed metacognitive strategies while reading academic texts. Moreover, the most prevalent and least prevalent reading metacognitive strategies were examined in this study. This empirical study used the self-reported SORS (Survey of Reading Strategies) questionnaire developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey in 2002 to gather the primary data. From 119 participants of English major 2nd-year students at two Bangladeshi southeastern universities, 100 participants' data (M-50, F-50; Age mean-20.5) were randomly chosen. Based on collected data, an independent t-test was performed to find out the male and female variations in using metacognitive strategies. The findings indicated that there were gender disparities in the use of metacognitive strategies (specifically in global and support strategies) while reading academic texts.*

**Keywords:** metacognitive strategies, EFL readers, SORS, undergraduate

## 1. Introduction

Finding a text's meaning frequently requires the reader's tactics. The entire process might not be straightforward; however, it might inspire the reader to adopt efficient reading techniques to quicken their reading rate and get through any challenges (Anderson, 2003; Alami, 2016). Researchers are increasingly interested in reading strategies because reading is considered to be one of the more difficult skills to master (Mokhtari&Sheorey, 2002; Poole, 2010; Nalliveettil, 2014; Jafarigohar&Khanjani, 2014; Mahasneh et al., 2016; Hayet et al. 2016; Zeng& Fan, 2017; Zhang, 2018, Monje Macasieb, 2020).

Metacognition has been identified as one of the crucial components in deriving meaning from reading, and more especially, reading comprehension. This is due to the fact that learning tasks that need cognitive abilities, including comprehending textual content, primarily rely on metacognition. The actualization of metacognition in reading takes the form of strategy. In order to predict students' literal and higher-order comprehension of texts, metacognitive strategies are crucial (Ghaith, 2018). A learner who is aware of metacognition will be able to apply metacognitive learning strategies when and where they are appropriate (Pelton, 2014). Knowing and implementing metacognitive strategies create the ability in planning and directing learners' own learning process (Thiede, Anderson, & Theriault, 2003).

Research on reading has recently begun to emphasize the value of metacognitive awareness during reading; therefore, studies on readers' metacognitive reading techniques are frequently conducted by researchers (Alami, 2016; Charoenchai Carmeesak, 2017; Abu-Snoubar, 2017). Research on the knowledge and use of metacognitive reading strategies has been done in a number of contexts and with a wide range of individuals; for example: teaching reading strategies to EFL learners (Islam & Akhtar, 2011; Hayet, 2016; Wudeneh, 2018; Dardjito, 2019; Teng, 2020), the effects of metacognition and proficiency on EFL reading performance (Aktar & Ahmed, 2018; Alsofyani, 2019; Sheikh et al., 2019; Ozturk Senaydin, 2019), and gender differences (Wu, 2014; Alami, 2016; Reilly & Andrews, 2019; Islam & Akhter, 2020; Rianto 2021). Among these, determining gender disparities is receiving focus, in recent years, for customizing teaching strategies based on learners' preferences and learning styles. Gender differences are commonly observed in achieving the language skill, such as: reading across cross-linguistically (Reilly, 2012). This is an exception to Hyde (2015)'s gender similarity hypothesis, which claimed that male and female are analogous in most psychological variables (Reilly, 2019). This exception is visible cross-linguistically. Reilly and Andrews (2019) mentioned that reading proficiency does vary between the sexes. Rianto (2021) used Anderson (2003)'s OSORS (Online Survey of Reading Strategies) to show that that female scored higher than the male in using metacognitive strategies in Indonesian EFL university students. Acar-Erdol and Akin-Arikan (2022) identified the relationship between gender and metacognitive techniques using SORS. They showed how the girls outperformed the boys while investigating the mediating effect of metacognitive techniques and attitudes towards reading among Turkish undergraduate male and female.

In Bangladesh, recent studies focused on finding out reading strategies employed by Bangladeshi EFL learners (Islam & Akter, 2011; Bashir, 2016; Hayet et al. 2016; Aktar & Ahmed, 2018; Haque, 2019; Islam & Akhtar, 2020). It is crucial to find out whether there are any differences between male

and female undergraduate learners in terms of how they use metacognitive techniques while reading since Islam & Rahman (2015) and Bashir (2016) were the two studies who delved into the topic. Both of these studies showed that there was no correlation between male and female Bangladeshi undergraduate's usages of strategies. Islam et al. (2015) used OSORS of Anderson (2003) to find out the gender differences. Bashir (2016) reached the conclusion based on his questionnaire that addressed both cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Now, a question arises, what happens if we adopt a specific metacognitive based questionnaire to find out the differences from a population who had reading courses in their previous semester, and had familiarity with the metacognitive strategies. Aktar& Ahmed (2018) showed that the HSC learners of Bangladesh have moderate metacognitive awareness and advocated for raising awareness about the reading strategies to be a better learner. In the Bangladeshi education system, the students entered into universities after completing HSC level. They learnt about reading strategies either through "Basic English Skills Courses" or "Reading Course" in their first year education at Department of English. This current study looks for the possibility of finding differences among male and female strategies by adopting a different tool and a different level (second year instead of first year). By employing a different tool (SORS) and a different level, this study intends to find out the gender gaps in the utilization of metacognitive methods by Bangladeshi undergraduate EFL learners. The following two research questions are the center of this study:

1. Are there any gender differences among Bangladeshi EFL undergraduate readers in using metacognitive strategies?
2. What are the frequent and less frequent metacognitive strategies used by Bangladeshi EFL readers?

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1. Participants**

A convenient sampling technique was employed to choose the participants in this empirical quantitative investigation. The participants belonged to the Department of English of a southeastern public university, and a southeastern private university of Bangladesh. The participants were chosen from the Department of English as they had to engage in reading English literary texts. These students came from 43 districts (among 64 districts) of Bangladesh. Two second year second semester classes were selected from these two universities. 66 (Male 37, Female 29) students from the Public University and 53 (Male 30,

Female 23) students from the Private University took part in this study.100 (Male 50 and Female 50) participants were randomly selected from 119 students to make an equal distribution (Age mean-20.5; Male-21, Female-20). These students were selected based on two reasons. First,they completed a reading course in their first year successfully. Public university students had “ENG 121: Reading” in their first year second semester and private university students had“ENG 1201: Developing Reading Skill” in their first year first semester. Although these courses had different title, their course content was almost same.In these reading courses, they learned about various reading strategies and how to apply these in texts (both short and long).Learning reading strategies, specifically, the metacognitive strategies may encourage the students to use them later while they engage with academic texts. Second, academic courses in the second year are typically more difficult than those in the first year, and the academic readings in these courses demand that students apply more strategies, particularly metacognitive ones.

Before conducting study, the permissions were taken from the authorities of these universities. The students agreed to participate in this study voluntarily, and a 30-minute briefing followed by a question-answer session was conducted before conducting the research. In this briefing session, the researchers discussed the participants’ confidentiality, and research ethics followed by students’ queries.

## **2.2. Instruments:**

The “Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS)” by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), a tool designed to assess how ESL students perceive reading metacognitive techniques, was used to carry out this study (p. 2). This metacognitive awareness tool has almost the same properties as MARSİ (Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory), except for a few wordings. Mokhtari and Reichard developed MARSİ in 2002; however, it was only for native readers. To evaluate the non-native readers and with an aim to assist the ESL/EFL educators, Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002)developed the SORS,a30-item based survey instrument to increase“learners’ awareness of reading strategies” (p.2). This self-reported instrument consists of thirty questions based on three strategies- global strategy (GLOB), support strategy (SUP) and problem-solving strategy (PROB). GLOB refers to the overall techniques adapted by the reader to analyze a text. PROB demonstrates how the reader solves the text difficulty, and finally, how a reader utilizes the outside materials to have the textual understanding belongs to SUP (Mokhtari and Reichard, 2002, p. 252).

The reason for choosing this scale is due to the internal consistency of MARSİ (the mother version of SORS), which had the reported reliability of overall 0.93 (GLOB 0.92, PROB, 0.79 and SUP 0.87) (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2002,

p.3). The other reason is that although it is widely used in different studies, its modified version was only used in one study in Bangladesh (Suchona & Urmi, 2019). This study explored the reading strategies with the modified version of SORS and they didn’t explore the gender differences. Another study, Islam et al, 2019 adopted OSORS (based on 38 categories) to find out the online reading strategies of undergraduate studies and did not find any difference between the sexes. In the SORS instrument, there are 30 sub-categories under 3 broad categories and table 1 displays the categorical distributions.

Table 1: The distribution of questions in SORS

| Strategy | Questions                         | Number |
|----------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| GLOB     | 1,3,4,6,8,12,15,17,20,21,23,24,27 | 13     |
| SUP      | 2,5,10,13,18,22,26,29,30          | 9      |
| PROB     | 7,9,11,14,16,19,25,28             | 8      |

This SORS scale adapts a 5-point Likert scale (1-‘I never or almost never do this’, ‘2-I do this only occasionally’, ‘3-I sometimes do this’, ‘4-I usually do this’ & ‘5-I always and almost always do this’) to collect the data. Before collecting the data, it was ensured that the participants understood the Likert scale and how to provide the responses.

2.3. Data Analysis:

The findings of the SORS scale were categorized according to high (mean of 3.5 to higher), medium (mean of 2.5 to 3.4) and low (mean of 2.4 or lower).An independent t-test was performed to find out the mean, standard deviation, frequency, significance (p-value)of the data using SPSS (2021 version).

3.Results and Discussion:

In response to answering research question 1, the table-2 showed the distribution of students’ reading questions in terms of male, female and overall. From Table 2, it could be interpreted that the Bangladeshi EFL readers are medium users of the metacognitive strategies. The three reading strategies are most frequently used by female readers than males.This also shows the female’s awareness towards using strategies while reading. Female readers equally use PROB and GLOB. For the male, PROB is the highest one while they engage with reading.However, both male and female use less SUP than

the other two. This result aligns with the findings of Rianto (2021), Alami (2016), Islam et al. (2015), Shikano (2013) and Yuksel and Yuksel (2012).

Table 2: Students’ Reading strategies’ Usage Scores

| No. | Category | GLOB Mean | Remarks | PROB Mean | Remarks | SUP Mean | Remarks | Total Mean | Remarks |
|-----|----------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|------------|---------|
| 1.  | Male     | 3.28      | Medium  | 3.51      | High    | 2.76     | Medium  | 3.18       | Medium  |
| 2.  | Female   | 3.54      | High    | 3.54      | High    | 3.14     | Medium  | 3.41       | Medium  |
| 3.  | Overall  | 3.41      | Medium  | 3.53      | High    | 2.95     | Medium  | 3.30       | Medium  |

Among these, PROB is the most preferred one for the Bangladeshi EFL readers that aligned with Islam et al (2015). Females are the ‘High’ users of the three strategies, and they outperformed the male in all categories. This result aligns with the result of Acar-Erdol and Akin-Arikan (2022) who examined the gender gap of Turkish readers’ reading achievement. This conclusion, however, did not support Mahasneh et al. (2016)’s findings, which claimed that there were no appreciable disparities between Jordanian male and female EFL undergraduates.

The table-3 shows that the females have a clear dominance in case of reporting SUP, which means they take notes, read aloud, underline information, use reference, paraphrase, reread (going back and forth to find the meaning from the text), asking questions for clarity, translate and use both English and Bangla to clarify the textual meaning. The males have the dominance over their counterpart in case of Q3, Q7, Q11, Q14, Q16, and Q20 (exploring background information to clarify reading, slow but careful reading, adjusting reading speed, paying closer attention when text becomes difficult, giving pauses to think, and using typographical features for example boldface and italics to identify the key information).However, in support strategies, both male and female have almost the same feedback in case of using Bangla translation and thinking about information in both Bangla and English. Although they belonged to the English department, this could be due to their level (all belonged to second year first semester).

Table 3: Cross-Gender mean comparisons of Bangladeshi EFL readers’ preference of reading strategies

| GLOB   |     |       | SUP    |     |      | PROB   |     |       |
|--------|-----|-------|--------|-----|------|--------|-----|-------|
| Q. No. | M/F | Mean  | Q. No. | M/F | Mean | Q. No. | M/F | Mean  |
| Q1     | M   | 3.48  | Q2     | M   | 2.74 | Q7     | M   | 3.52* |
|        | F   | 3.84  |        | F   | 3.08 |        | F   | 3.24  |
| Q3     | M   | 3.44* | Q5     | M   | 2.56 | Q9     | M   | 3.16  |
|        | F   | 3.18  |        | F   | 3.08 |        | F   | 3.22  |
| Q4     | M   | 3.12  | Q10    | M   | 2.50 | Q11    | M   | 4.18* |
|        | F   | 3.18  |        | F   | 2.68 |        | F   | 3.90  |
| Q6     | M   | 3.10  | Q13    | M   | 2.86 | Q14    | M   | 3.48* |
|        | F   | 3.52  |        | F   | 3.16 |        | F   | 3.44  |
| Q8     | M   | 3.42  | Q18    | M   | 2.60 | Q16    | M   | 3.74* |
|        | F   | 3.80  |        | F   | 3.26 |        | F   | 3.72  |
| Q12    | M   | 3.60  | Q22    | M   | 2.60 | Q19    | M   | 3.20  |
|        | F   | 4.14  |        | F   | 2.66 |        | F   | 3.92  |
| Q15    | M   | 2.82  | Q26    | M   | 2.40 | Q25    | M   | 3.58  |
|        | F   | 2.90  |        | F   | 3.04 |        | F   | 3.82  |
| Q17    | M   | 3.18  | Q29    | M   | 3.52 | Q28    | M   | 3.22  |
|        | F   | 3.18  |        | F   | 3.78 |        | F   | 3.06  |
| Q20    | M   | 3.42* | Q30    | M   | 3.06 |        |     |       |
|        | F   | 3.22  |        | F   | 3.56 |        |     |       |
| Q21    | M   | 3.44  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
|        | F   | 3.44  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
| Q23    | M   | 3.38  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
|        | F   | 3.84  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
| Q24    | M   | 3.04  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
|        | F   | 3.98  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
| Q27    | M   | 3.16  |        |     |      |        |     |       |
|        | F   | 3.74  |        |     |      |        |     |       |

\*Male’s response is higher than female.

In the case of selecting the most frequent strategy, among all the 30 items, females’ favorite one is Q24 (guessing about the content during reading) among the GLOB, Q29 (translating into Bangla) among the SUP, and Q19

(visualizing information to remember what I read). For male, among all these 30-items, males’ favorite one is Q12 (deciding what to read or not read during reading) for GLOB, Q29 (translating into Bangla) for SUP, and Q11 (adjusting my reading speed depending on text) for PROB.

In case of least favorite strategy, among all the 30 items, females select Q15 (using tables, figures and pictures in text to enhance understanding of the text) among the GLOB, Q22 (going back and forth in the text to find the relationships among the ideas) among the SUP, and Q28 (guessing the meaning from the text) for PROB. For male, among all these 30-items, males’ least favorite one is Q15(using tables, figures and pictures in text to enhance understanding of the text) for GLOB, Q26 (I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text) for SUP, and Q9 (I try to get back on track when I lose concentration) for PROB. From this data (table 3), it can be interpreted that both male and female did not use tables, figures and pictures in text to clarify their reading of the text.

Table-4: Gender differences in selecting/using metacognitive strategies by EFL readers

| Strategy | Q. No. | F     | Sig. (2-tailed) | Strategy | Q. No. | F      | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|----------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| GLOB     | Q1     | 4.222 | .043            | SUP      | Q18    | 10.502 | .002            |
|          | Q6     | 4.117 | .045            |          | Q26    | 11.160 | .001            |
|          | Q8     | 4.901 | .029            |          | Q30    | 6.056  | .016            |
|          | Q12    | 3.969 | .049            |          |        |        |                 |
|          | Q27    | 7.607 | .007            |          |        |        |                 |

Independent t-test (Table-4) analysis shows that the significant differences between male and female occur in choosing/using GLOB and SUP strategies. Among the GLOB, the male and female differ in Q1 (purposeful reading), Q6 (matching content with reading purpose), Q8 (reviewing the text), Q12 (deciding what to read and what to ignore), and Q27 (checking the guesses with the text).Among the SUP, male and female differ in Q18 (paraphrasing ideas), Q26 (I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text)& Q30 (I think about information in both English and Bangla while reading). There are no significant differences found in the case of PROB.

Table 5: Independent sample t-test

| Strategy | N      | Mean | Std. Deviation | F     | t-value | Sig.  | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|----------|--------|------|----------------|-------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| PROB     | Male   | 3.51 | .33866         | 1.352 | -.403   | .248  | .688            |
|          | Female | 3.54 | .40362         |       |         |       |                 |
| GLOB     | Male   | 3.28 | .32413         | 5.124 | -4.423  | 0.026 | .000            |
|          | Female | 3.54 | .25629         |       |         |       |                 |
| SUP      | Male   | 2.76 | .69493         | 4.191 | -3.079  | 0.043 | .003            |
|          | Female | 3.14 | .54445         |       |         |       |                 |
| Overall  | Male   | 3.18 | .29443         | .849  | -3.998  | .359  | .000            |
|          | Female | 3.41 | .26589         |       |         |       |                 |

In response to research question 1, the outcome of this study demonstrates that there are variations between male and female users of metacognitive strategies, mostly in GLOB and SUP (Table 5). There is no gender difference in using PROB (Table 5). In response to research question 2, the male and female differs in purposeful reading, matching content with reading purpose, reviewing the text, deciding what to read and what to ignore, checking the guesses with the text, paraphrasing ideas, asking self-monitoring questions, and using both English and Bangla while reading to deduct information from the text (Table 4).This result does not align with Bashir (2016). He came to the conclusion that there might not be any significant gender difference in the use of general reading techniques, despite the fact that he used both metacognitive and cognitive strategies. Bashir (2016) used a 36-item questionnaire (cognitive and metacognitive) based on the 5-point Likert scale adopted from Phakiti’s (2006) reading strategies. Despite not finding any differences, Bashir (2016) noted that, with the exception of planning strategies, the mean scores of females were higher than those of males in all other categories (p.112).

Table 6: Frequency of metacognitive strategies used by Bangladeshi ESL readers

| Most Frequent        |           | Less Frequent       |                   | Overall Frequent | Overall Less Frequent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Male                 | Female    | Male                | Female            |                  |                       |
| Q11(PROB)            | Q12(GLOB) | Q26(SUP)            | Q22(SUP)          | Q11(PROB)        | Q10(SUP)              |
| Q16(PROB)            | Q24(GLOB) | Q10(SUP)            | Q10(SUP)          | Q12(GLOB)        | Q22(SUP)              |
| Q12(GLOB)            | Q19(PROB) | Q5(SUP)             | Q15(GLOB)         | Q16(PROB)        | Q26(SUP)              |
| Q25(PROB)            | Q11(PROB) | Q18(SUP) & Q22(SUP) | Q28(PROB)         | Q1(GLOB)         | Q5(SUP)               |
| Q7 (PRUB)& Q29 (SUP) | Q1(GLOB)  | Q2(SUP)             | Q2(SUP) & Q5(SUP) | Q29(SUP)         | Q15(GLOB)             |

If all the three groups are considered together, it can be found that Q11 & Q12 are the most preferred strategies for male and female respectively, and the less frequent for male and female is Q26 and Q22 respectively (Table-6).

4. Conclusion:

This paper’s primary goal is to identify how male and female users of metacognitive strategies differ from one another, so that both EFL teachers and students could be aware of these strategies and focus on the less frequent strategies in their EFL classroom. The ‘SORS’ questionnaire’s function was to find out the type and frequency of reading techniques used by the EFL learners (Mokhtari&Sheorey, 2002). By adapting the SORS questionnaire, this study explores the types of reading strategies and their frequency of Bangladeshi EFL readers. The results of this study indicate that women use metacognitive strategies substantially more frequently than men. However, it could not be confirmed whether they can successfully implement these strategies in test or during reading due to the limitations of the study. Despite the fact that this study demonstrates a gender difference in the use of reading metacognitive strategies,the result cannot be generalized due to its sample size, sampling techniques and methods. This paper only uses one self-reporting instrument to collect data instead of conducting interviews, using think-aloud protocol, or measuring students’ performance on a reading comprehension test.The significance of this study’s findings lies in the fact that they reveal how frequently Bangladeshi undergraduate students use different reading techniques to comprehend academic texts written in English. The strategies listed in Table 6 will aid teachers in comprehending the situation of an EFL second-year undergraduate reader and will help them place more emphasis on SUP (the ability to assess oneself, grasp information, navigate

between lines of a text to obtain information, read aloud when a text is challenging, and decipher meaning from tables, figures, and pictures in a text). In Bangladesh, literary texts make up the majority of the undergraduate English course curricula, and the text complexity varies according to the students' proficiency. Students may have more success understanding various types of texts if teachers provide them with SUP and address their needs in classroom. As there is no research showing how SUP can improve students' reading skills, this study asks for research showing how equipping readers with metacognitive methods (particularly SUP) can improve readers' capacity to interact with challenging academic texts.

## References

- Abu- Snoubar, T. (2017). Gender differences in metacognitive reading strategy use among English as a Foreign Language Students at Al-Balqa Applied University. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 8. 1 - 12.
- Acar-Erdol, & Akin-Arikan, Ç. (2022). Gender gap in reading achievement: the mediating role of metacognitive strategies and reading-related attitudes. *Social Psychology of Education*, 25(2-3), 537–566. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09692-9>
- Ahmadian, M., & Pasand, P. G. (2017). EFL learners' use of online metacognitive reading strategies and its relation to their self-efficacy in reading. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 17(2), 117–132.
- Alami, M. (2016). Cross-gender comparison of metacognitive strategies utilized by Omani students in reading comprehension classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(4), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.4p.20>
- Ali & Razali (2019). A review of studies on cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in teaching reading comprehension for ESL/EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*. 12 (6), doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n6p94
- Alsofyani, A. H. 2019. "Examining EFL learners' reading comprehension : The impact of metacognitive strategies discussion and collaborative learning within multimedia E-Book dialogic environments. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of South Florida." *University of South Florida*. <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/7729>
- Anderson, N. (2003). Scrolling, clicking, and reading English: Online reading strategies in a second/foreign language. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 1–33.

Aktar, T. & Ahmed, I (2018). Metacognitive awareness of strategy use and EFL reading comprehension at Higher Secondary Level in Bangladesh. *Journal of ELT Research*.3(2). DOI: 10.22236/JER\_Vol3Issue1pp205-222

Anderson, N. J. (1999). Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers

Baba Öztürk, &Aydogmus, M. (2021).Relational assessment of metacognitive reading strategies and reading motivation. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(1), 357–375. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.329.23>

Bashir, A. (2016). Reading strategy use and gender differences among undergraduate EFL/ESL students. *Spectrum*. 12. 99-128.

Charoenchai&Buri (2017).The relationship between metacognitive reading strategies and reading comprehension among 2<sup>nd</sup> year EFL university students. *ICLEHI*.6. <https://icsai.org/procarch/6iclehi/6iclehi-075.pdf>

Dardjito.(2019). Students’ metacognitive reading awareness and academic English reading comprehension in EFL context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 611–624. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12439a>

Ghaith, G. (2018). English as a second/foreign language reading comprehension: A framework for curriculum and instruction. *TESL Reporter*, 50 (2), 1–17

Grabe, W., & Stroller, F. L. (2002). Teaching and researching reading. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Grabe, W. (2010).Fluency in reading — Thirty-Five years later. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 71–83.

Hayet, A., Nabi, N. & Ahmed, F. (2016).Using reading strategies for developing EFL reading skill: A study of undergraduate level in Bangladesh. *The EDRC Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 1 (1), Dhaka.

Islam, F., & Akhter, F. (2020). EFL learners’ reading strategies at the tertiary level in Bangladesh. *Journal of ELT and Education*, 3(4): 116-123. Retrieved from <https://jee-bd.com/journal/34162020>

Islam, M. J.&Aktar, T. (2011). Metacognitive language-learning strategies and language-learning motivation: A study on Bangla-speaking undergraduate EFL Learners. *Outlooks*, 1

Islam, M.S., Rahman, M.S. &Haque, E. (2015).Exploring awareness of online reading strategies used by EFL learners in a developing country: A study on undergraduate students in Bangladesh. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 14(1), 29-54. Waynesville, NC USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved October 22, 2023 from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/40649>

Hamad, A. A. 2019. "Saudi ESL/EFL learners' metacognitive online reading strategies in Arabic and English [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]." *The University of Memphis*.

Levine, A., Ferez, O., &Reves, T. (2000). EFL academic reading and modern technology: How can we turn our students into independent critical readers? *TESL-EJ*, 4 (4), 1-9. Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej16/a1.html>

Sheorey, R., &Mokhtari, K. (2001).Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers.*System*, 29(4), 431–449. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\) 00039-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01) 00039-2)

Mahasneh, Alkhawaldeh, M. F., &Almakanin, H. A. (2016).Assessing students' meta-cognitive awareness reading strategies in Jordan.*North American Journal of Psychology*, 18(2), 229–238.

Martínez, R.S., Aricak, O.T. and Jewell, J. (2008), Influence of reading attitude on reading achievement: A test of the temporal-interaction model. *Psychol. Schs.*, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20348>

Mokhtari, K., &Reichard, C. (2002).Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies.*Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259. doi: 10.1037/0022- 0663.94.2.249

Mokhtari, K., &Sheorey, R. (2002).Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies.*Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-10. Retrieved from <http://nelson.Myfastmail.com>

Nalliveettil, G. (2014). Assessing reading strategies of Engineering students: Think-aloud approach.*English Language Teaching*. 7. 38-49. Doi: 10.5539/elt.v7n5p38

Nietfeld, J. L., &Schraw, G. (2002).The effect of knowledge and strategy training on monitoring accuracy.*The Journal of Educational Research*, 95(3), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670209596583>

Phakiti, A. (2006). Theoretical and pedagogical issues in ESL/EFL teaching of strategic reading.*University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 1, 19-50. Retrieved from [http://www.faculty.edfac.usyd.edu.au/projects/usp\\_in\\_tesol/pdf/volume01/article02.pdf](http://www.faculty.edfac.usyd.edu.au/projects/usp_in_tesol/pdf/volume01/article02.pdf)

Poole, A. (2010). The reading strategies used by male and female Colombian university students.*New England Reading Association Journal*, 46 (1), 55-65. Retrieved from [http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1657-07902009000100003](http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1657-07902009000100003)

Rianto, A. (2021). Examining gender differences in reading strategies, reading skills, and English proficiency of EFL university students.*Cogent Education*, 8 (1).DOI: 10.1080/2331186X.2021.1993531

Schellings, van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., Veenman, M. V. J., & Meijer, J. (2013). Assessing metacognitive activities: the in-depth comparison of a task-specific questionnaire with think-aloud protocols. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(3), 963–990. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-012-0149-y>

Omar, N. A. (2014). Online metacognitive reading strategies use by postgraduate Libyan EFL students. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(7), 2281–2284. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1093955>

Öztürk, N., & Şenaydın, F. (2019). Dichotomy of EFL reading: Metacognition vs. proficiency. *DilVeDilbilimiÇalışmalarıDergisi*, 15(2), 605-617.

Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2019). Gender differences in reading and writing achievement: Evidence from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 445–458. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000356>

Rianto, A. (2021) Examining gender differences in reading strategies, reading skills, and English proficiency of EFL University students, *Cogent Education*, 8(1), DOI: 10.1080/2331186X.2021.1993531

Sheikh, I., Soomro, K.A, Hussain, N. (2019).Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies, Reading Practices and Academic Attainments of University Students.*Journal of Education and Educational Development*. 6. 126-137. DOI: 10.22555/joeed.v6i1.2749.

Suchona, I. J., &Urmy, K. K. (2019) “Exploring Reading Strategies and Difficulties among Bangladeshi Undergraduates.”*Shanlax International Journal of English*, 8(1) pp. 42–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34293/english.v8i1.1308>

Teng, F. (2020) The benefits of metacognitive reading strategy awareness instruction for young learners of English as a second language. *Literacy*, 54: 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12181>.

Thiede, K. W., Anderson, M. C. M., &Therriault, D. (2003). Accuracy of metacognitive monitoring affects learning of texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 66–73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.66>

Wu, J. Y. (2014). Gender differences in online reading engagement, metacognitive strategies, navigation skills and reading literacy.*Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 30(3), 252–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12054>

Wudeneh. (2018). Assessing the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among freshman university students. *International Education and Research Journal (IERJ)*, 4(10). Retrieved from <https://ierj.in/journal/index.php/ierj/article/view/1666>

Yuksel&Yuksel (2012).Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies.*Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 31, 894-898. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.164>

Zhang, L., Zhang, L., & Liu. (2017). *Metacognitive and cognitive strategy use in reading comprehension: A structural equation modelling approach*. Springer. DOI:10.1007/978-981-10-6325-1

Appendix

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is adopted from Mokhtari and Sheorey’s (2002) SORS (Survey of Reading Strategies) questionnaire

[This study is conducted to find out the gender differences in using reading metacognitive strategies. Your data will be used only for research purposes. Please read carefully as your response is crucial for this study.]

Directions: This is a 30-item questionnaire designed on three sub-strategies of metacognitive strategies. The items are statements about what people do when they read academic materials such as textbooks or library books. Five numbers follow each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, & 5), and each number means the following:

- a. 1 means “I never or almost never do this”
- b. 2 means “I do this only occasionally”
- c. 3 means “I sometimes do this”
- d. 4 means “I usually do this”
- e. 5 means “I always or almost always do this”

After reading each statement, **circle the number** (1, 2, 3, 4, & 5) that applies to you using the scale provided. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers in this inventory.

| No. | Question/Statement                                                            | Scale |   |   |   |   |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  | I have a purpose in mind when I read.                                         | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.  | I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.                 | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3.  | I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.                  | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4.  | I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it. | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5.  | When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.  | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|     |                                                                                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.  | I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7.  | I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I am reading.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8.  | I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9.  | I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | I underline or circle information in the text to help remember it.                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I am reading.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. | I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | I check my understanding when I come across new information.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|     |                                                                     |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. | I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the test.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. | I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. | When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. | When reading, I translate from English into Bangla.                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. | When reading, I think about information in both English and Bangla. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |