

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTEMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE

READING STRATEGY USE: THE CASE
OF HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS AT PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOLS OF
KB ACADEMY GRADE NINE AND TEN STUDENTS

By

Yechalework Aynalem

Advisor: Dr. Fekadu Mulugeta

August, 2017

Addis Ababa

**READING STRATEGY USE: THE CASE
OF HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS AT PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOLS OF
KB ACADEMY GRADE NINE AND TEN STUDENTS**

By

Yechalework Aynalem

**A Thesis Presented to the
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
(School of Graduate Studies)**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of Masters of
Arts in Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)**

August, 2017

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by **Yechalework Aynalem** , entitled **Reading Strategy Use: The Case of High and Low Achievers at Private High Schools of KB Academy Grade Nine and Ten Students** and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL) complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed By Examining Committee:

Advisor _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

Examiner _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

Examiner _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, stress that this thesis is my original work and has not presented for a degree in any other university and all the materials used in the thesis have been properly acknowledged.

Name: **Yechalework Aynalem Kumera**

Signature: _____

Addis Ababa University, Department of Foreign Language and Literature

Date of submission: August, 2017

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to Almighty God for helping me complete this research work with success.

The number of those to whom I am indebted to for making this work comes true is much greater than the scope of this space. My apologies go to all those whose names deserve to be mentioned.

First and foremost, I am immensely grateful to my advisor, Dr. Fekadu Mulugeta for his deep expertise, invaluable guidance, and inspiration without which it would have been impossible for this work to come into being. The same appreciation goes Tsegaye Mekuria for helping me in observation session; Dilinesa Mekonnen for his help with statistical computation aspects of the thesis; Belay Zeleke for his help in editing grammatical and mechanical errors; Tigist Ayalew for her cooperation in typing neatly as possible.

I am also indebted to the teachers who volunteered to take part in the study. Special thanks go to those who trusted me enough to invite me into their classes and willing to have the interview with me. Thanks are also due to the students who are participated in this study.

The last but not the least, my gratitude goes to my wife, Meron Berehanu for her continuous encouragement, care, love and support. I believe that the words that recognize her sacrifice do not yet exist in any language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Pages
Acknowledgement	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	viii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Abstract	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Objectives of the Study	4
1.3.1. General Objectives	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	4
1.4. Research Questions	4
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Scope of the Study	5
1.7. Limitation of the Study	5
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
2.1. Definition of Reading	6
2.2. The Importance of Reading	8
2.3. Definition of Language Learning Strategies	9
2.4. Definition of Reading Strategies	10
2.5. The Importance of Reading Strategies	11
2.6. Characteristics of ‘Good’ Language Learners	12
2.7. Classification of Language Learning Strategies	13
2.7.1. O'Malley et al (1985) Classification of Language Learning Strategies	14
2.7.1.1. Metacognitive Strategies	14
2.7.1.2. Cognitive Strategies	14
2.7.1.3. Socio-Affective Strategies	14
2.7.2. Rubin's (1987) Classification of Language Learning Strategies	18

2.7.2.1. Learning Strategies	18
2.7.2.1.1. Cognitive Learning Strategies	19
2.7.2.1.2. Metacognitive Learning Strategies	20
2.7.2.2. Communication Strategies	20
2.7.2.3. Social Strategies	20
2.7.3. Stern's (1992) Classification of Language Learning Strategies	20
2.7.3.1. Management and Planning Strategies	20
2.7.3.2. Cognitive Strategies	21
2.7.3.3. Communicative-Experiential Strategies	21
2.7.3.4. Interpersonal Strategies	22
2.7.3.5. Affective Strategies	22
2.7.4. Oxford's (1990) Classification of Language Learning Strategies	22
2.7.4.1. Memory Strategies	21
2.7.4.2. Cognitive Strategies	24
2.7.4.3. Compensation Strategies	24
2.7.4.4. Metacognitive Strategies	25
2.7.4.5. Affective Strategies	26
2.7.4.6. Social Strategies	26
2.8. Factors Affecting Learners' Choice of Strategies	26
2.9. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)	29
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	30
3.1. Research Design	28
3.2. Research Setting	28
3.3. Target Population	28
3.4. Sample Population	29
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	29
3.5.1. Questionnaire	29
3.5.2. Interview	30
3.6. Data Collection Procedure	30
3.7. Data Analysis Procedure	30
3.8. The Pilot Study	31

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	30
4.1. Background of the Participants	30
4.2. Use of Memory Strategies	30
4.2.1. Visualizing Information	31
4.2.2. Remembering Location to Remember New Words/Phrases	32
4.2.3. Associating Text Idea with Background Knowledge	32
4.2.4. Reviewing a Text	33
4.2.5. Practicing a New Word, Phrase, or Sentence in a Memorable Situation	33
4.3. Use of Cognitive Strategies	34
4.3.1. Re-reading to Increase Understanding	35
4.3.2. Underlining Key Information	35
4.3.3. Paraphrasing	36
4.3.4. Note Taking	36
4.3.5. Referring	37
4.3.6. Thinking Information in both English and Mother Tongue	38
4.3.7. Using Typographical Features	38
4.3.8. Dividing Words into Parts to Find their Meaning	39
4.3.9. Skimming Skill	39
4.3.10. Reading for Pleasure	40
4.3.11. Summarizing Information	40
4.4. Use of Compensation Strategies	41
4.4.1. Making Guesses to Understand Unfamiliar Words	42
4.4.2. Using Titles to Guess the Content of the Text	42
4.4.3. Using Tables, Figures, and/or Pictures to Increase Understanding	43
4.4.4. Using Contextual Clues	44
4.4.5. Reading without Looking up Every New Word	44
4.5. Use of Metacognitive Strategies	45
4.5.1. Adjusting Reading Speed	46
4.5.2. Having Purpose of Reading	46
4.5.3. Taking an Overview of the Text	47

4.5.4. Checking Own Understanding	47
4.5.5. Checking the Accuracy of Guessing	48
4.5.6. Critically Analyzing and Evaluating	48
4.5.7. Deciding to Read Closely and to Ignore	49
4.5.8. Looking for Opportunities to Read in English	49
4.5.9. Having Goals for Enhance Reading Skill	50
4.5.10. Learning from Mistakes	50
4.5.11. Attempting to Ask Oneself What Information is Sought	51
4.5.12. Trying to Organize Conditions	51
4.6. Use of Affective Strategies	52
4.6.1. Keeping Own Moral	53
4.6.2. Taking Deep Breath to Lower Anxiety	54
4.6.3. Noticing Emotion when Studying English	54
4.6.4. Discussing Emotion with Others	54
4.6.5. Trying to Reduce Anxiety	55
4.7. Use of Social Strategies	56
4.7.1. Asking for Clarification	56
4.7.2. Learning about the Culture of English Speakers	57
4.7.3. Attempting to Share Feeling about the Text with Others	57
4.7.4. Discussing with Others to Check Own Understanding	58
4.7.5. Formulating Questions to Focus on	58
4.8. Analysis of Comparison among High and Low Achievers	
Regarding Main Strategy Use	59
4.9. Analysis on Significance Difference on the Six Main Strategies by	
High and Low Achiever Students	61
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	63
5.1. Conclusions	63
5.2. Recommendations	65
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A: STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE	

APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX C: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE AMHARIC VERSION

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1: Memory Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students	31
Table 2: Cognitive Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students	34
Table 3: Compensation Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students	41
Table 4: Metacognitive Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students.....	45
Table 5: Affective Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students	53
Table 6: Social Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students	56
Table 7: High and Low Achievers' Main Strategies Use Comparison	59
Table 8: Independent Samples Test on Significance Difference on Strategies Use by High and Low Achiever Students	61

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SILL =	Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
SPSS =	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
EFL =	English as a Foreign Language
SD =	Standard Deviation
DF =	Degree of Freedom
X =	Mean

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the reading strategies use by high and low achiever of private grade nine and ten students of Addis Ababa. The focus was to attain the type and range of strategy they use and frequency level thereby to assess the differences/similarities in using the reading strategies by high and low achiever students. To this end, thirty students were selected (15 top high achievers and 15 least low achievers) using stratified sampling technique. To measure students' reading strategy use, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) was adapted. The modified self-report questionnaire with 43 items were prepared and administered to all selected students. In addition, interview was conducted with sixteen (8 top high achievers and 8 least low achievers) of the sample population. Data obtained through the questionnaire were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version-20. The descriptive statistics such as frequency counting, mean value, standard deviation, and Independent T-test were considered in discussion. The t-test (with significant difference level $p < 0.05$) was applied to check if there was a statistically significant difference between high and low achievers in using the main reading strategies. During discussion, data obtained through the self-report questionnaire were cross checked using the data obtained through interview. Results of the study show that there was a relationship between four main strategies use (i.e. memory, cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies) and language learning achievement. High achiever students were also found to use all the main strategies more often than low achiever students. Based on the findings, it was recommended that awareness raising should be made to enhance students' use of various strategies at higher frequency and the low achievers must be encouraged to use the reading strategies more frequently.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

There has been a prominent shift within the field of language education over the last twenty years with greater emphasis being put on learners and learning rather than on teachers and teaching (Tseng, 2005). There have been some major developments in language education that led to viewing the language learner as an active participant rather than a passive recipient. In response to these developments, many researches have focused on language learners characteristics since the 1970s (Atakilte, 2011). This implies that learning strategies have been at the center of attention and they have gained great importance in the teaching-learning process.

Researchers assert that reading is one of the most important language skills in academic contexts of Ethiopia, especially, in high schools and universities, where the English language is used as the medium of instruction. Reading is by far a very important skill of the four skills (Getachew 1996, cited in John, Hailom, & Nuru, 1996). This is because students' eventual academic success or failure depends to a large degree on reading strategies they use. In other words, university students get most of the knowledge through reading. In addition, almost all examinations, which are aimed to test their knowledge and abilities that often emanate from their reading and comprehending abilities in English. However, failure to use appropriate reading strategies use may lead students not to have adequate reading proficiency and this in turn leads them to lose interest in learning English language.

Oxford (1990) reported that Strategy use correlates with students' language proficiency and self-confidence. This implies that the degree of success in language learning depends greatly on learners' strategies use. Given the same learning environment, the same learning material, and the same teaching staff, second language students vary greatly in the speed with which they learn the language (Ellis, 1997). There are different factors that affect students' success in language learning; the degree of using appropriate reading strategies might be one among them.

Therefore, comparison between high and low achievers in foreign language learning setting especially in context of Ethiopian high schools need a substantial investigation to find out the

factors that can affect learners' language achievement. More importantly, learners' strategies use, which enables them to be self-reliant learners, can play a significant role in foreign language learning context. This is because strategies are personal behaviors in which one employs in learning process.

Extensive investigations have shown the importance of language learning strategies in making language learning more efficient and in producing a positive effect on learners' language use (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Chamot and O'Malley, 1994; Oxford, 1996). How learners process new information and what kinds of strategies they employ to understand, learn or remember the information has been the primary concern of the researchers dealing with the area of language learning. This implies that language achievement depended quite heavily on the individual learner's endeavors. This naturally led to a greater interest in how individual learners approached and controlled their own learning of language (Nation, 2001). Moreover, Janzen (2002) stated that researches in the area of reading strategies showed that a conscious use of strategies could significantly enhance learning.

In line with the above framework, this study attempted to see the reading strategies used among high and low achiever students at KB Academy grade nine and ten students.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The benefits of reading strategy use depend on how effectively readers use these strategies rather than the mere knowledge of it. Therefore, different researchers investigated the relationship between strategy use and language performance based on diverse definitions and classifications of language learning strategies. These studies shed light on the relationships between strategy use and language performance from different perspective. Some studies explore whether students who were better in language performance reported higher level and frequencies of strategy use (e.g., Green and Oxford, 1995), whereas other studies examine whether higher level and frequency of strategy use contributed to better language performance (e.g., Park,1997). Some researchers concluded that a causal, reciprocal relationship exists between strategy use and language performance, which indicates strategy use and language performance are both causes and outcomes of each other (e.g., Bremner, 1999).

Unlike previous researchers, Purpura (1999) reported that the "greater degree to which a strategy was used did not necessarily correspond to the better performance" (1999, p.180). Phakiti (2003) explored the relationships between strategy use and reading performance with Thai EFL University students. He found a positive relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use on reading performance, but the relationship was weak.

From the above explanation, there seems to be neither consensus regarding strategy use in language learning nor agreement about the relationships between strategy use and language performance. This may be partially due to the fact that different strategy definitions, classifications, and measurement techniques have been utilized, as well as the existence of different interpretations of what it means to be proficient in language performance. Another important reason that contributes to these differences is that these studies were conducted in different cultural surroundings; participants also varied in terms of education levels and background.

Most of the studies that investigated the relationship between reading strategy use and language performance were done in settings different from Ethiopia. Thus, the current research intends to investigate reading strategy use among high and low students in Ethiopian private schools context.

In doing so, the researcher of this study could try to explore some related local works in this area. As a result, as far as the researcher's knowledge goes, no research was done on reading strategy use among high and low high school students. However, there are some related local studies; Atakilte (2011) conducted his study on reading strategies used by grade 11 EFL students of Addishilu Senior Secondary School. The finding indicated that students were employing six strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social, and affective) at a medium frequency level. Moreover, there is a bit difference in using the six strategies by the students. Megersa (2011) claims that poor guidance, practice, motivation, and poor background were some of the factors that affect students' reading strategy use. Endaweke (2008) reported that there was no significant difference between male and female preparatory students in using the six main language-learning strategies.

Therefore, since there is lack of consensus regarding strategy use and language performance, there is a way to go further in this area. The researcher of this study aims to contribute to this field with information about reading strategy use among high and low grade nine and ten students so as to bring forth wholesome solutions for better language achievement of foreign language learners in Ethiopian context.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The main objective of this study is to investigate the reading strategies use among high and low achiever students of grade nine and ten.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

Specific objectives of this study are:

- Investigate the type of reading strategy used by high and low achiever students.
- Identify the frequency of reading strategy use by high and low achiever students.
- Determine the differences (if any) in reading strategy use by high and low achiever students.
- See the relationship between reading strategy use and academic achievement.

1.4. Research Questions

This research attempts to find out answers to the following questions:

- Is there a difference between high and low achievers on reading strategy use? If "yes",
- What reading strategies do high achiever students use?
- What reading strategies do low achiever students use?
- Is there any significant difference between the two groups in reading strategy use?
- Is there any relationship between reading strategy use and academic achievement?

1.5. Significance of the Study

The role of language teaching and learning is to help learners of the target language in order to acquire the language and use it in and out of the class. This process needs learners to develop

their own language learning strategies independent of their teacher help. The facts that reading strategies play a significant role in helping students learn and acquire language easily. It is, also, obvious that students have their own reading strategies that they think are helpful to promote their language skills.

This in turn needs strategy training in a while teaching process by the classroom teacher in each task and can be also design materials since strategies are teachable. Researchers suggest that reading strategies can be taught directly by designing materials for its own purpose (Hudson, 2007; Zhang & Wu, 2009). Therefore, attention should be given to reading strategies especially for high school students; this is because they get most of the knowledge through reading.

Therefore, the ultimate findings of the study help high school level English teachers to develop materials that facilitate reading learning. It can also serve as basis for students to evaluate their reading strategies use. Finally, researchers who are interested in reading strategy may use the findings as a stepping-stone for further investigation that could lead to the improvement of language learning.

1.6. Scope of the Study

The research is conducted at KB Academy, grade nine and ten students. However, it would have been better if the study had addressed more government and private schools. The research is limited only to KB Academy, grade nine and ten students because of time and resource constraints. Also, because of the school is established this years, students who are in grade nine and ten came from at least seven private schools in Addis Ababa so the samples of this research might have a minor possibility to represent students' use of reading strategies in private schools.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

The study has some limitations. The study would have been more important if it had investigated more factors that affect the choice of strategies and also include students at primary and preparatory levels where such kind of study needs longer time and more fund. However, the researcher was not able to do that due to lack of time and resource constraints. Moreover, the researcher limited himself to only questionnaire and semi-structured interview that he thought were relevant to the study because of the mentioned constraints.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Definition of Reading

It is not as such easy to give a succinct definition for the word 'reading'. This is because as Perfett (1985) cited in Melkamu (2002) suggested reading incorporates intricate process of visual, linguistic, and cognitive activities. In the same vein, Aebersold and Field (1997:5) noted, "the act of reading is not completely understood nor easily described." Similarly, Smith (1978) suggested the uneasiness of giving a single clear-cut definition for reading as follows:

Reading is not different from all the other common words in our language, it has a multiplicity of meanings. And since the meaning of the word on any particular occasion will depend largely on the context in which it occurs, we shouldn't expect that a single definition for reading will be found . . . (1978:100).

Despite this fact, scholars have defined reading in various ways and all the definitions seem to have similar concepts. The definitions presented by different experts of reading usually ranges from equating reading with recognition and decoding of words to perceiving reading as a creative and thinking process.

Grellet (1981) defines reading as a process of extracting and understanding the required information from a text. He further notes that it is an active skill where the guessing, predicting and checking as well as questioning oneself are entailed. Pressley (2002) states reading as a hierarchy of skills, from processing of individual letters and their associated sounds to word recognition to text processing competencies. For Goodman (1971) cited in Melkamu (2002), reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game in which reader reconstructs meaning from a minimal text sample by relying on his/her knowledge of the language and the background knowledge of the subject through cycles of sampling, predicting, testing, and confirming what has been encoded by the writer(s). According to Carrell (1988:2) reading is "a decoding process of reconstructing the writer's meaning through recognizing the letters and words, and creating a meaning for a text from the smallest textual units at the 'bottom' (letters and words) to larger and

larger units at the 'top' phrases, clauses, (intersentential linkages)." This means reading is a mere decoding of graphic representation by matching letter - sound relationships. Asher (1994) also views reading as the ability to comprehend the thoughts and feelings of others through the medium of written text (cited in Negash, 2008). Dechant (1991) further describe reading as the reconstruction of the message encoded graphically by the writer; as constructing meaning from print; as making sense of written language; and as a process of information search, or information processing. It is described as an interactive process involving both the reader's previous fund of knowledge and the words in the text; it is a process of putting the reader in contact and in communication with ideas of the writer which are cued by the written or printed symbols; it is a process of building a representation or a mental mode of text.

Similarly, Nuttall (1982) says it is not as such easy to give a succinct definition for the word 'reading'. This is because some authorities have tried to define reading in various ways based on different views of reading models. However, she says the most common all are share in the following words about reading. Such as:

- a) Understand interpret meaning sense
- b) Decode decipher identify
- c) Articulate speaking pronounces and etc.

From these definitions, we can deduce that reading is an activity in which the reader seeks to identify, comprehend, interpret, and evaluate the ideas and point of view expressed by the author.

2.2. The Importance of Reading

Reading is one of language skills and it is the key to opening doors to all students (Duffy, 1993). Therefore, it is needed in both classroom and real life situations. In many second or foreign language-teaching situations, reading receives a special focus Richards and Renandya (2002). There are a number of reasons for this. First, many foreign language students often have reading as one of their most important goals. They want to be able to read for information and pleasure, for their career, and for study purpose. In fact, in most EFL situations, the ability to read in a foreign language is all that students ever want to acquire. Second, written texts serve various pedagogical purposes. Extensive exposure to linguistically comprehensible written texts can

enhance the process of language acquisition. Good reading texts also provide opportunities to introduce new topics, to stimulate discussion, and to study language (e.g, vocabulary, grammar, and idioms). Reading, then, is a skill which is highly valued by students and teachers alike. Scholars have defined reading in various ways and all the definitions seem to have similar concepts. According to McDonough and Shaw (1993) the major language skill that enables learners to grasp ideas, facts, concepts, and thoughts is reading. This is to mean that reading enables people to access information from technologies and books. It is also a skill that learners make use of in the environment out of school in their daily routine.

Many research findings suggest that one of the best ways to help students increase their ability in other language skills is through giving them appropriate practice in reading. Reading enhances language proficiency of students at all levels. On this point McDonough and Shaw, (1993: 89) note the following “As a skill reading is clearly one of the most important; in fact in many instances around the world we may argue that reading is the most important foreign language”. Another scholar Sesunan (2003: 132) refers to the importance of reading by saying “Reading is one of the basic skills which everyone accepts is essential for survival in the modern world”. This indicates that reading is the most important so as to enable students to understand the social and economic situation of the world and their environment.

2.3. Definition of Language Learning Strategies

Many researchers have attempted to give definitions to 'Language learning strategy'. Williams and Burden (1997) define language learning strategies as techniques used by learners to make their language learning become more effective and increase their independence and autonomy as learners. O'malley and Chamot (1990) stated that language-learning strategies are any set of actions, plans, tactics, thoughts, or behaviors that the learners employ to facilitate the comprehension, storage, retrieval, and use of information. Similarly, Wenden and Rubin (1987) defined learning strategies as any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information. Strategies can be employed by learners to assist storage of information, construction of language rules, and an appropriate attitude towards the learning situation. Oxford (1990:8) expanded this definition by saying that learning strategies are "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations."

Language learning strategies are intentional behavior and thoughts that learners make use of during learning in order to better help them understand, learn, or remember new information. These may include focusing on certain aspects of new information, analyzing and organizing information during learning to increase comprehension, evaluating learning when it is completed to see if further action is needed. Chamot and Kupper (1989) stated learning strategies as "techniques which students use to comprehend, store, and remember new information and skills. What a student thinks and how a student acts in order to learn comprise the non-observable and observable aspects of learning strategies "(p. 13). Stern (1992:261) explains, "The concept of language learning strategy is based on the assumption that learners consciously engage in activities to achieve certain goals that they exercise choice procedure, and that they undertake."

With the emergence of the concept of language learning strategies, scholars have attempted to link these strategies with language learning skills believing that each strategy enhances language skills.

2.4. Definition of Reading Strategies

Reading is an interactive, meaning building process, in which the readers employ multitude of strategies to grasp information from various available sources. According to Cohen (1990), reading strategies are those mental procedures that readers deliberately prefer to employ in accomplishing reading tasks. Garner (1987) identifies use of reading strategies as an action, or a chain of actions that a reader practices in order to make meaning in the reading process (cited in Hudson, 2007). Hence, employing reading strategies means how readers visualize a task, what they do to construct meaning from the manuscripts, and what they do when comprehension collapses (Block, 1992; Macaro, 2001; Macaro & Erler, 2008; Zhang, 2001).

Janzen (2002) definition of reading strategies reflects Oxford's (1990) understanding of learning. Oxford (1990) views learning as specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations. According to Janzen (2002), reading strategy defined as plans for solving problems encountered in constructing meaning. They range from bottom-up vocabulary strategies, such as looking up an unknown word in the dictionary, to more comprehensive actions, such as connecting what is being read to the reader's background knowledge.

Reading is an active process of understanding print and graphic texts. Effective readers know that when they read, what they read is supposed to make sense. They monitor their understanding, and when they lose the meaning of what they are reading, they often unconsciously select and use a reading strategy (such as rereading or asking questions) that will help them reconnect with the meaning of the text (Nuttall, 1982). The definitions show that reading strategies use plays a prominent role in students' achievement.

2.5. The Importance of Reading Strategies

Language learning strategies are good indicators of how learners approach tasks or problems encountered during the process of language learning. Language learning strategies give language teachers valuable clues about how their students assess the situation, plan, select appropriate skills so as to understand, learn, or remember new input presented in the language classroom. Fedderholdt (1997) stated that the language learner capable of using a wide variety of language learning strategies appropriately can improve his/her language skills in a better way. Metacognitive strategies improve organization of learning time, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. Cognitive strategies include using previous knowledge to help solve new problems. Socio-affective strategies include asking native speakers to correct their pronunciation, or asking a classmate to work together on a particular language problem (Martinez, 1996). Developing skills in these three areas can help the language learner build up learner independence and autonomy whereby he/she can take control of his/her learning.

Regarding the importance of reading strategies use, Janzen (2002) states the following points. (1) Strategies help to improve reading comprehension as well as efficiency in reading. (2) By using strategies, students will be reading in the way that expert readers do. (3) Strategies help readers to process the text actively, to monitor their comprehension, and to connect what they are reading to their own knowledge and to other parts of the text.

As students progress through school, they are asked to read increasingly complex informational and graphical texts in their courses. The ability to understand and use the information in the texts is key to a student's success in learning. Successful students have a repertoire of strategies to draw upon, and know how to use them in different contexts. Struggling students need explicit teaching of the strategies to become better readers (Janzen, 2002).

2.6. Characteristics of ‘Good’ Language Learners

In most of the research on language learning strategies, the primary concern has been on identifying what good language learners report they do to learn a second or foreign language, or in some case, are observed doing while learning a second or foreign language as (Wenden and Rubin, 1987). Certain people appeared to be endowed with abilities to succeed; others lacked those abilities. This observation led Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) to describe 'good' language learners in terms of personal characteristics, styles, and strategies. According to Rubin (1975)

‘good’ language learners find their own way organize information about language. They are creative and experiment with language, make their own opportunities and strategies for getting practice in using the language inside and outside the classroom; and learn to live with uncertainty and develop strategies for making sense of the target language without wanting to understand every word.

They also use mnemonics (rhymes, word associations, etc to recall what has been learnt), make errors work, use linguistic knowledge, let the context (extra-linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the world) help them in comprehension and learn to make intelligent guesses (Rubin 1975 cited in Nunan, 1991)

Rubin and Thompson (1982), summarized the characteristics of good language learners as the following. Good language learners:

1. Find their own way, taking charge of their learning
2. Organize information about language
3. Are creative, developing a "feel" for the language by experimenting with its grammar and words
4. Make their own opportunities for practice in using the language inside and outside the classroom
5. Learn to live with uncertainty by not getting flustered and by continuing to read or listen without understanding every word
6. Use mnemonics and other memory strategies to recall what has been learned
7. Make errors work for them and not against them

8. Use linguistic knowledge, including knowledge of their first language, in learning a second language
9. Use contextual cues to help them in comprehension
10. Learn to make intelligent guesses
11. Learn chunks of language as wholes and formalized routines to help them perform
12. "beyond their competence"
13. Learn certain tricks that help to keep conversations going
14. Learn certain production strategies to fill in gaps in their own competence
15. Learn different styles of speech and writing and learn to vary their language according to the formality of the situation (cited in Brown, 2007:132).

In the same vein, Karbalaei (2010) states that there are many reading strategies employed by successful language learners such as being able to organize information, using linguistic knowledge of their first language when they are learning their second language, use contextual cues, and learning how to chunk language (cited in Atakilte, 2011). Successful language learners know how to use such reading strategies efficiently.

It is important to note that language-learning strategies are not limited to the classroom. Many so-called successful learners have reached their goals of mastery through their own self-motivated efforts to extend learning well beyond the confines of a classroom.

2.7. Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Classification of language learning strategies has primarily followed the theory of cognition (Macaro 2001). Cognition refers to how the brain works for information processing and retrieval. Strategies are used to retrieve and store new information in the brain till this information becomes 'automatic' and such strategies are classified into a system by researchers and educators.

Many scholars (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Stern, 1992; Ellis, 1994, etc.) have classified language-learning strategies. However, most of the attempts to classify language-learning strategies reflect more or less the same categorization of language learning strategies without radical changes. O'Malley's and others (1985), Rubin's

(1987), Stern's (1992), and Oxford's (1990) taxonomies of language learning strategies have been discussed as follow respectively.

2.7.1. O'Malley et al (1985b) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

O'Malley et al (1985b: 582-584) divided language learning strategies into three main subcategories.

- i. Metacognitive Strategies
- ii. Cognitive Strategies
- iii. Socio-Affective Strategies

2.7.1.1. Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive is a term used in information-processing theory to indicate an "executive" function, strategies that involve planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, monitoring of one's production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed. Similarly, Martinez (1996) suggested that metacognitive strategies improve organization of learning time, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation.

2.7.1.2. Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are more limited to specific learning tasks and involve direct manipulation of the learning material itself. Repetition, translation, grouping, note taking, deduction, recombination, key word, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, and inference are among the most important cognitive strategies. Martinez (1996) also noted that cognitive strategies include using previous knowledge to help solve new problems.

2.7.1.3. Socio-Affective Strategies

Socio-affective strategies include asking native speakers or teachers to correct their pronunciation, or asking a classmate to work together on a particular language problem. It can be stated that they are related with social-mediating activity and interacting with others. Similarly, Brown (1987) noted that cooperation and question for clarification are the main socio-affective strategies (cited in Hanna, 2012).

Classification of O'Malley et al (1985b) Language Learning Strategies is Summarized in the Following Table.

<i>Learning Strategy</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>Metacognitive Strategies</i>	
Advance organizers	Making a general but comprehensive preview of the organizing concept or principle in an anticipated learning activity
Directed attention	Deciding in advance to attend in general to a learning task and to ignore irrelevant distractors
Selective attention	Deciding in advance to attend to specific aspects of language input or situational details that will cue the retention of language input
Self-management	Understanding the conditions that help one learn and arranging for the presence of those conditions
Functional planning	Planning for and rehearsing linguistic components necessary to carry out an upcoming language task
Self-monitoring	Correcting one's speech for accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, or for appropriateness related to the setting or to the people who are present
Delayed production	Consciously deciding to postpone speaking in order to learn initially through listening comprehension
Self-evaluation	Checking the outcomes of one's own language learning against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy
<i>Cognitive Strategies</i>	
Repetition	Imitating a language model, including overt practice and silent Rehearsal
Resourcing	Using target language reference materials
Translation	Using the first language as a base for understanding and/or producing the second language

Grouping	Reordering or reclassifying, and perhaps labeling, the material to be learned based on common attributes
Note taking	Writing down the main idea, important points, outline, or summary of information presented orally or in writing
Deduction	Consciously applying rules to produce or understand the second Language
Recombination	Constructing a meaningful sentence or larger language sequence by combining known elements in a new way
Imagery	Relating new information to visual concepts in memory via familiar, easily retrievable visualizations, phrases, or locations
Auditory representation	Retention of the sound or a similar sound for a word, phrase, or longer language sequence
Keyword	Remembering a new word in the second language by (1) identifying a familiar word in the first language that sounds like or otherwise resembles the new word and (2) generating easily recalled images of some relationship between the new word and the familiar word
Contextualization	Placing a word or phrase in a meaningful language sequence
Elaboration	Relating new information to other concepts in memory
Transfer	Using previously acquired linguistic and/or conceptual knowledge to facilitate a new language learning task
Inferencing	Using available information to guess meanings of new items, predict outcomes, or fill in missing information
<i>Socioaffective Strategies</i>	
Cooperation	Working with one or more peers to obtain feedback, pool information, or model a language activity
Question for clarification	Asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation, and/or examples

Source: O'Malley et al., 1985b, pp. 582-584.

2.7.2. Rubin's (1987) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Rubin, who pioneered much of the work in the field of strategies, makes the distinction between strategies contributing directly and indirectly to learning (Hanna, 2012). According to Rubin, there are three types of strategies used by learners that contribute directly or indirectly to language learning. These are:

- i. Learning Strategies
- ii. Communicative Strategies
- iii. Social Strategies

2.7.2.1. Learning Strategies

They are of two main types, being the strategies contributing directly to the development of the language system constructed by the learner (Rubin, 1987).

1. Cognitive learning strategies
2. Metacognitive learning strategies

2.7.2.1.1. Cognitive Learning Strategies

They refer to the steps or operations used in learning or problem solving that requires direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Rubin identified six main cognitive learning strategies contributing directly to language learning.

- i. Clarification/ Verification
- ii. Guessing/ Inductive Inferencing
- iii. Deductive Reasoning
- iv. Practice
- v. Memorization
- vi. Monitoring

2.7.2.1.2. Metacognitive Learning Strategies

These strategies are used to oversee, regulate, or self-direct language learning. They involve various processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

2.7.2.2. Communication Strategies

They are less directly related to language learning since their focus is on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying what the speaker intended. Communication strategies are used by speakers when faced with some difficulty due to the fact that their communication ends outrun their communication means or when confronted with misunderstanding by a co-speaker (Rubin, 1987).

2.7.2.3. Social Strategies

Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language (Wenden and Rubin, 1987).

2.7.3. Stern's (1992) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

According to Stern (1992: 262-266), there are five main language learning strategies. These are as follows:

- i. Management and planning strategies
- ii. Cognitive strategies
- iii. Communicative strategies
- iv. Interpersonal strategies
- v. Affective strategies

2.7.3.1. Management and Planning Strategies

These strategies are related with the learner's intention to direct his/her own language. A learner can take charge of the development of his/her own program when he/she is helped by a teacher whose role is that of an advisor and resource person. That is to say that the learner must:

- Decide what commitment to make to language learning
- Set himself/herself reasonable goals
- Decide on an appropriate methodology, select appropriate resources and monitor progress
- Evaluate his/her achievement in the light of previously determined goals and expectations (Stern 1992: 263)

2.7.3.2. Cognitive Strategies

They are steps or operations used in learning or problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Stern like that Rubin's cognitive learning strategies exhibited the following cognitive strategies which directly contributing to language learning.

- Clarification/ Verification
- Guessing/Inductive Inferencing
- Deductive Reasoning
- Practice
- Memorization
- Monitoring

2.7.3.3. Communicative-Experiential Strategies

Communication strategies, such as circumlocution, gesturing paraphrase, or asking for repetition and explanation are techniques used by learners so as to help a conversation group. The purpose of using these techniques is to avoid interrupting the flow of communication (Stern, 1992)

2.7.3.4. Interpersonal Strategies

They should monitor their own development and evaluate their own performance. Learners should contract with native speakers and cooperate with them. Learners must become acquainted with the target culture (Ibid)

2.7.3.5. Affective Strategies

It is evident that good language learners employ distinct affective strategies. Language learning can be frustrating in some cases. In some cases, the feeling of strangeness can be evoked by the foreign language. In some other cases, second language learners may have negative feelings about native speakers of second language. Good language learners are more or less conscious of these emotional problems. Good language learners try to create associations of positive involved. Learning training can help students to face up to the emotional difficulties and to overcome them by drawing attention to the potential frustrations or pointing them out as they arise (Stern, 1992).

2.7.4. Oxford's (1990) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford has developed comprehensive learning strategy classifications. She identifies six types of general learning strategies. The classification includes the features of the previous classification. Since this study intends to use the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) as an initial measuring instrument of reading strategy, the classification system advocated by Oxford (1990) will be used. She developed a system of classification organized around a division of two strategy groups, direct and indirect. Among these, six strategy groups exist in total.

Some language learning strategies, which relate with learning directly, are called direct strategies. Those strategies that directly involve learning the target language include memory, cognitive, and compensation. The second set of strategies suggested by Oxford (1990) includes indirect strategies or those involving actions or processes, which learners regulate, manage, and

self-direct in learning. Indirect strategies are those strategies limited to a supportive role without being directly related to the interaction of the language itself. Strategies categorized within this group include metacognitive, affective, and social. These six categories are used in this study in order to identifying the reading strategies use by high and low achiever students. Each main strategy is discussed below.

2.7.4.1. Memory Strategies

In language learning process, a language learner tries to store or receive new information that he/she is taught or read in the language classroom or in any other learning context. He/she also needs to remember the language elements such as words or grammar rules he/she has learnt. Hence, to cope with these entire related processes, a learner tends to develop strategies which enable him/her to achieve all the stated objectives. These strategies are said to be memory strategies, which help students to store and retrieve information (Richards and Lockhart 1996, cited in Endaweke, 2008).

Before literacy become widespread, people used memory strategies to remember different aspects of information. In Ethiopia, for example, the education system had tight affiliation with the church system from its earliest days. During those days, memorizing was the only way of learning and reading aloud was practiced by those religious men as a means of teaching. In this case, reading was perceived and used as a means to memorize. However, after literacy become commonplace people forget their previous reliance on memory strategies and disparaged those techniques. Now a day, according to Oxford (1990), memory strategies are regaining their prestige as powerful mental tools.

Some types of memory strategies include creating mental linkage. (e.g. placing new words into a context), applying images and sounds (e.g. representing sounds in memory), reviewing well and employing action (Williams and Burden ,1997). They reflect very simple principles, such as arranging things in order, making association, and reviewing. These principles all involve meaning. For learning a new language, the arrangement and associations must be personally meaningful to the learner and the material to be reviewed must have significance.

Memory strategy of structured reviewing, according to Oxford (1990), helps move information from the "fact level" to the "skill level," where knowledge is more procedural and automatic.

When information has reached the skill level, it is more easily retrieved and less easily lost after a period of disuse.

2.7.4.2. Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are important in learning a new language, which enables learners to understand and produce new language are categorized as direct strategies. Such strategies are varied a lot, ranging from practicing to receiving and sending messages to analyzing to creating structure (Oxford, 1990).

Strategies for practicing is one of the important cognitive strategies which including repeating, recognizing and using formulas and practicing naturalistically. Reading a text again and again to better understanding is one of the practicing strategies. Strategies for receiving and sending messages known as getting the idea quickly, which include skimming and scanning, and using resources (like using dictionaries). Analyzing and reasoning strategies are also one of the cognitive strategies. Using these strategies learners tend to reason out the new language. They construct a formal model in their minds based on analysis and comparison, create general rules, and revise those rules when new information is available. Determining the meaning of new expression by break it down into parts (e.g, un-break-able) is one of the techniques of analyzing. To understand better, learners need to structure all inputs that they got from reading materials into manageable chunks by using strategies such as taking notes, summarizing, and highlighting (Ibid). Appropriate uses of the cognitive strategies enable learners to make their language learning meaningful and understandable.

2.7.4.3. Compensation Strategies

Compensation strategies enable learners to understand new language for comprehension despite limitations in knowledge. According to Oxford (1990), these strategies are intended to make up for an inadequate repertoire of grammar and, especially, of vocabulary. This means that learners try to make up limited knowledge whenever they encounter unfamiliar words or expressions. These strategies include guessing intelligently for instance learners use linguistic clues in order

to guess the meaning of what is read in the target language, in the absence of complete knowledge of vocabulary, grammar or other language elements. These clues may come from aspects of the target language that the learner already knows from the learners' own language, or from another language. When there are no linguistic clues learners have still another option, they can use non-linguistic clues in order to guess the challenging one. These clues may come from knowledge of context, situation, text structure, topic or general world knowledge (Ibid).

2.7.4.4. Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive means beyond, beside or with the cognitive. Therefore, metacognitive strategies are actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide away for learners to coordinate their own learning process. The devices of these strategies include centering your learning, arranging and planning your learning and evaluating your learning (Oxford, 1990).

Strategies for centering your learning are one of the metacognitive strategies, which help learners to converge their attention and energies on certain language tasks, activities, or materials. Strategies for centering learning include techniques such as over viewing comprehensively a key concept, principle, or set of materials in an upcoming language activities and associating it with what is already know and deciding in advance to pay attention in general to a language learning task and to ignore distractors. The second one that categorized under metacognitive strategies is strategies for arranging and planning learning. Strategies for arranging and planning include organizing, setting goals and objectives, finding out about language learning, considering task purpose and planning for tasks. Learning from errors or self-monitoring and evaluating over all progress or self-evaluating are in strategies for evaluating learning which categorized in metacognitive strategies(Ibid).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990:8) say that “Students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without directing and ability to review their progress, accomplishments, and further learning direction.”

2.7.4.5. Affective Strategies

The term "affective" refers to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values. They are categorized under indirect strategies. According to Brown (2007), affective domain spreads out which encompass self-esteem, attitudes, motivation, anxiety, extroversion, inhibition, risk taking, and tolerance for ambiguity. Affective strategies enable learners gain control over their emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values. They exist with three main sets such as lowering their anxiety, encouraging themselves as successful language learners when they understand better, and taking their emotional temperature by talking with another person (Oxford, 1990).

The affective side of the learner is probably one of the very biggest influences on language learning success or failure. This is because human beings are emotional creatures. At the heart of all thought and meaning and action is emotion. As 'intellectual' as we would like to think we are, we are influenced by our emotions. Negative feelings can stunt our language learning progress and positive emotions and attitudes can make language learning far more effective and enjoyable.

2.7.4.6. Social Strategies

Language is a form of social behavior; it is communication and communication occurs between and among people. These strategies contribute to learning indirectly like the former two strategies. They enable learners interact with other people to develop the language. They include techniques such as asking questions when something is not understood or when the learner wants to check whether something is correct. Doing these learners can get closer to the intended meaning and thus aids their understanding. In addition to asking questions, cooperating with classmates or proficient users of the target language helps learners to overcome the challenges. Becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings and understanding target language culture is also one of the techniques of the social strategies (Ibid).

2.8. Factors Affecting Learners' Choice of Strategies

There are various factors affect the choice of strategies: stages of learning, task requirement, age, sex, nationality, general learning style, motivation and purpose for learning the language (Oxford 1990 cited in Williams and Burden, 1997). Bialystok (1979) speculated that such factors might

relate to “characteristics of the learner, such as language learning aptitude, attitude, and motivation, personality variables; or relate instead to characteristics of the learning situation, such as length of exposure to the language, the teaching method employed” (p. 272).

Based on the assumption that “explicit understanding of individual-difference dimensions can enhance the work of all teachers” (p. 188). Oxford and Ehrman (1993) noted the nine factors included aptitude, motivation, anxiety, self-esteem, tolerance of ambiguity, risk-taking, language learning styles, age, and gender. A number of factors are assumed to affect the types, numbers, and frequency of use of language learning strategies: cultural background, language studied, stage of learning, age, motivation, language learning goals, previous language learning experience, language learning styles, gender, anxiety, lack of inhibition, and career or academic specialization.

2.9. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Oxford (1990) devised the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) as an instrument for assessing the frequency of use of language learning strategies by students. In various versions, the SILL has been used in many parts of the world with learners of many different languages. This SILL is the most widely used rubrics around the world to assess learners' strategy use. For instance, more than 30 major studies including dissertations and thesis have been conducted using this inventory. The utility, reliability, and validity of the instrument have also been recognized on various studies (Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995).

Oxford's (1990) book contains two versions, SILL version 5.1 and 7.0. The former Version (Version 5.1) contains 80 items assessing the frequency of strategy use. This form is for English speakers learning a new language. The latter Version (version 7.0) containing 50 items that participants rate on a five-point likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree on a number of strategy descriptions. This version is geared to students of English as a second or foreign language. SILL scores averaging 3.5-5.0 are designated as high 2.5- 3.4 are considered medium strategy utilization and scores ranging from 1.0-2.4 are often labeled as low strategy use.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Study Design

The main objective of this study is to investigate the reading strategies use among high and low achiever students. The research was carried out by using the descriptive research design. To achieve the main purpose, the study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. However, the study largely tended to quantitative method to statistical analysis and interpretation of the data, which gathered from the self-report questionnaire, while the analysis of the semi-structured interview constitutes the qualitative aspect.

3.2. Research Setting

The study was conducted at KB academy, which is located at Bole Sub-City, specifically, Bole Bilbula. KB Academy grade nine and ten students were selected for two reasons. First, the researcher had familiarity with the students and school administration. According to the researcher's perception, this familiarity assists to have access to documents needed for the study. The second reason for selecting grade ten students is the population size of the grade ten students are greater than that of one to nine and preparatory students so the amount of size plays a great role on validity of the study. Therefore, purposive sampling technique was used to select the grade and school.

3.3. Target Population

Grade nine and ten students were target population of the study because students' population size were larger than that of the primary and preparatory students. The researcher believes that the larger size of the target population helps to employ larger subject to the study. The larger the sample size, the better representative of the population and reliable (Kothari, 2004). Therefore, purposive sampling technique has been used to KB Academy grade nine and ten students.

3.4. Sample Population

Grade nine and ten students were selected to participate in this study. Out of the total 41 grade nine and ten students, 30 (15 high and 15 low) students were selected using stratified sampling technique. Totally, there were 41 students in the two sections (22 grade nine students and 19 grade ten students respectively). The high and low achievers are selected on their achievement with two quarters of students' average subject result according to average passing mark set by school which is below seventy and above seventy.

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

3.5.1. Questionnaire

In order to gather data on students' use of reading strategies, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL) has been adapted. The SILL is the most widely used rubrics around the world to assess learners' strategy use. For instance, more than 30 major studies including dissertations and thesis have been conducted using this inventory (e.g., Endaweke, 2008). The utility, reliability, and validity of the instrument have also been recognized on various studies (Oxford and Burry- Stock, 1995).

Therefore, the researcher of this study has found this inventory inevitably indispensable to conduct the study. The present study self-report questionnaire contains 43 items of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) the items, adapted from SILL version 7.0. The items in SILL are grouped systematically into six main strategies; memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. These 43 items, designed based on five point likert-scales, which indicate the frequency (as 1 = 'Never True of Me'; 2 = 'Rarely True of Me'; 3 = 'Sometimes True of Me'; 4= 'Frequently True of Me'; 5= 'Always True of Me') use of reading strategies. In addition, background questions were used to learn participants' information such as gender and age. It was intended to find and remove students with above or below average levels of age.

3.5.2. Interview

A semi-structured interview was used to gather more data for cross-checking. To this end, 16 interviewees were selected (the top eight high achievers and the least eight low achievers) using systematic sampling technique. To facilitate clear understanding between the researcher and the participants, the interview was held in Amharic. The content of the interview was similar with the questionnaire. As a result, there is no special section for interview analysis. Therefore, the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire were cross-checked qualitatively with the data obtained through the interview.

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

First, high and low achievers were interviewed before filling in the questionnaire. The students were interviewed before filling in the questionnaire to avoid bias of data because of their awareness about the area of focus from the questionnaire statements. Second, the questionnaire was coded according to the participants' academic performance to 'high' and 'low' achiever students. Then, the questionnaire was distributed and collected by the researcher.

3.7. Data Analysis Procedure

The data obtained through the self-report questionnaire were organized. Then, the organized data were entered into computer to be analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programme version-20. The results obtained from the programme were categorized into six main reading strategies (i.e. memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies) along with their descriptive statistics results and their respective items.

In each main category, high and low achiever students' preference for each item was computed based on frequency counting, mean value, and standard deviation (standard deviation was used to discuss only when the data from questionnaire contradict with the interview). Then, high achievers' and low achievers' six main strategies use were put in a rank order based on the respective mean values. Finally, independent T-test (SPSS) was used to see if there is statistically significant difference between high and low achievers in using reading strategies.

The five point likert scales were collapsed into the following use of frequency range as Low =1.0 – 2.49, Medium = 2.5 – 3.49 and High = 3.5 – 5.0 in order to analyze the data, a concurrent strategy (Oxford, 1990) used to interpret the data. The statistical significant difference was computed at the p-value < .05 of this study based on Oxford (1990).

The purpose of the interview is to support the self-report questionnaire. As a result, there is no special section for interview analysis. Hence, the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire were cross- checked qualitatively with the data obtained through the interview.

3.8 The Pilot Study

The pilot study was made in order to obtain information about the reliability and validity of the data collection instruments. In this stage, the instruments of the study were tested on the subjects other than the actual study participants. The pilot study help the research to make all the necessary changes, modifications, and revisions on the instruments of the data collection before dealing the actual study. Understanding these advantages, the researcher made a pilot on TEFL learners at Addis Ababa University. In order to get information, eight students were selected using stratified sampling technique, which means that four top high achievers and four low achievers were selected to fill in the self-report questionnaire. From eight students top two high achievers and two low achievers were selected to participate in the interview. Then, the participants were interviewed to express their reading strategies use. However, most of them, especially, low achievers suggested that they could express it freely if the interview was held in Amharic. Concerning the suggestion, the researcher made the actual study interview in Amharic. The participants also given other comments and suggestions; based on the comments some changes were made. For example, two items in the self-report questionnaire found to be similar meaning, therefore, one item was excluded in the actual research. Generally, the researcher has gained several insights about the procedures of the study, having all the comments and suggestions that the pilot study has offered.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this part of the study, the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire was analyzed using frequency counting, mean value and standard deviation (standard deviation was used to discuss only when the data from questionnaire disagree with the interview). In each main reading strategies category, high and low achiever students' preference for each item was computed by mean. Then, high achievers' and low achievers' six main strategies use were put in a rank order based on the respective mean values. Finally, independent T-test was used to see if there was statistically significant difference between high and low achievers in using reading strategies.

The purpose of the interview was to cross-check the self-report questionnaire data. As a result, there was no special section for interview analysis. Hence, the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire were cross-checked qualitatively with the data obtained through the interview.

4.1. Background of the Participants

The participants of the study were grade nine and ten students of KB Academy. The study employed twelve males and eighteen females who were categorized into two groups i.e. the high achievers (15 students) and low achievers (15 students) based on their two quarters average result, whose age ranges from fifteen to eighteen years old.

4.2. Use of Memory Strategies

Items 1-5 were designed to collect data on how often high and low achiever students use memory strategies (See Appendix A). The following table shows the responses for the items.

Table 1: Memory Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Memory</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>							
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			
<i>Item 1</i>	-	2	1	5	7	4.13	1.060	1	3	9	2	-	2.8	.775	
<i>Item 2</i>	-	1	8	1	5	3.67	1.047	3	1	6	3	2	3.00	1.309	
<i>Item 3</i>	-	-	3	3	9	4.40	.828	2	1	5	6	1	3.20	1.146	
<i>Item 4</i>	1	-	1	8	5	4.07	1.033	2	3	5	1	4	3.13	1.407	
<i>Item 5</i>	-	3	3	4	5	3.73	1.163	-	3	7	3	2	3.27	.961	
<i>Average</i>						4.00	1.026	<i>Average</i>						3.08	1.120

4.2.1. Visualizing Information

Item 1 was designed to get data on how often high and low achiever students visualize or create mental image of information they get from the text in order to remember what they read. As it is indicated in table 1, high and low achiever students differ on visualizing information. The table shows that the means of high and low achiever students were found to be $\bar{x} = 4.13$ and $\bar{x} = 2.8$ respectively. This implies that high achiever students' visualizing information ($\bar{x} = 4.13$) falls between scales ($\bar{x} = 1.0 - 2.49 =$ low, $\bar{x} = 2.5 - 3.49 =$ medium, $\bar{x} = 3.5 - 5.0 =$ high, a concurrent strategy Oxford, 1990 used these scales to interpret the data) and low achiever students medium as $\bar{x} = 2.8$ falls between $\bar{x} = 2.5 - 3.49$. The results also indicated that high achiever students visualize information more often than low achiever students do. The table also depicts that most of the high achiever students rated between 'Frequently true of me' and 'Always true of me' only two of them rated 'Rarely true of me' and one student rated 'Sometimes true of me'. In other case, most of the low achiever students rated 'Sometimes true of me'. Therefore, one can understand

that high achiever and low achiever students apply this strategy in different frequency level in favor of high achiever students as higher users.

4.2.2. Remembering Location to Remember New Words/Phrases

The aim of item 2 was to assess how often the students remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign. As it is depicted in table 1, high achiever students remember new words or phrases by remembering the location more frequently ($\bar{x} = 3.67$) than the low achievers ($\bar{x} = 3.00$). Their mean value clearly shows that to remember new words high achiever students use the location where they read it more frequently than the low achievers. The table also indicates that high achiever students use this (remembering location to remember new words/phrases) at high level since their mean score falls between 3.5 -5.0. On the other hand, low achiever students practice this at a medium level as their mean value is between 2.5 -3.49.

4.2.3. Associating Text Idea with Background Knowledge

The respondents were asked, in item 3, about how often they associate text idea with their background knowledge. It is shown in table 1 that high achiever students with $\bar{x} = 4.40$ and low achiever students with $\bar{x} = 3.20$ associate text idea with their prior knowledge. This implies that high achiever students use this method more frequently than low achiever students. The figures also suggest that high achiever students' mean value of associating text idea with their background knowledge is high as their mean value falls between $\bar{x} = 3.50$ -5.0 and low achiever students' is medium as $\bar{x} = 3.20$ falls between $\bar{x} = 2.5$ -3.49. Table 1 also reveals that out of fifteen high achiever students, nine students rated 'Always true of me', three students rated 'Frequently true of me', and the other three rated 'Sometimes true of me'. Whereas, most of low achiever students rated between 'Sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. From this, we can understand that high and low achiever students apply this strategy (associating text idea with background knowledge) in different frequency level, which means that high achievers as high and low achievers as medium users. Data from interview also shows that there is discrepancy between high and low achievers in using this strategy. During the interview most of the high achievers reported that they frequently associate the text ideas with their prior knowledge. The

significant number of the low achievers said that they rarely associate the text ideas with their prior knowledge.

4.2.4. Reviewing a Text

Item 4 was designed to ascertain data on how often high and low achiever students review a text. As presented in table 1, the data reveal that high achiever students try to review what they read from a text more often ($\bar{x} = 4.07$) than low achievers do ($\bar{x} = 3.13$). This means that high achiever students employ this method more often than low achiever students. From the results, we can also understand that high achiever students try to review a text with high frequency scale ($\bar{x} = 3.5 - 5.0 = \text{High}$). However, low achiever students do this with medium frequency scale ($\bar{x} = 2.5 - 3.49 = \text{Medium}$). Data from the interview agree with the data obtained through the questionnaire. During the interview, most of the high achiever students reported that they frequently review what they read. In contrary, most of the low achievers said that they sometimes review what they read.

4.2.5. Practicing a New Word, Phrase, or Sentence in a Memorable Situation

An attempt was made in item 5 to find out data on how often the respondents of this study practice a new English word, phrase, or sentence of the text in a memorable situation. Data in table 1 shows that high and low achiever students differ in practicing a new English word, phrase, or sentence in a memorable situation. According to the figures, high achiever students practice a new English word/phrase/sentence in a memorable situation more frequently ($\bar{x} = 3.73$) than their counterparts ($\bar{x} = 3.27$) do. The mean values also reveal that high achiever students practice this technique in high frequency whereas low achievers employ this in medium range which means their rating fall in a scale $\bar{x} = 3.50 - 5.0 = \text{High}$ and $\bar{x} = 2.5 - 3.49 = \text{Medium}$ respectively.

The results of the interview agree with the results obtained through self-report questionnaire. During interview, the significant number of high and low achiever students reported that they practice a new English word, phrase, or sentence of the text in a memorable situation to remember easily or not to forget what they read 'Frequently' and 'Sometimes' respectively.

From the above discussion and data in the table 1, we can understand that high and low achiever students employed memory strategies in different frequency level. It is also possible to say that memory strategies are in favor of high achiever students because they use all memory strategies more frequently than their counterparts. In all these, the mean values show that high achiever students use them with high frequency scale and low achiever students employ them with medium frequency scale. Out of memory strategies, which listed in self-report questionnaire, the most frequently used strategy was item 3 (associating text idea with background knowledge) with a mean score \bar{x} = 4.40 by high achiever students. While, highly rated strategy by low achiever students was item 5 (practicing a new English word, phrase, or sentence of the text in a memorable situation) with a mean score \bar{x} = 3.27 still this item more frequently used by high achievers than their counterparts.

4.3. Use of Cognitive Strategies

Items 6 - 16 in the questionnaire were designed to find out the use of cognitive strategies among high and low achiever students (See Appendix A). The following table shows how often the sample population of the study use cognitive strategies.

Table 2: Cognitive Strategies Use of High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Cognitive</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>						
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (\bar{x})</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (\bar{x})</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>		
<i>Item 6</i>	1	-	1	3	10	4.40	1.121	3	3	3	2	4	3.07	1.534
<i>Item 7</i>	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1.397	3	-	6	3	3	3.20	1.373
<i>Item 8</i>	-	-	3	2	10	4.47	.834	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1.457
<i>Item 9</i>	-	-	1	7	7	4.40	.632	2	4	5	2	2	2.87	1.246
<i>Item 10</i>	1	-	5	4	5	3.80	1.146	1	3	6	1	4	3.27	1.280
<i>Item 11</i>	-	1	4	3	7	4.07	1.033	-	5	4	2	4	3.33	1.234
<i>Item 12</i>	2	4	6	2	1	2.73	1.100	2	4	4	3	2	2.93	1.280

<i>Item 13</i>	3	1	4	3	4	3.27	1.486	1	3	5	5	1	3.13	1.060
<i>Item 14</i>	1	-	3	6	5	3.93	1.100	4	1	5	-	5	3.07	1.624
<i>Item 15</i>	1	4	4	6	-	3.00	1.000	4	9	2	-	-	1.87	.640
<i>Item 16</i>	-	-	6	2	7	4.07	.961	2	4	5	2	2	2.87	1.246
<i>Average</i>						3.80	1.083	<i>Average</i>					2.98	1.270

4.3.1. Re-reading to Increase Understanding

In item 6, the students were asked to report how often they re-read text to increase their understanding. As table 2 exhibits, a considerable number of high achiever students inclined to re-reading text to better understanding. Ten and three of high achiever students indicated that they apply this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. It was only one student reported that she/he 'never' uses the strategy. In contrast, four and two of low achiever students ascertain that they re-read text to increase their understanding 'always' and 'frequently' respectively and three of them reported that they 'never' read text again and again to better understanding. Thus, we can say that more successful students (i.e. high achievers) use re-reading to increase their understanding more frequently than less successful students (i.e. low achievers) do. The data in table 2 also reveals that high achievers' responses are found to be mean=4.40 and low achievers mean= 3.07. From the results, we can understand that high achievers use re-reading to increase their understanding with high frequency scale ($\times = 3.5-5.0 = \text{High}$) whereas low achievers do this with medium frequency scale ($\times = 2.5-3.49 = \text{Medium}$).

4.3.2. Underlining or Circling Key Information

In item 7, the sample populations of the study were asked to report how often they underline or circle key information in the text to help them to understand what they read. As table 2 demonstrates, five and five of high achiever students rated 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively, and two and two of them rated 'sometimes true of me' and 'never true of me' respectively. Beside low achiever students, three and three of them reported that they underline key information 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and also six and three respondents of them rated 'sometimes true of me' and 'never true of me' respectively. Thus, we can infer from this that high achievers more often use this technique than their counterparts. The

figures above also suggest that high achiever students' mean value of underlining key information is high as their mean score is 3.67 and low achievers' mean value is medium because their mean score falls between 2.5-3.49. The results of data analysis revealed that high achiever students employ underlining key information more frequently than low achiever students.

4.3.3. Paraphrasing

In the same way, item 8 asked the respondents of the study to shown how regularly they paraphrase what they read in their own words for better understanding. The data in the table 2 indicates that significant number of high achiever students paraphrase what they read in their own words. The table indicates that ten and two of the high achiever students apply this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and also very few of them (only three students) indicated that they 'sometimes' use this strategy. In contrast, three and four of low achiever students exposed that they 'always' and 'frequently' paraphrase what they read in their own words respectively. Thus, the data inform that high achievers more frequently paraphrase text idea in their own words than low achiever students. The above discussion further strengthened by their mean value difference. The table displayed that high achievers' mean score is 4.47 and low achievers' is 3.13, which means that high achiever students employ this in high range as they fall in a high scale ($\times=3.5-5.0$) and low achievers apply this in medium range as they fall in a medium scale ($\times=2.5-3.49$).

4.3.4. Note Taking

Similarly, item 9 was prepared to ascertain data among high and low achiever students how often they take notes while reading text to comprehend what they read. It is shown in table 2 that significant number of more successful students (i.e. seven and seven of them) marked 'always true of me' and 'frequently true me' respectively in five point scale questionnaire. Whereas, insignificant number of less successful students (i.e. two and two of them) rated 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. Hence, this implies that high achiever students take notes more often than low achievers. The data also shows that high and low achiever students differ on taking notes while reading to increase their understanding. As it is reveals in table 2, high achievers with mean 4.40, and low achievers with mean 2.87 take notes to comprehend what they read. From the presentation, one can understand that high achiever students take note

with high frequency range in a scale ($\times=3.5-5.0$ =High) than low achievers do this with medium frequency range in a scale ($\times=2.5-3.49$ =Medium). Data from the interview corresponds with the data obtained through the questionnaire.

4.3.5. Referring from Dictionary

The purpose of item 10 was to see how often the sample population of the study use reference materials like dictionary to help them understand what they read in better way. Table 2 reveals that five and four of the high achiever students marked 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively and the remaining five and one of them pointed 'sometimes true of me' and 'never true of me' respectively. While, four and one of low achiever students reported that they use this strategy 'always' and 'frequently' respectively and also six and three of them rated 'sometimes true of me' and 'rarely true of me' respectively. One student 'never' uses reference materials e.g. dictionary at all in both categories (high and low achievers). As it is depicted in table 2, high and low achiever students were found $\times=3.80$ and $\times=3.27$ respectively. From the discussion and the table, we can infer that high achievers use the strategy more regularly at high frequency scale $\times=3.80$, which falls between $\times=3.5-5.0$, but low achievers at medium frequency scale $\times=3.27$, which falls between $\times=2.5-3.49$. The information from the interview contradicts with the data obtained from the questionnaire. In the interview, almost all the low achiever interviewees said that they frequently use dictionary to help them understand what they read. However, most high achievers said that they rarely use dictionary. However, the results of the quantitative data reveal that the high achiever students employed this strategy in high frequency level than the low achievers. Standard deviation informed us whether their rating in self-report questionnaire clustered or spread out; from it we can understand how much the mean values represent their rating scores in five point scale questionnaire. Table 2 shows that high achiever students use reference materials like dictionary at high frequency scale ($\times=3.80$) with $SD=1.146$ and low achievers use it at medium frequency scale with $SD=1.280$. This implies that high achievers' mean value represents their rating scores in self-report questionnaire relatively better than that of low achievers' mean value since the high achievers standard deviation is ($SD=1.146$) less than that of low achievers ($SD=1.280$). Hence, we can infer that low achiever students might be not genuinely reported for this technique during interview as high achiever students.

4.3.6. Thinking Information in both English and Mother Tongue

Item 11 was developed to collect data how frequently high and low achiever students practice the strategy of thinking information in both English and mother tongue while reading. As table 2 shows, seven and three of the high achiever students reported that they think information in both English and mother tongue while reading 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. Beside low achiever students, four and two of them practice this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. This indicates that high and low achievers differ in using the strategy. This is also strengthened by their mean value analysis in table 2, which means that high achiever students' mean value, is $\bar{x}=4.07$ and low achievers' is $\bar{x}=3.33$. Therefore, one can conclude that high achiever students employ this technique (thinking information in both English and mother tongue during reading) more often than their counterparts (low achievers practice) because their mean scores imply that high achievers use this technique with high scale ($\bar{x}=3.50-5.0=$ High) and low achievers use it with medium scale ($\bar{x}=2.49-3.5=$ Medium).

4.3.7. Using Typographical Features

Item 12 was designed to obtain data on how often the sample population of the study use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information. As table 2 demonstrates, low achievers seem to have an experience in using typographical features. This is because two and three of low achievers and one and two of high achievers use typographical features respectively 'always' and 'frequently'. This shows us low achiever students use typographical features to identify key information more often than high achiever students do. The table above also reveals that less successful students (i.e. low achievers) apply typographical features to identify key information more frequently than more successful students (i.e. high achievers) do. The numerical values also suggest that both categories (high and low achievers) belong to medium users of this strategy since their mean scores were 2.73 and 2.93 respectively. From the discussion, we can infer that both groups of students use typographical features to identify key information in medium frequency scale.

4.3.8. Dividing Words into Parts to Find their Meaning

The respondents were asked, in item 13, about how often they divide words into parts to find their meaning in order to enhance their understanding. From the data obtained in table 2, we can understand that both high and low achiever students divide words into parts to find their meaning in medium scale since high achievers' mean is 3.27 and low achievers' mean is 3.13 which are found in range of ($\times=2.5-3.49=$ Medium). This means that both high and low achiever students are medium users of this strategy. Their mean value implies that the significant number of both high and low achievers' rating scale was between 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me' in self-report questionnaire. From this, we can say that both categories of the sample population practice this technique in medium frequency range in favor of high achievers.

4.3.9. Skimming Skill

An attempt was made in item 14 to extract data on how often respondents of this study use skimming skill to improve their understanding when they read passage in English. As it is shown in table 2, more successful students' use of frequency level differ from that of less successful students' in skimming a passage in order to get the main idea of it. The reading frequency of table 2 also depicts, five and six of the high achievers reported that they apply this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. On the other hand, five and no one of the low achievers rated 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively in self-report questionnaire. Only one student of the high achievers said that he/she 'never' skims an English passage, while four of low achiever students reported that they 'never' apply this strategy at all. The table also reveals that high achiever students' response is found to be $\times=3.93$ and low achievers' is $\times=3.07$, these imply that they employed this technique with high and medium frequency scales $\times=3.93$ and $\times=3.07$ respectively. The numerical descriptions also suggest that the high achiever students use skimming skill more regularly than their counterparts. Therefore, from the discussion and their mean value, one can infer that both groups of students apply skimming skill but high achievers do it with high frequency scale. Data obtained from interview suggests that the high achiever students use skimming skill more frequently than the low achievers. Hence, it is possible to say that information obtained from the questionnaire agrees with the interview. This is because data from both ways show that the high achievers more frequently use skimming skill than the low achievers.

4.3.10. Reading for Pleasure

An attempt was made in item 15 to gather data on how often the sample population of the study read for pleasure in English. The reading frequency in table 2 implies that six and four of the high achievers rated 'frequently true of me' and 'sometimes true of me' respectively. However, no one of the low achievers rated in five-point scale questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. Nine and four of the low achievers and four and one of the high achievers respectively reported that they 'rarely' and 'never' read for pleasure in English. The data obtained from the analysis imply the difference among high and low achiever students in their mean values, which means that the high achievers' read for pleasure in English is mean $\bar{x}=3.00$ and the low achievers' is $\bar{x}=1.87$. It can also be understood that high achievers read for pleasure in English at medium frequency scale, but the low achievers practice reading for pleasure at low frequency range. Therefore, from the results, we can conclude that high achiever students' habit of reading for pleasure in English is better than that of the low achiever students. In the interview, the majority of high achievers reported that they sometimes read for pleasure in English, while participants of the low achievers asserted that they never read for pleasure in English rather they read for pleasure in Amharic. Thus, the interview result seems partially agree with the data obtained from the questionnaire. This is because the quantitative results of the low achievers show that they rarely read for pleasure, but almost all of the low achievers during interview reported that they never read for pleasure in English.

4.3.11. Summarizing Information

Similarly, item 16 was employed to get information about how frequently high and low achiever students of this study summarize the information that they read in English. The reading frequency in table 2 shows that seven and two of the high achievers marked 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively, on the other hand, two and two of the low achievers summarize information 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. As it is depicted in the table 2, a substantial number of the high achievers tend to summarize information more frequently than low achievers. The statement above also strengthened by their mean scores since the high achievers' mean is 4.07 and low achievers' is 2.87. This means that the high achievers summarize information more regularly ($\bar{x}=4.07$) than the low achievers. This also suggests that the high achievers practice this with high frequency scale and the low achievers do in medium frequency

range. Hence, it is possible to say that the high and low achiever students summarize information with different frequency range.

Regarding cognitive strategies, both groups of the students (i.e. high and low achievers) use the entire cognitive strategies, but with different frequency level. It is possible to say that cognitive strategies are in favor of the high achievers because they use ten among eleven listed cognitive strategies more frequently than their counterparts (low achievers) do. From the ten techniques, eight items 6,7,8,9,10,11,14, and 16 employed with high frequency range and the remaining in medium range (Low=1.0-2.49, Medium=2.5-3.49, High=3.5-5.0). In contrary, low achievers use all listed cognitive strategies in medium frequency scales except item 15 (\bar{x} =1.87=Low). From the discussion and data in the table 2, we can understand that high achiever students' average use of cognitive strategies is \bar{x} =3.80 at high frequency range, while low achiever students' average is \bar{x} =2.98 at medium frequency range.

4.4. Use of Compensation Strategies

In the questionnaire, items 17-21 were designed to find out how often the subject students of the study use compensation strategies (See Appendix A). The following table displays the use of compensation strategies by high and low achiever students.

Table 3: Compensation Strategies Use Among High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Compens</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>						
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>		
<i>Item 17</i>	-	1	2	4	8	4.27	.961	4	3	5	1	2	2.60	1.352
<i>Item 18</i>	-	1	-	6	8	4.40	.828	2	2	1	7	3	3.47	1.356
<i>Item 19</i>	2	3	7	3	-	2.73	.961	6	2	2	2	3	2.60	1.639
<i>Item 20</i>	-	-	5	4	6	4.07	.884	3	5	1	2	4	2.93	1.580
<i>Item 21</i>	6	6	1	2	-	1.93	1.033	2	1	7	3	2	3.17	1.187
<i>Average</i>						3.48	.933	<i>Average</i>					2.95	1.423

4.4.1. Making Guesses to Understand Unfamiliar Words

The aim of item 17 was to collect data on how often the sample populations of this study make guesses in order to understand unfamiliar English word. As it is exhibited in table 3, significant number of high achiever students rated between 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. On the other hand, a considerable number of low achiever students rated between 'sometimes true of me' and 'rarely true of me'. This shows that high achiever students differ from low achiever students in the level of frequency in making guesses. This is also further strengthened by their mean values difference. The results show that the mean values of high and low achievers were 4.27 and 2.60 respectively. These informed that high achievers use at high frequency and low achievers at medium frequency scale ($\bar{x}= 3.5-5.0$ =high and $\bar{x}=2.5-3.49$ =medium respectively). This implies that high achiever students make guesses more frequently than low achiever students. The information taken from interviews indicated that there is similarity between the data obtained from the questionnaire. Most high achiever interviewees report revealed that they make guessing more frequently than the low achievers. Significant number of the low achiever interviewees reported that they prefer dictionary than guessing because their inability to guess the possible meanings of the word very often discouraged them from using the strategy.

4.4.2. Using Titles to Guess the Content of the Text

Item 18 was developed in order to obtain data on how frequently the high and low achiever students employ titles to guess what the content of the text is about. As it is presented in table 3, eight and six of the high achievers make guesses depending on a title what the content of the text is about 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and only one student of them rated 'rarely true of me' in the five point scale questionnaire. On the other hand, three and seven of the low achievers apply this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. And also two and two of the low achievers marking in five point scale questionnaire 'rarely true of me' and 'never true of me' respectively. The mean values among high and low achiever students also reveal the difference between two groups in using this strategy. As it is seen in table 3, high achievers mean value is $\bar{x}=4.40$ and low achievers mean value is $\bar{x}=3.47$. The figures demonstrate, the high achiever students practice this method of reading more frequently than the low achiever students. During

interview, the majority of high achiever interviewees reported that they usually make guesses depending on a title what the content of the text is about, while participants from the low achievers asserted that they rarely make guesses depending on a title what the content of the text is about. Thus, the interview results seem to disagree a little from the side of the low achievers because the quantitative data shows that significant numbers of the low achievers frequently use a title to guess the content of the text but qualitative data reveals that they rarely make guesses depending on a title what the content of the text is about. From this, we infer that low achievers quantitative results might be no representing their actual practice of this technique. This is because low achiever students' standard deviation found to be $SD=1.356$ and High achiever students' standard deviation found to be $SD=.828$. This informs that most of high achievers' responses were clustered, while the low achievers' responses in self-report questionnaire were spread out. Thus, one can understand that the low achievers mean value no represents their scores as high achievers mean value.

4.4.3. Using Tables, Figures, and/or Pictures to Increase Understanding

In the same way, item 19 was developed in order to obtain data on how often high and low achiever students use tables, figures, and/or pictures to increase their understanding. The data collected from the sample population of the study discloses that seven and three of the high achievers and two and two of the low achievers rated 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. And also two and three of the high achievers and six and two of the low achievers marked 'never true of me' and 'rarely true of me' respectively. This implies that there is a difference between two groups using tables, figures, and/or pictures to increase their understanding. However, their rating frequency range was similar which means that both high and low achiever students practice this technique at medium frequency level $\bar{x}=2.73$ and $\bar{x}=2.60$ respectively. From the discussion, one can understand that high achiever students marked in five- point scale questionnaire clustered together, but low achievers rating in self-report questionnaire was spread out.

4.4.4. Using Contextual Clues

Item 20 was prepared to collect data among high and low achiever students how regularly they use contextual clues to better understanding. The data obtained from the analysis (in table 3) disclosed that six and four of the high achievers rating in self-report questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. However, four and two of the low achiever students use contextual clues to better understanding 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. As it is depicted in the above table, the mean value of high achievers is 4.07 and low achievers' is 2.93. This means that high achievers use contextual clues to increase their understanding more frequently than the low achievers. The mean value also suggests that high achievers use this strategy at high frequency ($\times=3.5-5.0$ =High) and low achievers employ this at medium frequency range ($\times=2.5-3.49$ =Medium). Therefore, one can infer that high and low achiever students use contextual clues to increase their understanding with different frequency range in favor of the high achievers.

4.4.5. Reading without Looking up Every New Word from Dictionary

The purpose of item 21 was to obtain data on how frequently the sample population of this study read English without looking up every new word from the dictionary. Table 3 demonstrates low achiever students seem to have an experience in reading an English text without looking up every new word from dictionary. As it is depicted in the table, low achiever students read English without looking up every new word on dictionary more often ($\times=3.13$) than high achievers ($\times=1.93$). Their mean values also reveal that low achievers do this more frequently at medium frequency scale than high achievers who practice this technique at low scale. These numerical descriptions can also tell us most of the low achiever students marked between 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. In contrary, most of the high achiever students rated between 'never true of me' and 'rarely true of me'. This means that high and low achiever students practice this strategy in differ frequency level in favor of low achiever students as moderate users. Thus, from the data, we can understand that low achievers more often do not look up dictionary for every new word, but high achievers look up every new word on dictionary while reading in English. However, the discussion above contradict with item 17 results, because, in item 17, high achiever students reported that they make guesses to understand unfamiliar (new) word more often than low achievers but in contrary, the above discussion

presents that high achievers use dictionary to looking up every new word more regularly than their counterpart (low achievers).

Concerning compensation strategies, the high achiever students employed four strategies among five listed compensation strategies more frequently than the low achievers. It is also possible to say that high achiever students are in favor of employing three strategies (item 17, 18, and 20) with high frequency range. Whereas, low achievers use the entire compensation strategies, which listed in the self-report questionnaire in medium frequency scale. The discussion and data in the table 3 show that high achiever students' overall use of compensation strategies average is $\bar{x}=3.48$ at medium frequency range, while low achiever students' average use of compensation strategies is $\bar{x}=2.95$ with the same frequency range.

4.5. Use of Metacognitive Strategies

In order to collect data about the students' use of metacognitive strategies, Item 22-33 were designed (See Appendix A). The following table shows how often high and low achievers use metacognitive strategies.

Table 4: Metacognitive Strategies Use Among High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Metacognitive</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>						
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>		
<i>Item 22</i>	-	-	1	10	4	4.20	.561	4	1	5	3	2	2.87	1.407
<i>Item 23</i>	-	-	-	4	11	4.73	.458	2	2	7	2	2	3.00	1.195
<i>Item 24</i>	-	-	6	5	4	3.87	.834	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1.438
<i>Item 25</i>	-	1	2	5	7	4.20	.941	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1.502
<i>Item 26</i>	1	-	3	6	5	3.93	1.100	3	2	2	5	3	3.20	1.474
<i>Item 27</i>	-	-	6	5	4	3.87	.834	-	1	5	5	4	3.80	.941
<i>Item 28</i>	1	-	4	5	5	3.87	1.125	-	2	5	7	1	3.47	.834

<i>Item 29</i>	1	1	1	7	5	3.93	1.163	4	5	3	2	1	2.40	1.242
<i>Item 30</i>	-	-	2	4	9	4.47	.743	2	1	4	5	3	3.40	1.298
<i>Item 31</i>	-	-	2	5	8	4.40	.737	2	4	3	4	2	3.00	1.309
<i>Item 32</i>	-	1	2	5	7	4.20	.941	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	1.438
<i>Item 33</i>	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	1.447	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1.246
<i>Average</i>						4.11	.907	<i>Average</i>					3.25	1.277

4.5.1. Adjusting Reading Speed

The sample populations of the study were asked, in item 22, to show how often they adjust reading speed according to what they are reading. As the reading frequency in table 4 shows, ten and four of the high achiever students reported that they adjust their reading speed 'frequently' and 'always' respectively, while only three and two of low achievers adjust their reading speed 'frequently' and 'always' respectively. On the other hand, no one of the high achievers marked in five-point scale questionnaire 'never true of me' and 'rarely true of me'. Beside low achievers, four and one of them rated 'never true of me' and 'rarely true of me' respectively. The results of the analysis in table 4 reveal that high achievers differ from low achievers in adjusting reading speed. The results in the above table also show that high achievers' responses are found to be mean=4.20 whereas low achievers' are mean= 2.87. This means that high achiever students adjusting reading speed more frequently than low achievers. One can understand from the results that high achievers adjusting reading speed with high frequency range ($\times=3.5-5.0=$ High) whereas low achiever students practice this technique with medium frequency level ($\times=2.5-3.49=$ Medium). Therefore, high and low achiever students differ in adjusting reading speed according to what they are reading.

4.5.2. Having Purpose of Reading

In the same way, item 23 was used to obtain data on how often respondents of this study read text with purpose. As it is depicted in table 4, significant number of high achievers (i.e. eleven students) reported that they 'always' read the text having purpose and the remaining four students rated in five-point scale questionnaire 'frequently true of me'. On the other hand, considerable number of low achievers (i.e. seven of them) said that they 'sometimes' read text-having purpose.

The results of the analysis show that the responses of the high achievers differ from the low achievers. The high and low achievers' mean values are found to be $\bar{x}=4.73$ and $\bar{x}=3.00$ respectively. From this, we can comprehend that high achiever students have set purpose of reading more frequently with high frequency scale ($\bar{x}=3.5-5.0$) than low achievers do in medium frequency scale ($\bar{x}=2.5-3.49$ =Medium).

4.5.3. Taking an Overview of the Text

Item 24 was designed to gather data on how frequently the sample populations of this study take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it. As it is shown in table 4, high and low achiever students differ on taking an overview of the text. The table also shows that four and five of the high achievers rated 'always true of me' and 'frequently true me' respectively and the remain six of them practice this strategy 'sometimes'. However, four and three of the low achiever students use this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and three, three and two of them rated respectively 'sometimes true of me', 'rarely true of me' and 'never true of me'. The results of the above presentation (in table 4) also show that high and low achiever students are found to be $\bar{x}=3.87$ and $\bar{x}=3.27$ respectively on taking an overview of the text. This implies that high achievers' taking an overview of the text is high as $\bar{x}=3.87$ falls between scales ($\bar{x}=1.0-2.49$ =Low, $\bar{x}=2.5-3.49$ =Medium, $\bar{x}=3.5-5.0$ =High) and low achievers' is medium as $\bar{x}=3.27$ falls between $\bar{x}=2.5-3.49$ =Medium. This implies that high achievers use this method more often than low achievers do. There is a match between the data obtained through the questionnaire and interviews. During interview, the majority of the high achievers reported that they frequently take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it, while the low achievers said that they practice this strategy sometimes.

4.5.4. Checking Own Understanding

Item 25 asked students to replay how frequently they check their own understanding when they come across new information. The data obtained from the analysis in table 4 disclosed that high achievers check their understanding more regularly ($\bar{x}=4.20$) than low achievers ($\bar{x}=3.40$) which suggests that the high achievers check their understanding in high frequency range and the low achievers do it in medium frequency range. The numerical descriptions also imply that seven and five of the high achiever students practice this (checking their understanding) 'always' and

'frequently' respectively, and two and one of them use it 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively. Whereas, five and three of the low achiever students check their understanding 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and another two and three of them apply this technique 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively. The remaining two students of the low achievers reported that they never check their understanding when they come across new information.

4.5.5. Checking the Accuracy of Guessing

The aim of item 26 was also to show their rating scale how often they check the accuracy of their guessing. The data obtained from the analysis in table 4 disclose that the high achiever students differ from the low achievers in checking the accuracy of their guessing. The collected data results show that the high achievers with mean $\bar{x}=3.93$ and the low achievers with $\bar{x}=3.20$ respectively found to be high and medium users of checking the accuracy of their guessing whether they are right or wrong. These numerical descriptions also reveal that five and six of the high achievers and three and five of the low achievers rated in self-report questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. And also three and no one of the high achievers and two and two of the low achievers marked 'sometimes true of me' and 'rarely true of me' respectively. Only one of the high achievers and three of the low achievers pointed 'never true of me' in five-point scale questionnaire respectively. Thus, we can understand that high achiever students check the accuracy of their guessing at high frequency scale ($\bar{x}=3.93$) than low achiever students as they practice this technique at medium frequency scale ($\bar{x}=3.20$).

4.5.6. Critically Analyzing and Evaluating

In the same way, item 27 was also designed to obtain data on how regularly the high and low achiever students critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text. As it is depicted in table 4, four and five of the high achievers and four and five of the low achievers reported that they use this strategy 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. Six of the high achievers and five of the low achievers exposed that they critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text 'sometimes'. No one of the high achievers rated 'rarely true of me' and 'never true of me' in self-report questionnaire. However, one and no one of the low achievers marked 'rarely true of me' and 'never true of me' respectively in five-point scale questionnaire. From this, we can understand that both groups of students use this technique

relatively in the same frequency scale. The discussion further strengthened by their mean value which means that high and low achiever students use the technique with mean $\bar{x}=3.87$ and $\bar{x}=3.80$ respectively.

4.5.7. Deciding to Read Closely and to Ignore

An attempt was made (in item 28) to quantify data on how often the respondents of the study decide to read closely (to pay more attention) and to ignore (to pay less attention) while reading. As shown in table 4, the majority of the high achievers rated between 'frequently true of me' and 'always true of me' and of the low achievers marked between 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. The mean value of the low achievers ($\bar{x}=3.47$) clearly support the above frequency descriptions than the high achievers mean value ($\bar{x}=3.87$). This is because a considerable number of the high achievers rated between 'frequently true of me' and 'always true of me' but their mean value is $\bar{x}=3.87$. The significant number of the low achievers marked between 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me' similarly their mean value is $\bar{x}=3.47$. The data also suggests that the low achievers' mean value ($\bar{x}=3.47$) represents the scores very well than the high achievers' mean value ($\bar{x}=3.87$).

4.5.8. Looking for Opportunities to Read in English

Similarly, an attempt was made in item 29 to find out how often the sample populations of the study look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English in order to improve their reading skill. Data in the table shows, five and seven of the high achievers look for opportunities to read in English 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, while one and two of the low achievers practice this technique 'always' and 'frequently' respectively. One student from high achievers and four of the low achievers 'never' look for opportunities to read in English in order to improve their reading skill. Table 4 also reveals that high and low achievers have mean value of $\bar{x}=3.93$ and $\bar{x}=2.40$ respectively, which means that the high achievers look for opportunities to read in English more regularly in high frequency scale than the low achievers do in low frequency scale since their mean values fall between ($\bar{x}=1.0-2.49$ =Low). From the analysis, it is possible to say that the high achiever students more experienced than the low achiever students in looking for opportunities to read in English in order to enhance their reading skill.

4.5.9. Having Goals for Enhance Reading Skill

The aim of item 30 was to know how frequently the sample students of the study set clear goals for improve their reading skill. It is shown in table 4 that significant number of the high achiever students (i.e. nine and four) rated in self-report questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. Whereas, considerable number of the low achievers (i.e. five and four of them) marked 'frequently true of me' and 'sometimes true of me' respectively. The presentation also strengthened by their mean scores because the high achievers' mean is $\bar{x}=4.47$ and the low achievers' is $\bar{x}=3.40$. From this, we can infer that high achiever students have clear goals to improve their reading skill with high frequency range but the low achievers set clear goals to improve their reading skill with medium frequency range.

4.5.10. Learning from Mistakes

An attempt was made in item 31 to collect data among high and low achievers how often they learn from their own English mistakes and use that information in order to do better in the future. The data obtained from the analysis in table 4 demonstrate that the majority of the high achiever students (i.e. eight and five of them) rating in five point scale questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively and very few of them (only two students) marked 'sometimes true of me'. Whereas, two and four of the low achievers use their mistakes to learn more in the future 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and also three and four of the low achievers reported that they use this technique 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively. The remaining two of the low achievers reported that they 'never' learn from their own English mistakes. As it is depicted in the table, high and low achiever students use differently their mistakes. High and low achievers' mean values are found to be $\bar{x}=4.40$ and $\bar{x}=3.00$ respectively. The results above reveal that high achiever students notice their mistakes and use them to do better in the future academic career more frequently than their counterparts.

4.5.11. Attempting to Ask Oneself What Information is Sought

The subjects of the study were asked in item 32 to report how regularly they try to keep asking themselves what information they are seeking when they read. Table 4 exhibits that substantial number of students in both groups rated between 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. The table also demonstrates that high and low achiever students employ this technique with mean 4.20 and 3.73 respectively. It shows that both high and low achievers' responses fall in high frequency scale ($\bar{x}=3.50-5.0=$ High). Therefore, it is possible to say that both high and low achiever students try to keep asking themselves what information they are seeking when they read in high frequency range, but still high achiever students use it more frequently than their counterparts.

4.5.12. Trying to Organize Conditions

Item 33 was designed to ascertain data among high and low achiever students how regularly they make attempting to organize conditions before they read. Table 4 indicates that the high and low achiever students differ on attempting to organize conditions before reading. The data analysis in the table implies that high and low achiever students were found to be mean $\bar{x}=3.67$ and $\bar{x}=3.47$ respectively. This reveals that high achiever students try to organize conditions at high frequency range as $\bar{x}=3.67$ falls between scales ($\bar{x}=1.0-2.49=$ Low, $\bar{x}=2.5-3.49=$ Medium, $\bar{x}=3.5-5.0=$ High) and the low achievers at medium frequency level as $\bar{x}=3.47$ falls between ($\bar{x}=2.5-3.49=$ Medium). From the results of the presentation, we can understand that the high achievers try to organize conditions before reading more frequently at high frequency scale than their counterparts (low achievers) who are in medium frequency scale.

Data from the interview disagrees with the data obtained through the self-report questionnaire. Four out of eight high achiever interviewees reported that they read everywhere when they feel good to read but they rarely organize conditions before they begin reading. The other two interviewees of the high achievers said that sometimes they organize conditions and the remaining two of them reported that they always organize conditions before reading. In contrary, almost all of the low achiever interviewees said that they usually adjust conditions before reading. Five of them said that they prefer quiet place before reading, while the others three of the low achievers reported that they adjust dictionary, and also arrange chair and table setting before they begin reading.

The reason for the discrepancy of quantitative and qualitative data might be their rating difference in self-report questionnaire. This means that high achievers' rating in five-point scale questionnaire was more spread out than the low achievers. This implies that the more spread out rating hardly represents the mean value than the less spread out rating. Thus, we can understand that high and low achiever students rating in five point scale questionnaire were found to be mean $\bar{x}=3.67$ with $SD= 1.447$ and $\bar{x}=3.47$ with $SD=1.246$. This shows that high achievers' mean value hardly represents their rating than low achievers mean value. Hence, it is possible to say that the qualitative data of the item (item 33) represents students actual practice than the quantitative data.

From the metacognitive strategies presentations, we can understand that the high achiever students employ entire metacognitive strategies that listed in the self-report questionnaire at high frequency range, but low achievers employ them in medium frequency range except item 27 and 28. Item 27 and 28 strategies, which used by the low achievers in high and low frequency range respectively. Table 4 also shows that the high and low achiever students employ metacognitive strategies with average mean value of $\bar{x}=4.11$ and $\bar{x}=3.25$ respectively. Hence, we can say that high achiever students are more experienced in using metacognitive strategies than low achiever students.

4.6. Use of Affective Strategies

Item 34-38 were designed in the questionnaire to determine how often the sample populations of the study use affective strategies (See Appendix A). Table 5 displays the responses for the items.

Table 5: Affective Strategies Use Among High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Affective</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>						
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>		
<i>Item 34</i>	-	-	4	7	4	4.00	.756	5	1	5	4	-	2.53	1.246
<i>Item 35</i>	2	1	7	2	3	3.20	1.265	1	3	5	2	4	3.33	1.291
<i>Item 36</i>	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1.265	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1.335
<i>Item 37</i>	2	2	5	3	3	3.20	1.320	2	6	-	2	5	3.13	1.598
<i>Item 38</i>	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1.302	2	1	8	3	1	3.00	1.069
<i>Average</i>						3.43	1.182	<i>Average</i>					3.05	1.308

4.6.1. Keeping Own Moral

The respondents were asked in item 34 how often they make an attempting to keep up their own moral even if they face reading difficulties. As it is indicated in table 5 above, four and seven of the high achiever students respectively reported that they 'always' and 'frequently' try to keep up their own moral even if the text become difficult to comprehend. Whereas, no one and four of the low achievers rating in five-point scale questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. Also, four and no one of the high achievers and five and one of the low achievers respectively reported that they make attempting to keep up their own moral even if they face reading difficulties. The table also shows that the high achiever students differ from the low achievers in keeping their own moral as their mean value are found to be $\bar{x}=4.00$ and $\bar{x}=2.53$ respectively. From the discussion, we can infer that the high achiever students keep their own moral more frequently at high frequency scale than the low achiever students do at medium frequency scale.

4.6.2. Taking Deep Breath to Lower Anxiety

The purpose of item 35 was to determine how often the subject students of the study take deep breath to lower their anxiety when they fail to understand what they read. As it is indicated in Table 5, low achievers seem to have an experience in taking deep breath to lower their anxiety than the high achievers. This means that the low achiever students practice the technique more regularly ($\bar{x}=3.33$) than the high achievers ($\bar{x}=3.20$). This tells that both categories (i.e. high and low achievers) take deep breath to lower their anxiety in medium frequency level, but low achievers apply it more frequently than their counterparts.

4.6.3. Noticing Emotion when Reading English

The aim of item 36 was to get information about how often the subject students of the study notice when they become tense or nervous while reading English text. Table 5 shows that the high and low achievers differ in noticing their emotions. The high achievers less experienced in noticing their emotions than their counterparts which means that the low achievers more frequently ($\bar{x}=3.27$) notice if they are tense or nervous when they read English than the high achievers ($\bar{x}=3.20$). The reading frequency (in table 5) depicts that substantial number of the high and low achiever students rating in five-point scale questionnaire between 'sometimes true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. From the analysis, we can understand that both high and low achiever students notice their tenseness or nervousness in medium frequency level, but still low achievers apply it more frequently than their counterparts.

4.6.4. Discussing Emotion with Others

In the same way, item 37 asked the respondents to show their rating scale how regularly they talk to someone else about how they feel when they read in English. In table 5, the results of the analysis show that the high and low achiever students' average mean score are found to be $\bar{x}=3.20$ and $\bar{x}=3.13$ respectively. This implies that both high and low achiever students discuss with someone else how they feel when they read in English at medium frequency since their mean values fall between in scales ($\bar{x}=1.0-2.49$ =Low, $\bar{x}=2.50-3.49$ =Medium, $\bar{x}=3.50-5.0$ =High), but high achievers practice it more frequently than their counterparts.

4.6.5. Trying to Reduce Anxiety

Similarly, item 38 was designed to know how often the sample populations of the study try to reduce anxiety when they compete to do some difficult reading tasks. As it is seen in table 5, five and two of the high achievers and one and three of the low achievers respectively reported that they make attempting to reduce their anxiety 'always' and 'frequently' and also five and two of the high achievers and eight and one of the low achievers respectively apply this technique 'sometimes' and 'rarely'. The remaining one and two of the high and of the low achievers respectively reported that they 'never' try to reduce their anxiety when they compete to do some difficult reading tasks. From the discussion, we can understand that high achiever students try to relax more frequently ($\bar{x}=3.53$) than the low achievers ($\bar{x}=3.00$). The respective mean values imply that the high achievers try to relax when they compete to do some difficult reading task at high frequency scale and low achievers do it with medium frequency scale. The results obtained from the interview partially agree with the results obtained from the self-report questionnaire. During interview, almost all of the low achievers reported that they sometimes try to reduce their anxiety; it perfectly much with their mean value ($\bar{x}=3.00$). In contrary, five of the high achievers said that they rarely try to reduce their anxiety, but usually they leave it and shift for other activities. The other three students of the high achievers reported that usually they try to reduce anxiety. This is, further strengthened by their standard deviation because high achievers standard deviation ($SD=1.302$) is greater than their counterparts ($SD=1.069$). Thus, we can understand that high achievers mean value hardly represents their rating in five-point scale questionnaire. Therefore, it might be possible to say that the qualitative data result of the study represents the technique (trying to reduce anxiety) better than the quantitative data result.

Among five listed affective strategies, item 34 used by the high achiever students in high frequency scales, and the other items at medium frequency, while the low achiever students use all of them in medium range. The discussion also exposes that the low achiever students use item 35, 36 and 38 (item 38 based on interview result) more frequently than the high achievers.

4.7. Use of Social Strategies

In order to obtain data about the students' use of social strategies, item 39-43 were developed. The following table shows how often the high and low achievers use social strategies.

Table 6: Social Strategies Use Among High and Low Achiever Students

<i>Sub Strategies of Social</i>	<i>High Achievers = 15</i>							<i>Low Achievers = 15</i>						
	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Frequency of Responses</i>					<i>Mean (x)</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>			<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>		
<i>Item 39</i>	-	-	2	7	6	4.27	.704	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1.291
<i>Item 40</i>	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1.424	5	3	3	2	2	2.53	1.457
<i>Item 41</i>	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1.356	5	2	3	5	-	2.53	1.302
<i>Item 42</i>	-	1	4	4	6	4.00	1.000	2	2	-	4	7	3.80	1.521
<i>Item 43</i>	1	-	6	3	5	3.73	1.163	-	3	5	3	4	3.53	1.125
<i>Average</i>						3.81	1.129	<i>Average</i>					3.14	1.339

4.7.1. Asking for Clarification

Item 39 asked students to show their rating scale how frequently they ask their classmates or teachers for clarification if they do not understand a text. The reading frequency in table 6 depicts that the majority of the high achievers (i.e. six and seven of them) rating in five point scale questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively. It was only two students of the high achievers said that 'sometimes' they ask their classmates or teachers for clarification. On the other hand, three and four of the low achievers reported that they ask for clarification 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and also five and one of them marked in five point scale questionnaire 'sometimes true of me' and 'rarely true of me' respectively. The remaining two students of the low achievers reported that they 'never' ask classmates or teachers for clarification if they do not understand a text. Table 6 also shows that the high and low achiever students' mean values are 4.27 and 3.33 respectively. This indicates that the high and

low achievers differ in asking for clarification, which means that the high achievers ask classmates or teachers for clarification if they do not understand a text more frequently at high frequency level than the low achievers do at medium frequency level. The information from the interview seems similar with the data obtained from the questionnaire. However, almost all of the high achiever students reported that they always ask teachers and rarely ask classmates for clarification if they do not understand a text. In contrary, the low achievers reported that they rarely ask teachers and frequently ask classmates for clarification if they do not understand a text.

4.7.2. Learning about the Culture of English Speakers

Item 40 was developed to determine how often the subjects of the study try to learn about the culture of English speakers. It is clearly seen in table 6, high achievers' attempting to learn about the culture of English speakers mean is $\bar{x}=3.20$ and low achievers' is $\bar{x}=2.53$. This implies that both high and low achievers' responses fall into medium frequency which means in scales (Low=1.0-2.49, Medium=2.5-3.49, High=3.5-5.0) both categories are medium users, but the high achievers employ the technique more often than the low achievers. The numerical descriptions also tell us three and four of the high achievers rating in self-report questionnaire 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively, and two and two of the low achievers rated 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me' respectively.

4.7.3. Attempting to Share Feeling about the Text with Others

The subjects of the study were asked in item 41 to report how regularly they try to share with their classmates what they feel about the text. As it is clearly indicated in table 6, seven and three of the high achiever students reported that they make attempting to share with their classmates what they feel about the text 'always' and 'frequently' respectively and two and two of them do this 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively. Only one of the high achievers said that he/she 'never' tries to share his/her feeling about the text with others. However, no one and five of the low achievers described that they do this 'always' and 'frequently' respectively, and three and two of them try to share feeling about the text with others 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively. The remaining five of the low achievers reported that they 'never' make attempting to share with other students what they feel about the text. Data obtained from the analysis also expose that the high

achievers practice the technique at high frequency scale ($\bar{x}=3.87$) and the low achievers do at medium frequency scale ($\bar{x}=2.53$). This means that the high and low achiever students practice this strategy with different frequency scale.

4.7.4. Discussing with Others to Check Own Understanding

To collect data on how frequently the high and low achiever students of the study discuss what they read with others to check their understanding, item 42 was designed. As it is shown in table 6, the high achievers with mean=4.00 and the low achievers with mean=3.80 are found to be high users of the strategy. The reading frequency (in the table 6) also reveal that considerable number of the high and low achiever students rating in five-point scale questionnaire between 'always true of me' and 'frequently true of me'. Therefore, from the data we can understand that both high and low achiever students have an experience in making discussion with others to check their understanding.

4.7.5. Formulating Questions to Focus on

Item 43 was developed to determine data how often the sample populations of the study formulate a question to be focused on before they begin to read a text. As it is depicted in table 6, there is no big difference among high and low achievers in formulating questions to be focused on before they begin to read a text. This is because that both groups (i.e. the high and low achievers) formulate questions to focus on at high frequency scale since the high and low achievers mean values are found to be $\bar{x}=3.73$ and $\bar{x}=3.53$ respectively. Hence, from the discussions, we can conclude that both the high and low achiever students have an experience in formulating questions to be focused on before they begin to read a text at high frequency scale.

Concerning social strategies use, the discussion shows that the high achiever students employ overall social strategies more frequently than the low achievers. The average mean value in table 6 also reveals that high achiever students ($\bar{x}=3.81$) more experienced in social strategies use than low achiever students.

4.8. Analysis of Comparison among High and Low Achievers Regarding Main Strategy Use

The following table shows high and low achiever students' comparison regarding six main strategies use.

Table 7: High and Low Achievers' Main Strategies Use Comparison

No	<i>High Achievers</i>				<i>Low Achievers</i>			
	<i>Strategy</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Level of Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Level of Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>
1	Metacognitive	4.11	High	1	Metacognitive	3.25	Medium	1
2	Memory	4.00	High	2	Social	3.14	Medium	2
3	Social	3.81	High	3	Memory	3.08	Medium	3
4	Cognitive	3.80	High	4	Affective	3.05	Medium	4
5	Compensation	3.48	Medium	5	Cognitive	2.98	Medium	5
6	Affective	3.43	Medium	6	Compensation	2.95	Medium	6
	Total	3.77	High	N/R	Total	3.08	Medium	N/R

*N/R = No Rank

As it is shown in table 7, the most frequently used strategy by high achievers among the six main strategies is metacognitive strategy with high frequency range ($\bar{x}=4.11$) closely followed by memory ($\bar{x}=4.00$), social ($\bar{x}=3.84$), and cognitive strategy ($\bar{x}=3.80$) in high range among the six strategies. However, affective strategy is the least practiced strategy with $\bar{x}=3.43$ in medium frequency scale by high achiever students.

The table also shows that the most frequently used strategy by low achiever students among the six main strategies is metacognitive strategy with medium frequency level $\bar{x}=3.25$ nearly followed by social $\bar{x}=3.14$, memory $\bar{x}=3.08$, and affective strategy $\bar{x}=3.05$ in medium frequency level. On the other hand, compensation strategy is the least practiced strategy with $\bar{x}=2.95$ in medium frequency level by low achiever students.

From the discussion and the table, we can infer that the high achiever students use metacognitive, memory, social, and cognitive strategies in high frequency scales among six main strategies, and the other two main strategies (i.e. compensation and affective strategies)

used in medium frequency range. In contrary, the low achievers use all main strategies in medium frequency levels. Metacognitive strategies were found to be the most frequently practiced strategies by both high and low achievers. Memory and social strategies hold the second and third place respectively by high achievers. Beside low achievers, the reverse is true which means that social strategies hold the second and memory hold the third place in medium frequency levels with mean $\bar{x}=3.14$ and $\bar{x}=3.08$ respectively. On the last or sixth place, high achievers use affective strategies in medium frequency scale, while low achievers use compensation strategies with similar frequency range.

Therefore, what we can understand from the discussion. First, there is a difference between high and low achiever students in employing six main strategies. This means that high achiever students employed four main strategies among six in high frequency scales and the other two main strategies practiced in medium frequency scales but still more frequently used by the high achievers than the low achievers. Whereas, low achievers use six main strategies in medium frequency scales. The second difference between high and low achiever students is the main strategies preference in the rank order. This implies that high and low achievers differ in the main strategies preference in the rank order except metacognitive strategies, which means that both high and low achievers' metacognitive strategies preference hold the first place, but the other strategies preference order is different.

4.9. Analysis on Significance Difference on the Six Main Strategies by High and Low Achiever Students

Table 8: Independent Samples Test on Significance Difference on Strategies Use by high and low achiever students

<i>Strategy</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Sig.</i> <i>(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean</i> <i>Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error</i> <i>Difference</i>
Memory	.943	-4.030	28	.000	-.92000	.22829
Cognitive	.480	-4.018	28	.000	-.82424	.20514
Compensation	.060	-1.880	28	.071	-.53333	.28369
Metacognitive	.810	-4.167	28	.000	-.86111	.20665
Affective	.430	-1.266	28	.216	-.37333	.29493
Social	.961	-2.453	28	.021	-.66667	.27181

An attempt was made in the independent samples test to see whether there is significant difference on strategies use by high and low achiever students. The study significance p-value is < 0.05 with degree of freedom ($df=28$).

As it is depicted in the independent samples test table, the statistical significance value of memory strategies is less than the significance p-value cut off ($0.000 < 0.05$). This implies that there is significant difference in using memory strategies among high and low achiever students. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is a relationship between memory strategies use and students' academic achievement. This is because more successful students (i.e. high achievers) not only use these strategies more frequently, but also with significant difference than less successful students (i.e. low achievers).

With respect to cognitive strategies, the statistical significant value is 0.000, which means that the statistical significant value is less than the significance p-value $0.000 < 0.05$. This implies that there is significant difference in using these strategies among high and low achiever students. Thus, we can infer that there is a relationship between cognitive strategies use and students' academic achievement since high achiever students practice these strategies more significantly than the low achievers.

As it is clearly shown in the independent samples test table, statistical significant value is 0.071 for compensation strategies. This value is greater than the significance p -value=0.05. This means that there is no significant difference on using compensation strategies by high and low achiever students, which implies the absence of a relationship between the use of compensation strategies and students' achievement. But, it is closer to the significant p -value cut off.

The statistical significant value of metacognitive strategies is 0.000. This value is less than the significant p -value ($0.000 < 0.05$). This implies that there is a relationship between metacognitive strategies use and students' academic achievement because there are significant difference among high and low achievers in using metacognitive strategies.

In the case of affective strategies, the statistical significance value is 0.216. This means that the study significance p -value is less than the statistical significance value of affective strategies. This shows that there is no significant difference on using affective strategies by high and low achiever students. Consequently, from the above result in table 10, we can conclude that there is no relationship between the use of affective strategies and academic achievement.

As it is shown in table 10, there is significant difference in the use of social strategies between high and low an achiever students. This is because the statistical significant value of social strategies is less than the significance p -value ($0.021 < 0.05$) which reveals the presence of a relationship between social strategies use and students' achievement.

The independent samples test table reveals that there is significant difference between high and low achiever students on employing four main reading strategies (i.e. memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies) among six main strategies. This means that, there is a relationship between reading strategies use and language learning achievement, i.e. high achievers frequently use more wide range of reading strategies than low achievers. Whereas, in the remaining two main strategies (compensation and affective strategies) the independent samples test shows that there is no significant difference on the use of these strategies between high and low achiever students. This means that affective and compensation strategies are found to have no relationship with achievement.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusions

The main objective of the study was to investigate the reading strategies use by high and low achievers of private school students in Addis Ababa, specifically, KB Academy grade nine and ten students. Through the main objective, the research attempts to find out answers to the following research questions. The first question was, is there a difference between high and low achievers on reading strategies use? If 'yes', what reading strategies do high students use? and what reading strategies do low students use? The second question of the study was, is there any significant difference between the two groups in reading strategies use? The third or last question was, is there any relationship between reading strategy use and academic achievement?

For this reason, data were collected from the sample students using self-report questionnaire and interview. Based on the findings, the following conclusions have been made.

There is discrepancy between high and low achievers in using reading strategies. High achievers use almost all the reading strategies more frequently than the low achievers.

High achiever students use six main reading strategies, which range from medium to high frequency level. However, their overall use of strategy was at high frequency level. In other hand, low achiever students use all six main reading strategies at medium frequency level. The most frequently used strategy among the six main reading strategies in both high and low achiever students were metacognitive strategies. In contrary, the least used strategy by high achiever students were affective strategies and by low achiever students were compensation strategies, and though both high and low achievers practice them at medium frequency level.

As stated in the review literature, various studies claim that more successful students use more strategies at higher level than less successful students (Green and Oxford, 1995; Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995; Janzen, 2002; Tseng, 2005). Similarly, this study reveal that high achiever students use four main strategies (metacognitive, memory, social, and cognitive strategies) at higher level than low achiever students.

The study reveals that there was significant difference between high and low achiever students on employing four main reading strategies (i.e. memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies) among six main strategies. However, in the remaining two main strategies use (compensation and affective strategies) there was no significant difference between high and low achiever students. But, compensation strategies were closer to the significant p-value cut off.

A local study (Hanna, 2012) suggested that there was no significant difference between high and low achievers on employing indirect learning strategies (metacognitive, affective, and social). However, the present study disagrees with this fact because the findings of the present study revealed that there was significant difference between high and low achievers using metacognitive and social strategies. Oxford (1990) suggests there are various factors affect the choice of strategies: stages of learning, task requirement, age, sex, and nationality some of them. Hence, stages of learning and task requirement might be some of the causes to the discrepancy between Hanna's and the present study's result. This is because Hanna had conducted her study on preparatory students, while this study conducted on private high school students of grade nine and ten.

The study shown that there was positive relationship between four main strategies use (i.e. memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies) and academic achievement, i.e. high achievers frequently use more wide range of reading strategies than low achievers.

The least used strategy by high achiever students were affective strategies, while by low achiever students were compensation strategies; the independent samples test shown that there was no significant difference on the use of these strategies between high and low achiever students, which means that affective and compensation strategies were found to have no relationship with achievement.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations have been made.

- ❖ There is a gap between high and low achievers in using reading strategies. High achievers use almost all the reading strategies more frequently than the low achievers. Various studies also exposed that there are positive relationships between the frequent use of strategies and achievement in the language (Green and Oxford, 1995; Oxford and Burry- Stock, 1995; Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito, and Sumrall, 1993). Thus, awareness- rising should be done to enhance students' use of strategy at higher and possibly at highest frequency.
- ❖ English teachers should also give special support to low achiever students to use various reading strategies more frequently as the high achievers do in order to develop their reading skill and their English language knowledge as a whole.
- ❖ Students themselves should be autonomous to employ various techniques and strategies to be good language learner.
- ❖ It is advisable for language teachers to detect the reading strategies of their students and help them compensate the missing areas in their strategy preference and use. This is because language-learning strategies are good indicators of how learners approach tasks or problems encountered during the process of language learning.
- ❖ It is also recommended that more research is needed to investigate the similarities and differences among high and low achievers in using reading strategies to arrive at more reliable conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Aebbersold, J. and Field, M. (1997). *From Reader to Reading Teacher: Issues and Strategies for Second Language Classrooms*. _____
- Atakilte Gebru (2011). *An Investigation of Reading Strategies Used by Grade 11 EFL Students of Addishilu Senior Secondary School*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Atkins, J., Hailom, B., Nuru, M. (1996). *Skills Development Methodology: Part two*: Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa University Printing Press.
- Bialystok, E. (1979). "The Role of Conscious Strategies in Second Language Proficiency". *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 35, 372-394.
- Block, E. (1992). "See How They Read: Comprehension Monitoring of L1 and L2 Readers". *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 319-342.
- Bremner, S. (1999). Language Learning Strategies and Language Proficiency: Investigating the Relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4), 490-514.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, (Fifth Edition). San Francisco: San Francisco State University.
- Carrell, P.L. (1988). "Interactive Text Processing: Implications for ESL/ Second Language Reading Classrooms." In Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. and Eskey, D.E (eds.). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language Learning Strategy Instruction: Current Issues and Research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 25, 112–130.
- Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989) 'Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction' *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 13-24.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, M. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook Reading*, MA: Addison- Weseley.

- Cohen, A. (1990). *Language Learning: Insights for Learners, Teachers, and Researchers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Dechant, E. (1991). *Introduction to the Reading Process*. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.Bcom/PM.qst?a.html>.
- Duffy, G. (1993). Rethinking Strategy Instruction: Four Teachers' Development and Their Low Achievers' Understandings. *Elementary School Journal*, *93*, 231-247.
- Endaweke Abebe (2008). *EFL Learning Strategy Use: The Case of Male and Female Preparatory Students*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University press
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Fedderholdt, K. (1997). *“Using Diaries to Develop Language Learning Strategies”*.
Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*, 261-297.
- Green, N.M.,& Oxford.R. (1995). *A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender*. TESOL Quarterly, 29,261-297
- Grellet, F. (1981). *Developing Reading Skills: A Practical Guide of Reading Comprehension Exercises*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Hanna ____ (2012). *An Investigation of the Language Learning Strategies Used by High and Low Achievers of Grade 12 Students at Kombolcha General Preparatory School*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching Second Language Reading*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Janzen, J. (2002). *Teaching Strategic Reading*. In Jack, C. Richards and Willy, A. Renandya (Eds.) *Methodology in Language Teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice*(pp.287-294). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi, India: New Age International Printing Press.
- Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning Strategies in Foreign and Second Language Classroom*. London: Continuum International.
- Macaro, E., & Erler, L. (2008). Raising the Achievement of Young-beginner Readers of French through Strategy Instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 90-119.
Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm023>
- Martínez, I. M. P. (1996). The Importance of Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Teaching. *Coandernos de Filologia Inglesa*, 5/1, 103-120.
- McDonough and C.Shaw. (1993). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Megersa Bejiga (2011). *An Investigation of Factors Affecting Students Use of Reading Strategies*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Melkamu Dumessa (2002). *An Investigation of English Language Teachers' Reading Lesson Presentation in Term of the New Course Book for Grade Nine in Some Selected Government Secondary Schools in Addis Ababa*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Negash Getachew (2008). *A Comparative Study of the Methods of Teaching Reading Employed by the Televised Teacher and the Classroom Teacher with especial Reference to Grade Nine Students of Jimma Town Senior Secondary Schools*. MA Thesis (Unpublished): Addis Ababa University.
- Nuttall, C. (1982). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Landon. Clays, it Ives plc.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Text Book for Teachers*. Great Britain: International Book Distributors, Ltd.

- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R., & Kupper, I. (1985b). Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 557-584.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (Ed.). (1996). *Language Learning Strategies around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R. L. and Ehrman, M. (1993). Second Language Research on Individual Difference. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *13*, 188-205.
- Oxford, R. and J.A. Burry-Stock. (1995). Assessing Language Learning Strategies World Wide With The ESL/EFL Version of The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, *Vol.23, No.1*, Pp. 1-23.
- Oxford, R. L., & Park-Oh, Y., Ito, S., & Sumrall, M. (1993). Learning a Language by Satellite Television: What Influences Student Achievement? *System*, *21*(1), 31-48.
- Park, G. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*, 211-221.
- Phakiti, A. (2003). A Closer Look at the Relationship of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Use to EFL Reading Achievement Test Performance. *Language Test*, *20*, 26-56
- Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and Self-regulated Comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup, & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What Research has to Say about Reading Instruction* (pp. 219-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/0872071774.13>
- Purpura, J.M. (1999). *Learner Strategy Use and Performance on Language Test: A Structural*

Equation Modeling Approach. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (Eds) (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History, and Typology. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 15-30). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'Good Language Learner' can Teach Us, *TESOL Quarterly*, **9**, 41-51.

Sesunan, B. (2003). *How to Teach English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tseng, S. (2005). Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Education. *An Interdisciplinary Journal* **49** pp.321-328.

Smith, F. (1988). **Reading**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Stanley, G. (2005). Extensive Reading. from <http://www.teaching English. org.uk/think/read/extensive.shtml>.

Stern, H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

_____ (1975). What Can We Learn from the Good Language Learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, **31**, 304-318.

Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Williams, M. and Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teacher: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: CUP.

Wu, A., & Zhang, L. J. (2009). Chinese Senior High School EFL Students' Metacognitive Awareness and Reading-strategy Use. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, **21(1)**, 37-59.

Zhang, L. J. (2001). Awareness in Reading: EFL Students' Metacognitive Knowledge of Reading Strategies in an Acquisition-poor Environment. *Language Awareness*, **10**, 268-288.

APPENDIX A

Addis Ababa University

**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and
Communication**

A Questionnaire to Be Filled By Students

Dear students

This questionnaire is designed to collect data for a study purpose. It has no any sort of evaluation intention and you are not evaluated based on the response you give to the questions. The success of the study depends on the will and genuine responses you give to the questions. Thus, you are asked to respond to the questions frankly and honestly.

Thank you in advance!

Instruction one: Complete the Following Background Information

accordingly. *Background Information*

Sex: female male Grade 9 10

Age: below 14 ___ 14-16 ___ 17-20 ___ above 20 _____

Instruction Two: Please read the statement below in the following chart very carefully.

Then, put a tick (✓) against each statement to indicate how often you use the strategies described by the statement in accordance with the frequency you use which is indicated as follow:

1= Never true of me

2= Rarely true of me

3= Sometimes true of me

4= Frequently true of me

5= Always true of me

	<i>Never true of me</i>	<i>Rarely true of me</i>	<i>Sometimes true of me</i>	<i>Frequently true of me</i>	<i>Always True of me</i>
<i>Memory Strategies</i>					
1. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read. e.g. Cat /kæt/ _what cat looks like.					
2. I remember the new words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign where I read it.					
3. I associate text ideas with my prior knowledge to remember it.					
4. I try to review what I read from a text.					
5. I try to practice a new word, phrase, or sentence of the text in a memorable situation.					
<i>Cognitive Strategies</i>					
6. When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.					
7. I underline or circle key information in the text to help me understand what I read.					
8. I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.					
9. I take short notes while reading to help me understand what I read.					
10. I use reference materials (e.g. a dictionary) to help me understand what I read.					

11. When reading, I think about information in both English and my mother tongue.					
12. I use typographical features like bold face and italics to identify key information.					
13. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand. For example un-touch-able					
14. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.					
15. I read for pleasure in English.					
16. I make summaries of information that I read in English.					
<i>Compensation Strategies</i>					
17. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.					
18. I try to guess depending on a title what the content of the text is about when I read.					
19. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.					
20. I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading.					
21. I read English with out looking up every new word from dictionary.					
<i>Meta cognitive Strategies</i>					
22. I adjust my reading speed according					

to what I am reading.					
23. I have a purpose in mind when I read.					
24. I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.					
25. I check my understanding when I come across new information.					
26. I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.					
27. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.					
28. When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.					
29. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.					
30. I have clear goals for improving my reading skill.					
31. I notice my English mistakes and use					
32. I try to keep asking myself, "What information am I looking for?" when I read text.					
33. I try to organize conditions before I read.					
<i>Affective Strategies</i>					
34. I try to keep up my moral even if I face reading difficulties.					
35. I take deep breath to lower my anxiety even if I fail to understand a text.					

36. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am reading English.					
37. I talk to some one else about how I feel when I am reading in English.					
38. I try to reduce my anxiety when I compete to do some difficult reading tasks.					
<i>Social Strategies</i>					
39. If I do not understand a text, I ask my classmates or teachers for clarification.					
40. I try to learn about the culture of English language speakers					
41. I try to share with my classmates what I feel about the text.					
42. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.					
43. I formulate a question to be focused on before I begin to read a text.					

APPENDIX B

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Do you organize conditions before you read? If your response is "Yes," what arrangements do you make before you begin to read? How often?
2. What techniques do you use to understand a text effectively? How often do you use?
3. What techniques do you use to remember easily or not to forget what you read? How often do you use?
4. Do you try to know what a reading text is about? If your response is "Yes," What techniques do you apply to know? How often do you apply?
5. Do you feel anxiety when you read some texts? If your response is "Yes," What strategy do you use to control your anxiety? How often do you use?
6. Do you ask your classmates or teachers for help if you fail to understand a text? How often do you ask?
7. When you come across unfamiliar words during reading what technique do you use to understand? How often do you use?
8. For what purposes do you read? How often do you do so?

APPENDIX C
SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE AMHARIC VERSION

ከፊል ነፃ ቃለ መጠይቅ

1. ምንባብ ከመጀመሪያ/ሽ በፊት ለንባብ ምቹ ሁኔታዎችን ትፈጥራለህ/ሽ? መለሰህ/ሽ "አዎ" ከሆነ ምን ዓይነት የማመቻቸት ሥራ ትሠራለህ/ሽ? ምን ያህል ጊዜ ታዘወትራለህ/ታዘወቲሪያለሽ?
2. ምንባብን በተገቢ ሁኔታ ለመረዳት ምን ዓይነት ዘዴ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሟልሽ? ምን ያህል አዘወትረህ/ሽ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሟልሽ?
3. ያነበብከውን/ያነበብሽውን ምንባብ በቀላሉ ለማሰታወስ ወይም ላለመረሳት ምን ዓይነት ዘዴ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሟልሽ? ምን ያህል ጊዜ ታዘወትራለህ/ታዘወትሪያለሽ?
4. የምንባብ ሀሳብ ስለምን እንደሆነ ለማወቅ ትሞክራለህ/ትሞክሪያለሽ? መለሰህ/ሽ "አዎ" ከሆነ ምን ዓይነት ዘዴ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሟልሽ? ምን ያህል ጊዜ ታዘወትራለህ/ታዘወትሪያለሽ?
5. አንዳንድ ምንባብ ስታነብ/ቢ ምቹት ማጣት (ውጥረት) ይሰማህል/ይሰማሻል? መለሰህ/ሽ "አዎ" ከሆነ በምን ዓይነት መለክ
6. (እንዴት አድርገህ/ሽ) ውጥረትህን/ሽን ለመቀነስ ትሞክራለህ/ትሞክሪያለሽ? ምን ያህል ጊዜ ታዘወትራለህ/ታዘወቲሪያለሽ?
7. ምንባብን መረዳት ቢያቅትህ/ሽ የክፍል ተማሪዎችን ወይም መምህራንን እገዛ ትጠይቃለህ/ትጠይቂያለሽ? ምን ያህል አዘወትረህ/ሽ ትጠይቃለህ/ትጠይቂያለሽ?
8. በምታነብበት/በምታነቢበት ጊዜ አዲስ (የማታውቀው/ቂው) ቃላት ሲያጋጥሙህ/ሽ ለመረዳት ምን ዓይነት ዘዴ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሟልሽ? ምን ያህል ጊዜ አዘወትረህ/ሽ እንዲህ ታደረጋለህ/ታደረጊያለሽ?
9. ለምን ዓላማ ነው የምታነበው/ቢው? ምን ያህል ጊዜ ታዘወትራለህ/ታዘወትሪያለሽ?