

Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Successful EFL Students: A Narrative Inquiry from Indonesia¹

Izza Rahmatika Mukti², Diah Retno Widowati³, Febti Ismiatun⁴, & M. Faruq Ubaidillah⁵,
Universitas Islam Malang, Malang, East Java, Indonesia⁶

Abstract

Although studies on the use of metacognitive strategies in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning have been widely explored, little is known about successful EFL students' use of metacognitive strategies through shared narratives in their reading classes. To fill this lacuna, the present study attempted to investigate the use of metacognitive reading strategies by successful students in EFL reading. Data was collected through in-depth interviews with ten student participants. The findings revealed that participants employed a range of interconnected metacognitive strategies across the pre-reading, whilst-reading, and post-reading stages, with support strategies emerging as the most frequently used. The narratives further suggested that metacognitive reading is a dynamic process in which global, problem-solving, and support strategies interact to facilitate comprehension. These findings contribute to a richer understanding of successful readers' strategic behaviour and provide pedagogical implications for promoting metacognitive awareness in EFL academic reading instruction.

Resumen

Si bien el uso de estrategias metacognitivas en el aprendizaje del inglés como lengua extranjera (ILE) ha sido ampliamente estudiado, se sabe poco sobre cómo los estudiantes exitosos emplean dichas estrategias a través de narrativas compartidas en sus clases de lectura. Para llenar este vacío, el presente estudio tuvo como objetivo investigar el uso de estrategias metacognitivas de lectura por parte de estudiantes con buen desempeño en esta área. Se recopilaban datos mediante entrevistas en profundidad con diez estudiantes participantes. Los resultados revelaron que los participantes empleaban una serie de estrategias metacognitivas interconectadas a lo largo de las etapas de prelectura, lectura y poslectura, siendo las estrategias de apoyo las más utilizadas. Asimismo, las narrativas sugirieron que la lectura metacognitiva es un proceso dinámico en el que interactúan estrategias globales, de resolución de problemas y de apoyo para facilitar la comprensión. Estos hallazgos contribuyen a una comprensión más profunda del comportamiento estratégico de los lectores exitosos y ofrecen implicaciones pedagógicas para fomentar la conciencia metacognitiva en la enseñanza de la lectura académica en inglés como lengua extranjera.

Introduction

Recently, studies on metacognitive strategies in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning have grown rapidly. The word "metacognition" is widely known as thinking about thinking, and it is closely related to learning as it is a means to actively control, monitor, and evaluate cognitive processes (Bergvall et al., 2023). If Student A realizes that the library is the best place for him to study due to its quietness since it helps him focus, then, it can be said that Student A's decision to choose the library as the best place to learn is an application of metacognition.

In educational practice and research, the term "metacognition" has turned into "metacognitive strategies" as applied linguists have focused their attention on the metacognitive strategies for the four language skills, particularly in teaching the reading skill for EFL learners. Metacognition used to refer to the sequential activities used by readers in controlling and managing the process of reading so that readers can evaluate whether they reached their reading goals or not. Numerous researchers, such as Arabmofrad et al. (2021), Dardjito (2019), and Gavora et al. (2020) have successfully provided in-depth contribution on metacognition to empower EFL readers' achievement.

To empower students to read effectively, Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) proposed three metacognitive strategies. The first are global strategies (GLOB) which are used by readers to carefully manage or monitor

¹ This is a refereed article. Received: 25 November, 2022. Accepted: 24 November, 2023. Published: 17 August, 2026.

² izza.rahma99@gmail.com, 0000-0003-3140-3606

³ d.retnowidowati@unisma.ac.id, 0000-0002-6530-1002, Correspondent.

⁴ febtiismi@unisma.ac.id, 0000-0002-2595-9977

⁵ mfubaidillah@unisma.ac.id, 0000-0002-0275-8283

⁶ Department of English Language Education and Center for Educational Innovation and Transformation, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education

their reading: previewing the length of text, having reading goals, and utilizing figures and tables. Secondly, problem-solving (PROB) strategies facilitate readers' abilities to solve their reading problems or difficulties by visualizing information while reading, re-reading, and translating unknown words. Lastly, support strategies (SUP) are used to develop and ensure whether they already understand the text through, for instance, highlighting an important word or taking notes while reading. Based on those three types of strategies (GLOB, PROB, and SUP), Mokhtari and Reichard developed a quantitative instrument, Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARS), to measure the use of these strategies by native English speakers in academic reading. They later expanded the MARS into Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) in the form of a questionnaire as it was designed to measure the reading strategies used by EFL students.

In the context of reading a text, EFL readers face problems such as unknown words, a lack of previous knowledge, and contextualization in drawing meaning (Alkhaleefah, 2017). With regard to readers' problems, teachers also face several problems in teaching reading. This issue attracts researchers to further investigate strategies that are applicable and effective for EFL learners to comprehend texts. As a result, the present study examines the types of metacognitive strategies implemented by successful students and the way they implement them. Two research questions guide this study:

1. What metacognitive reading strategies are employed by successful students in their EFL reading?
2. How do successful students use metacognitive reading strategies in their EFL reading?

Literature Review

Metacognitive strategies

Flavell (1979) as cited in Georgiades (2012) explained that metacognition refers to learner's knowledge, awareness, and control of their own learning process. Metacognitive strategies are indicated as effective strategies for EFL learners (Muhid et al., 2020). The process of metacognition itself consists of two features: self-appraisal and self-management (Hamiddin & Saukah, 2020). These authors explain that self-appraisal refers to the learners' reflection and evaluation of their understanding, whilst self-management implies learners' efforts in solving problems. Through active use of metacognition, learners consciously monitor and control their own thinking process, as metacognitive activities cover three techniques: planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The main reason to transfer metacognitive knowledge to learners is to make them independent and effective readers (Zhussupova & Kazbekova, 2016). Through this ability, Muhid et al. (2020) highlighted that readers will know appropriately which strategies are needed while considering the genre, the techniques used, and the difficulties the readers might encounter.

To clearly shape how readers comprehend texts using metacognitive strategies, the present research refers to the metacognitive strategies' taxonomy of Mokhtari and Reichard (2002), which categorizes strategies into three kinds: global reading strategies, problem-solving strategies, and support strategies. Global reading strategies are the activities of a readers' plan which manages and controls their reading, whilst problem-solving strategies consist of activities through which readers apply to break barriers or solve the difficulties. The final category, support strategies, includes of additional activities that help raise students' understanding of the texts (Arabmofrad et al., 2021; Lin, 2019).

Reading English in a foreign language context

Reading is simply defined as a process of decoding and comprehending text (Rastegar et al., 2017), and it is perceived as an interactive process between readers and texts (Javed et al., 2015). Some important factors that develop reading comprehension are implementing various strategies, recognizing detailed information and the type of the text, guessing certain words, expecting what texts talk about, and understanding the main idea of texts (Nurkamto et al., 2021). Through active processes of cognition and metacognition, it is easy for readers to meet their goals and become more proficient in comprehending texts (BalikciOllu & Efe, 2016). Albashtawi (2019) and Csomay and Prades (2018) also reveal that academic reading and the use of academic language are essential for L2 learners to raise their competency as skilled readers and writers.

Previous studies on metacognitive strategies

Recently, there has been a myriad of studies that explore metacognitive strategies in educational settings as reviewed in this section. First, Do and Phan (2021) studied 23 Vietnamese students majoring in English

and found that problem-solving strategies were used more frequently than support and global strategies. The study indicates that language proficiency can drive reading strategies usage and choice effectively. Finally, high level students use more metacognitive strategies than their less advanced colleagues. The following paragraphs discuss several studies related to the implementation of metacognitive strategies.

Teng (2019) assessed 25 Hong Kong international primary school students after being taught to apply metacognitive awareness instruction. The study concluded that primary school students can benefit from metacognitive instruction to develop their reading comprehension level. In a different study, Arabmofrad et al. (2021) assessed 67 elementary students through a survey of reading strategies which was proposed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), they reported that problem-solving strategies are mostly used by the participants followed by global strategies and supporting strategies.

Furthermore, Hamiddin and Saukah (2020) employed the qualitative approach to deeply investigate the metacognitive knowledge (task, person, and strategy) of successful and less successful Indonesian students. They categorized students into successful and less successful only based on their reading scores: Successful students achieved score A in reading while less successful ones scored C and both were aware that they should be effective readers. In fact, successful students have more metacognitive knowledge, particularly drawing conclusions by reading from the final paragraph and underlining important information in which less successful students did not experience.

Lin (2019) examined the factors influencing the reading strategies used by ESL/EFL learners. He found that English proficiency was the most important factor, more important than L1 literacy experiences, gender, or motivation factors. He added that skilled readers displayed the use of more metacognitive strategies than unskilled ones, and they were more aware of when, why, and how certain strategies were applied. They also adapted their use of strategies in accordance with the context faced.

In a different study, Dardjito (2019) chose 373 first-year Indonesian university students to find out the correlation between metacognitive awareness and reading performance. The result indicated that participants' metacognitive awareness and their reading comprehension skills correlated negatively. Their scores in reading comprehension were low in contrast with their high metacognitive awareness. Thus, it was implied that the participants were actually aware of their metacognition learning strategies, yet they did not implement them properly. The students also had limitations on vocabulary mastery; this barrier decreased their reading performance.

Shang (2018) explored the metacognitive strategies applied by Taiwanese medical students. After assessing 69 participants, the results revealed that problem-solving was the most used strategy followed by global, while the support strategy was the least used metacognitive strategy. In fact, these findings supported Teng's (2020) study described above, which found similar results despite investigating different levels of participants.

Other previous studies on metacognition in reading have been conducted in a variety of educational contexts. For example, Arabmofrad et al. (2021) studied elementary school students and revealed that, in general, the participants applied problem-solving strategies. Meanwhile, Muhid et al. (2020) found that metacognitive reading strategies positively enhance senior high school students' reading performance. Other researchers focused on the effect that metacognitive strategies had on the college students' reading performance. For example, Zhussupova and Kazbekova (2016) trained EFL university students of National University of Eurasian and proved that metacognitive reading strategies raised students' reading proficiency.

In the Indonesian context, Hamiddin and Saukah's (2020) work using a qualitative approach also found that successful readers performed better in applying metacognitive knowledge. Different from underachieving readers, the study highlighted that the successful students employed various metacognitive strategies. Their conclusion was in line with Shih and Huang's (2018) who uncovered that the ability to apply various strategies differed between students with high or low academic success.

Although previous studies on metacognitive strategies in educational contexts have been extensively carried out, they have used quantitative approaches, including correlation (Arabmofrad et al., 2021; Dardjito, 2019), quasi-experimental (Muhid et al., 2020), experimental (Teng, 2021; Zhussupova & Kazbekova, 2016), and survey designs (Do & Phan, 2021). These studies still lack a deep description of the context of personal information regarding the application of metacognitive strategies. Since very few studies on metacognitive strategies have used the narrative inquiry design (Yang & Bai, 2019), the present research explores the use of metacognitive strategies through personal narratives, as it is a particularly appropriate

technique for studying experiences (Goldfus, 2014) and exploring individual stories and perspectives, as every person shares their own unique personal perspectives and interpretations (Green et al., 2006).

Method

Research design

The present study employed a narrative inquiry design to reveal participants' metacognitive strategies used in reading. Narrative inquiry is used to generate personal feelings and experiences of people through which individuals as "human beings both live and tell stories about their living" (Clandinin, 2006, p. 44). Therefore, it is an appropriate research design for investigating individuals' involvement and reactions in a situated context.

Participants

Ten successful EFL students were invited to attend the interview. They were eighth semester students of the English Education Department at a private university in Indonesia. These participants were recruited through convenience sampling technique because they were the second author's students and were available for the study (Creswell, 2012). The participants obtained an A grade in their two-year reading classes, so we categorized them into successful EFL students for reading skills. All participants in this study were female and had been learning English in formal schools for nearly ten years.

As for the ethical considerations, in this study, a consent form was sent to the participants. Although they were the second author's students, such a status did not affect their freedom of either to participate or withdraw from the research because we have ensured that the research would benefit them and other people. To do so, at the outset, we explained the research objectives, benefits, and potential drawbacks that might have arisen for the participants and other people. We also explained that the participants are allowed to withdraw from this study at any time they wanted. This was to ensure that their participation was voluntary. In our country, it is uncommon to receive a review from ethics commission team for social and humanities research projects. Thus, we used a consent form and sent it to the participants. This form was kept in our department as a legal permission to conduct the research. In narrative inquiry, researchers focus on understanding how people make sense of their lived experiences. In addition, narrative inquiry does not aim to investigate facts and numbers. Although participants in narrative inquiry may lie, this could also happen in other qualitative research designs (Barkhuizen, 2022). Thus, we carried out this narrative research with the participating students by following Barkhuizen's thoughts. Lastly, we used codes to identify the participants. This procedure guaranteed their anonymity. Hence, we coded the names of those students who accepted to make part of the study as S1, S2, S3 to S10.

Data collection

Using a semi-structured interview method (Kalio et al., 2016; Myers, 2009; Ruslin et al., 2022), the researchers collected the personal experiences of the participants in applying metacognitive reading strategies in their English academic reading. The semi-structured interview is a data collection method used to uncover perceptions, ideas, opinions, and beliefs of participants using pre-determined questions (Henriksen et al., 2022). At first, the recruited participants were asked about their willingness to join the interview sections and once all participants agreed to join the interview, we set the schedule for the interview based on their availability, as demonstrated in Table 1.

Date	Time	Participants' Identity
Monday, 5/16/2022	11:00 – 12:00 AM	S1
	08:00 – 09:00 PM	S5
Tuesday, 5/17/2022	08:00 – 09:00 AM	S3
	11:00 – 12:00 AM	S7
	02:00 – 03:00 PM	S6
	08:00 – 09:00 PM	S8
Wednesday, 5/18/2022	11:00 – 12:00 AM	S4
	08:00 – 09:00 PM	S10
Friday, 5/19/2022	08:00 – 09:00 AM	S9
	11:00 – 12:00 PM	S2

Table 1: Participant's interview schedules

Based on the pre-formulated questions and additional questions (see Appendix) that sought to clarify the participants' answers (Myers, 2009), the first author conducted the interview sections online using *Zoom* to facilitate recording. The Indonesian language (Bahasa Indonesia), which is the participants' mother tongue, was used to avoid misunderstandings in the questions and responses. The choice of this language was appropriate because, despite the teaching and learning of English in the education sector, as well as the participants' years of experience in English learning, they do not speak it daily. This fact contributes to the participants' minimal knowledge of the English language.

During the interview, the first author asked the participants about their experiences in English academic reading. They were interviewed individually and their voices were recorded using a smartphone for a total of ten hours, with an average of one hour each. The data collected from the participants were also kept confidential and were not displayed in any form, which means that only the researchers can access the interview recordings.

Data analysis

In the analysis stage, the data from the interviews was analyzed based on each author's role. The first author listened to the recordings multiple times until a global understanding of the participants' narratives was obtained. Then, the recordings were transcribed using Bahasa Indonesia. In the following stage of the analysis, the second author translated the transcripts which were later crosschecked by the third and fourth authors to guarantee the translations were accurate (Qoyyimah, 2023). This was done to ensure that the concept of the researcher as the translator yielded an appropriate interpretation of the transcribing process, as the second author was very fluent in the language participants used in this study (Bailey, 2008; Temple & Young, 2004). Afterwards, the third and the fourth authors analyzed the translated transcripts to obtain themes based on the study's research questions. Next, the written data were coded based on the types of metacognitive strategies. The analysis was carried out separately and similar themes were found as presented in Findings below. Further, the data were categorized based on reading steps: pre-reading, whilst reading, and post-reading. In each step, the activities were classified based on the metacognitive reading strategies taxonomy of Mokhtari and Reichard (2002). At last, data from the interviews were displayed in Ts 2, 3, and 4 to provide a brief overview of the interview results.

Findings

The study's findings are presented in three sections based on the themes that emerged from the data.

Pre-reading stage

All participants applied global strategies in the form of having reading purposes, choosing the text, and matching the text with their purposes of reading. This is depicted by the following statements:

Reading purposes

In the pre-reading stage, data from our interviews show that one participant employed reading purposes in her reading activities. She narrated that it was done due to her assignments.

I read an academic text, because I have assignments ^(GLOB) and I prepare myself to join the next meeting ^(GLOB) by reading the topic that will be discussed. I matched the text with my purposes ^(GLOB). I searched references related to it ^(GLOB). To ensure that the text fits my reading goal, I read the title ^(GLOB) and read the abstract and sub-topics (article research) ^(GLOB). (S1)

Choosing texts

Unlike S1, S5 conveyed in the interview that in her pre-reading stage, she chooses texts due to her personal needs and interests. For example, she mentioned that Tables of Contents have been her first stage in choosing books to read:

I read academic books or articles to do my assignments, preparing for English essay competitions, preparing myself before joining classes, and carrying out my lecture's tasks ^(GLOB). I choose the reading text based on the topic I need ^(GLOB). The book is what I need from the chapters in the Table of Contents ^(GLOB). If it's a research article, I look at the abstract, research methodology, and the findings at a glance ^(GLOB). (S5)

Matching texts with personal purposes

Another type of activity in the pre-reading stage used by our research participants, was the one that was presented by S6. She matched texts with personal purposes. In the interview, S6 mentioned that she usually read the book chapters to ensure that what she is reading fits her needs or purposes.

I have a goal why I must read academic texts (GLOB) as I need certain theories for my thesis (GLOB). I usually search for reading material on Google. I type the key words (GLOB). I just select based on the most credible web (GLOB). Then, I select the texts by reading the title, key words, and abstract (GLOB). To ensure that the text fits my purpose, I read chapter 1 or the first sub-chapter at glance (GLOB). (S6)

After analyzing the the participants’ texts at the pre-reading stage, it can be seen that they clearly set the purpose of academic reading such as completing assignments, writing an essay, and looking for certain theories. Further, the participants knew what they were looking for within the text. Hence, they ensured that the texts they chose matched their purposes. The following Table indicates the use of metacognitive reading strategies at the pre-reading stage by the participants.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies		Students									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Global strategies (GLOB)	Setting purpose when I read	x	x	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x
	Scanning the text at glance to know what the text tells about before reading it	x	x	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x
	Considering whether the text fits with my purposes of reading	x	x	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x

Table 2: Metacognitive reading strategies at the pre-reading stage

Table 2 shows that all participants in this study employed global strategies in their reading activities. Such strategies included reading purposes, scanning texts, and matching texts.

Whilst-reading stage

During the whilst-reading stage, the ten participants employed all types of metacognitive strategies: global, support, and problem-solving with different portions.

Global strategy

In global strategies, S1 and S3 said that they used translation techniques and searched for key terms on Google when they found unfamiliar English words. Such strategies helped them understand the meaning of the sentences by guessing from the context and linking to previous ideas from the same text.

When I face unknown words, I immediately translate through e-dictionary (SUP). I guess the meaning of reading one sentence fully (PROB). The more difficult the text, the longer time I need to completely read it (GLOB). I stop for a while and think (SUP) 'what does it mean'. I have to understand what the author written (SUP). I come back to read the part of text (PROB) in which I have lost focus. I do so to reconnect previous idea within sentences (PROB). I also search on Google, for instance when I don't know the differences between term EFL and ESL (SUP). I like reading loudly especially when I am in my home (PROB). It keeps me staying focus on the track. To check whether I understand the text. (S1)

I translate unfamiliar words or phrases I find (PROB). Sometimes I guess the meaning after I fully read one sentence (PROB). If it's difficult, I reduce the speed in reading (GLOB). I also need to think while reading (SUP) to understand the text. I re-read the path where I only look at the sentences without trying to understand (PROB). If I read a new topic, I search on google 'Phonology is' using Indonesian (SUP). I usually take note and highlight key information I get (SUP). I read slowly (GLOB) and re-read again (PROB) to make sure I do really understand and get the point. If the text mostly use difficult scientific words, I absorb the information using Indonesian (SUP). Whilst I mostly understand the words used, I just think about the information in simpler English (SUP). (S3)

Support and problem-solving strategies

Our data shows that although some students use similar strategies, as reported by S1 and S3 in the previous sections, others have a completely different approach.

I highlight (SUP) and look the meaning of unknown words I find up in the dictionary (SUP). If the text is getting harder, I will read it slower (GLOB). Because I re-read the sentence again (PROB) If I don't understand. "What does this mean?". I stop and think trying to gasp the main point (SUP). If I suddenly realize 'how come I don't focus', I

will re-read back to the track^(PROB). I can look for another reference (such as an introduction to the topic)^(SUP), so that I can understand the text. I think the information within the text uses Indonesian^(SUP). To ensure that I have understood what I read, I can verbalize or talk to myself about what the text tells about^(SUP). (S10)

During the whilst-reading stage, our data reveals that there are different numbers of participants in applying global, problem-solving, and support strategies. There are six activities representing each problem-solving and global strategies while the support strategy is depicted by 13 actions. In general, as can be seen in the Table below, the support strategies are mostly used as compared to global and support strategies.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies		Students									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Global Strategies (GLOB)	Regulating my reading speed	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Connecting ideas to find relationship by going back and forth	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
	Choosing what to read closely and what to ignore	x	x	x	x				x		x
	Paying closer attention to text when it gets difficult	x	x	x	x				x		
	Considering whether the text fits with my purposes of reading	x	x	x	x		x				x
	Reading carefully and slowly to ensure I understand the text I read	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB)	Reading loudly to aid me understand the text	x									
	Re-reading to enhance my understanding	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	Thinking my prior knowledge to help me understand	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x
	Paying closer attention to the text when it gets difficult	x	x	x		x	x			x	x
	Getting back on track when I do not focus	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words and phrases	x		x	x			x		x	
Support Strategies (SUP)	Underlining, circling, or marking information in the text to aid me remember the information		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
	Stopping time to time and thinking about the content of the text	x	x	x	x	x			x		x
	Restating or paraphrasing ideas using my own words to get better understanding	x			x	x	x			x	
	Noticing a table and diagram in the text to raise my understanding	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	Taking notes while reading to assist me understand the text	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	
	Thinking the content of the text in both English and Indonesian	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Translating from English into my native language when the text becomes difficult	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Having additional references such as a dictionary or article to support me understand the text	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Visualizing the information to support me remember and understand it	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	Critically evaluating and analyzing my understanding through the text	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
	Checking my understanding when come across new information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
	Verbalizing what I gain from text to ensure my understanding	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
	Questioning myself to ensure whether I have understood the text				x	x					

Table 3: Metacognitive reading strategies in the whilst-reading stage

Table 3 shows that most of the participants employed metacognitive reading strategies in the whilst-reading stage. Interestingly, some specific sub-strategies in the three main strategies of metacognitive reading were not used by the majority of the participants. For example, only two participants used "Questioning myself

to ensure whether I have understood the text” in the support strategies. This is possible since strategies in reading are based on students’ personal needs and interests.

Post-reading stage

In the last stage of reading, that is, post-reading stage, all participants employed a few metacognitive reading strategies: global, problem-solving, and support strategies. The use of these types of reading strategies is related to the fact that each student has different needs after finishing reading the text.

Global strategy

In the post-reading stage, one participant related the text she was reading to her background knowledge. She did this to ensure that she got insights from her personal needs.

To check my understanding, I can connect what the text tells about with my background knowledge^(SUP). After reading, I sometimes feel that the text I read is not what I need^(GLOB). That is because the text don’t match with my expectation^(GLOB). If it happens, I just focus on what a little bit relates to what I am looking for^(GLOB). (S3)

Problem-solving strategy

In the problem-solving strategy, two participants claimed to used self-explanation in order to understand what they read. This is especially true in situations where they faced some difficulties in comprehending the text. For instance, S4 stated that “I know I am not quite sure to understand the text if I still cannot get the point. I always evaluate myself. I try to retell what I have gained from the text”. Another student mentioned that “I ask myself what I get from the text, what factors enhance students’ competency^(SUP). I know that the text really fits my reading goals if I can complete my assignments and gain the information I need” (S5).

Support strategy

In order to support the understanding of what they read from the texts, some participants tried reading the text multiple times until they understood the information. This can be seen from one of the participants’ statements “I do ask myself what the text is about, what method is used, and what factors influence, etc.^(SUP). However, if I cannot do it, I re-read the text again^(PROB)”(S7). In addition to this statement, Table 4 below presents a picture of students’ use of metacognitive strategies in their post-reading stage. From Table 4, it can be seen that only a few sub-strategies were used by the students. This finding adds information in terms of the frequent use of strategies by the students. Below are the number of the students who used each of the metacognitive reading strategies.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies		Students									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Global strategies (GLOB)	Considering whether the text fits with my purposes of reading	x		x							
Problem solving strategies (PROB)	Re-reading to enhance my understanding							x	x		
Support strategies (SUP)	Critically evaluating and analyzing my understanding through the text		x	x	x	x	x		x		x
	Verbalizing what I gain from text to ensure my understanding				x		x				x
	Questioning myself to ensure whether I have understood the text					x		x		x	
	Restating or paraphrasing ideas using my own words to get better understanding		x								

Table 4: Metacognitive reading strategies applied in the post-reading stage

Discussion

The first research question in this study examined the metacognitive strategies used most commonly by the ten participants. After analyzing the data in the pre-reading stage, results showed that all the participants applied global strategies. These strategies were employed while establishing reading purposes and matching

the text they had chosen with their purposes. However, in the whilst reading stage, all types of metacognitive strategies, that is, global, support, and problem-solving were implemented by all participants with different activities in each type of strategies. It is worth mentioning that support strategies were the most used by the participants as they were used 13 times according to the analysis. Meanwhile, in the post-reading stage, two types of metacognitive strategies, that is, global strategies and problem-solving strategies were the two least used strategies. For instance, Student 1 only used global strategies during the post-reading stage, while Student 7 and Student 8 applied both problem-solving and support strategies.

Referring to the second research question related to how the chosen strategies were used, the participants applied all types of metacognitive reading strategies depending on their problems and needs. For example, when finding unknown words, Student 10 firstly highlighted the word and looked up the meaning on e-dictionary. However, if she still did not understand the word, she re-read the sentence with the unknown word. From Student 10's text, it can be concluded that the student used more than one strategy to solve her reading problem. If she realized that the first chosen strategy did not solve her problem, she used another option from the metacognitive strategies types.

The study's findings suggest that successful students have knowledge of metacognition as they realize their cognitive processes in understanding the text. Furthermore, they have the ability to choose the appropriate type of metacognitive strategies while facing reading problems. This is in line with Hamiddin and Saukah (2020), Lin (2019), and Do and Phan's (2021) findings that successful students have more knowledge of metacognition and utilize various metacognitive strategies. This finding aligns as well with Zhussupova and Kazbekova (2016) who revealed that active application of metacognitive strategies can boost students' own thinking process to control, manage, and facilitate being independent readers. However, the present study contrasts with Do and Phan (2021) who found that problem-solving was the most frequently used strategy compared to other strategies. However, there was an interconnection between the types of metacognitive reading strategies, a result supported by Wharton's (2000) findings.

It was also found that all the participants undertook global strategies during the pre-reading stage to match their reading purposes and the text. In the whilst-reading step, global, problem-solving, and support strategies were mostly used by all participants in different proportion. Surprisingly, the most used type of strategies was a support strategies. At the post-reading stage, the participants only applied few strategies: global, problem-solving, and support. Each type of metacognitive reading strategies did not stand as an independent strategy since an individual could use an alternative strategy if another one did not solve the participant's problem. Thus, there is an interconnection between the types of metacognitive reading strategies, a result supported by Wharton's (2000) findings.

Conclusion

This study used a narrative inquiry approach to examine metacognitive reading strategies used by ten successful EFL students in Indonesia. The first research question examined the metacognitive strategies used most commonly by the ten participants, while the second investigated how the strategies were used. Results showed that the participating students employed multiple metacognitive strategies in their reading. In their choice of metacognition strategies, support strategies, along with global and problem-solving were commonly used. This finding signals that successful students are autonomous in their use of metacognition in reading. Based on the study, it is essential that unsuccessful students take advantage of appropriate the strategies in order to succeed in their EFL reading. This can be done with the help of EFL teachers who should identify and provide practice in the strategies. Finally, further studies are encouraged to uncover in-depth relationships between this metacognition and students' autonomous learning. Because this study used a narrative design; longer and more in-depth interviews for follow-up research should be used to guarantee more thorough results.

Acknowledgment

This article is derived from the undergraduate thesis of the first author at Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia. The second, third, and fourth authors served as the thesis supervisors. The authors sincerely thank the Editor-in-Chief and the anonymous reviewers of the MEXTESOL Journal for their constructive comments and valuable suggestions on the earlier version of this article.

References

- Albashtawi, A. H. (2019). Improvement of EFL students' academic reading achievement through the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). *Reading Psychology*, 40(8), 679-704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2019.1658669>
- Alkhaleefah, T. A. (2017). Saudi EFL learners' reported reading problems and strategic processing of text types: A think-aloud case study. *Reading Psychology*, 38(7), 687-730. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2017.1336660>
- Arabmofrad, A., Badi, M., & Rajaei Pitehnoee, M. R. (2021). The relationship among elementary English as a foreign language learners' hemispheric dominance, metacognitive reading strategies preferences, and reading comprehension. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 37(5), 413-424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2020.1846005>
- Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: Transcribing. *Family Practice*, 25(2), 127-131. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmn003>
- Balikciolu, G. & Efe, T. (2016). The role of metacognitive activities on university level preparatory class EFL learners reading comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 294-299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.024>
- Barkhuizen, G. (2022). Ten tricky questions about narrative inquiry in language teaching and learning research: And what the answers mean for qualitative and quantitative research. *LEARN Journal*, 15(2), 1-19. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/259919>
- Bergvall, H., Ghaderi, A., Andersson, J., Lundgren, T., Andersson, G., & Bohman, B. (2023). Development of competence in cognitive behavioural therapy and the role of metacognition among clinical psychology and psychotherapy students. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 51(3), 200-213. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465822000686>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived experience. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 27(1), 44-54.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Csornay, E., & Prades, A. (2018). Academic vocabulary in ESL student papers: A corpus-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33, 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.003>
- Dardjito, H. (2019). Students' metacognitive reading awareness and academic English reading comprehension in EFL context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 611-624. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12439a>
- Do, M. H., & Phan, H. L. T. (2021). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies on second language Vietnamese undergraduates. *Arab World English Journal*, 12(1), 90-112. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no1.7>
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- Gavora, P., Vaculíková, J., Kalenda, J., Kálmán, O., Gombos, P., Swigost, M., & Bontová, A. (2020). Comparing metacognitive reading strategies among university students from Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(7), 896-910. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1614545>
- Georghiades, P. (2012). From the general to the situated: Three decades of metacognition. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26(3), 365-383. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950069032000119401>
- Goldfus, C. (2014). Improving fluency in EFL reading comprehension in adolescents with learning difficulties. In T. Muller, J. Adamson, P. S. Brown, & S. Herder (Eds.), *Exploring EFL fluency in Asia* (pp. 261-278). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Green, J. L., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P. B. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hamiddin, H., & Saukah, A. (2020). Investigating metacognitive knowledge in reading comprehension: The case of Indonesian undergraduate students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 608-615. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23211>
- Henriksen, M. G., Englander, M., & Nordgaard, J. (2022). Methods of data collection in psychopathology: The role of semi-structured, phenomenological interviews. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 21(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-021-09730-5>
- Javed, M., Eng, L. S., & Mohamed, A. R. (2015). Developing reading comprehension modules to facilitate reading comprehension among Malaysian secondary school ESL students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2015.8211a>
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954-2965. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031>
- Lin, J. (2019). Factors related to EFL/ESL learners' reading strategy use: A literature review. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(1), 92-112. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2019-0006>
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249>
- Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2-11. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42784357>

- Muhid, A., Amalia, E. R., Hilaliyah, H., Budiana, N., & Wajdi, M. B. N. (2020). The effect of metacognitive strategies implementation on students' reading comprehension achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 847-862. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13257a>
- Myers, M. D. (2009). *Qualitative research in business and management*. Sage.
- Nurkamto, J., Drajati, N. A., Ngadiso, N., & Karlina, Y. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching reading at Islamic secondary schools in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31753>
- Qoyyimah, U. (2023). Handling translations of data for qualitative research. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.18063/fls.v5i1.1515>
- Rastegar, M., Mehrabi Kermani, E., & Khabir, M. (2017). The relationship between metacognitive reading strategies use and reading comprehension achievement of EFL learners. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 7(2), 65-74. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2017.72006>
- Ruslin, Mashuri, S., Abdul Rasak, M. S., Alhabsyi, F., & Syam, H. (2022). Semi-structured interview: A methodological reflection on the development of a qualitative research instrument in educational studies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 12(1), 22-29. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-1201052229>
- Shang, H.-F. (2018). EFL medical students' metacognitive strategy use for hypertext reading comprehension. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(2), 259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-017-9156-y>
- Shih, H.-C. J., & Huang, S. C. (2018). EFL learners' metacognitive strategy use in reading tests. *English Teaching & Learning*, 42(2), 117-130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-018-0007-3>
- Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794104044430>
- Teng, M. F. (2019). The benefits of metacognitive reading strategy awareness instruction for young learners of English as a second language. *Literacy*, 54(1), 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12181>
- Teng, M. F. (2021). Effects of individual and group metacognitive prompts on tertiary-level students' metacognitive awareness and writing outcomes. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31, 601-612. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00611-8>
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203-243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00117>
- Yang, C., & Bai, L. (2019). The use of metacognitive strategies by Chinese PhD students of social sciences in Australian universities. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 97, 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.06.007>
- Zhussupova, R., & Kazbekova, M. (2016). Metacognitive strategies as points in teaching reading comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 228, 593-600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.091>

Appendix

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Purpose of the Interview

The interview aimed to explore students' experiences and metacognitive reading strategies when reading English academic texts during the pre-reading, whilst-reading, and post-reading stages.

Introductory Questions

1. Can you tell me about your experience of reading English academic texts?
2. What kinds of English academic texts do you usually read?
3. How often do you read English academic texts?

A. Pre-reading Stage

1. What do you usually do before reading an English academic text?
2. Do you set a specific purpose before you start reading? If yes, what is it?
3. How do you choose an academic article or book chapter?
4. How do you decide whether a text is relevant to your learning needs or assignments?
5. What parts of the text do you usually examine first (e.g., title, abstract, keywords, table of contents)?

B. Whilst-reading Stage

1. What strategies do you use while reading English academic texts?
2. What do you usually do when you encounter unfamiliar vocabulary?
3. How do you deal with difficult or confusing sections?
4. Do you change your reading speed depending on the difficulty of the text? Why?
5. Do you reread certain sections? In what situations?
6. Do you take notes, highlight important information, or use dictionaries? Please explain.
7. Do you translate the text into Indonesian or think in Indonesian while reading? Why?
8. How do you know whether you understand what you are reading?

C. Post-reading Stage

1. What do you usually do after finishing an English academic text?
2. How do you evaluate whether you have understood the text?
3. Do you summarize or explain the text in your own words?
4. Do you relate what you have read to your prior knowledge or learning needs?
5. What do you do if you realize that you have not fully understood the text?

Closing Questions

1. Which reading strategy do you think helps you the most when reading English academic texts?
2. What challenges do you still experience when reading English academic texts?
3. Is there anything else you would like to share about your academic reading experience?