

The Relationship Between Preferred Reading Strategies and Language Achievement On the IELTS Reading Module of Students at Thai Nguyen University

Le Quang Dung, Ph.D *, Nguyen Thi Dieu Ha, Ph.D **

* International School - Thai Nguyen University

** School of Foreign Languages - Thai Nguyen University

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.9.08.2019.p9290

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.08.2019.p9290>

Abstract- The study tries to find the correlation between preferred reading strategies and language achievement of non-English majored students at two institutions at Thai Nguyen Universities; The International School and the Foreign Language Faculty. The participants are required to achieve IELTS 5.0-5.5 academic version for graduation. The study employs the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory, version 4.0 (MARSI) as a tool for data collection. The SPSS version 20.0 is used to analyze the data as well as to find out the preferred reading strategies of the students. The result of an IELTS which is adapted from Cambridge IELTS preparation 12 is used to compare the language achievement among different reading strategy users. The results of the study show that students use most reading strategies at moderate and high levels, except for GRS1, GRS2, GRS3 and PSRS3. The most preferred strategies include PSRS7, PSRS8, SRS1, SRS2, SRS6, SRS7, SRS9. The reading achievement is affected by GRS and PSRS. There is no significant different between the use of SRS and the reading achievement.

Index Terms- reading skill, reading strategy, reading comprehension, preferred reading strategies language achievement

I. INTRODUCTION

RTeading skill has long been regarded as a prerequisite for foreign language acquisition (Aebersold and Field, 1997) since it functions as an essential source of input for other skills to develop. The process of comprehending a text involves the activation of schemata, i.e. the readers' background knowledge about the reading texts, the ability to guess unknown words from context clues, the understanding of structures of the reading texts etc. These are named as reading strategies. Research discovered that readers spontaneously use reading strategies in the reading process (Pritchard, 1990). Literature also suggested that the use of appropriate reading strategies may improve reading comprehension (Oxford, 1990, Olsen and Gee, 1991). Using reading strategies can be of great help for non-native readers because it may serve as an effective way of overcoming language deficiency and obtaining better reading achievement both for regular school assignments and on language proficiency tests (Zhang, 1992).

As teachers of English at Thai Nguyen University, where students have to gain 6.0 overall band in the International English Language Testing System or IELTS, we notice that reading comprehension is one of the most difficult skill for those learners. This study attempts to find appropriate strategies that more or less can improve the reading scores at Thai Nguyen University, Vietnam.

There are many reasons for the poor reading achievement in an IELTS exam such as; types of readings, types of tasks, learners' schemata i.e. the background knowledge of the learners in processing the information from the reading materials. However, we assume that the inappropriate utilization of the reading strategies might be the causes. That is the impetus for this study.

1.1. Statement of the problem

The International English Language Testing System or IELTS is an international standardized test of English language proficiency for non-native English language speakers. The exam consists of four modules namely Reading, Listening, Writing and Speaking. Many international organizations and institutions worldwide use the result as the language requirement for accepting candidates from non-English speaking countries to study undergraduate or post-graduate programs in English speaking countries or even non-English speaking countries.

In Vietnam, many universities require IELTS result as a prerequisite for graduation. The overall band varies by different institutions as well as different major fields of study ranging from 5.5 to 6.0. Many test-takers fail the desire score because of the reading module. That inspires us to carry out this study with a hope that appropriate strategies can improve their reading achievement in the exam.

1.2. Scope of the study

The study is carried out with 93 students who are studying at International School and Foreign Language Faculty, Thai Nguyen University. All of these students have studied English for 3 semesters of English, focusing on the IELTS test. They all aim at the target of 6.0 overall band score.

1.3. Purpose of the study

This study aims to find what preferred reading strategies that IELTS test-takers use while they take the reading module. Besides, the relationship between preferred strategies and the real

achievement in the reading task will be explored. The results of the study will be used to raise awareness in the utilization of appropriate reading strategies for all IELTS test-takers. In addition, the findings from this study may have some implications for teachers who wish to do better in preparation courses.

1.4. Research questions

From the above mentioned aims, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are preferred reading strategies students reported using when they take the reading module in the IELTS exam?
2. To what extent do the uses of reading strategies affect the reading achievement?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this part of the study, the first focus will be discussions about the importance of reading strategies while taking the IELTS test. In the second part a review of related literature on models of reading, reading strategies definitions as well as research findings in the field will be discussed.

2.1. The importance of reading strategies

Reading strategies or methods refers to a planned or established way of reading. The foundation of reading comprehension strategies is the ability to decode information using techniques and activities designed to help students become active, purposeful readers. Strategies may also be applied as individualized assessment tools. This analysis not only provide in-depth information about what strategies a reader is using, but also identifies areas that need attention for reading to develop.

There are a variety of reasons why IELTS reading is difficult, this may include; academic vocabulary that means the words in the IELTS readings are unusually used in daily life but common in topics of reading academic. In addition, the reading module is quite long in terms of three reading passages of approximately 3000 words. Another thing that makes reading is a challenge is the types of tasks, i.e. types of questions such as; multiple choice, gap-filling, summary or flow-chart completion. In order to gain high score test-takers are advised to use appropriate strategies while taking the reading module.

2.2. Models of reading comprehension

Research in the field of reading has identified theories of reading models such as; bottom-up, top-down, and interactive.

2.2.1. Bottom-up models

In bottom-up models, the reading process is considered a text-driven decoding process wherein the sole role of the reader is to reconstruct meaning embedded in the smallest units of text (Gough, 1972; Carrell, 1988; McKoon & Radcliff, 1992). It views the text as a "chain of isolated words, each of which is to be deciphered individually" (Martinez-Lang, 1995:70), and the reader as someone who "approaches the text by concentrating exclusively on the combination of letters and words in a purely linear manner" (p. 70). Meaning is understood through analysis of individual parts of the language and the reader processes language in a sequential manner, "combining sounds or letters to form

words, then combining words to form phrases, clauses, and sentences of the text" (Shrum & Glisan, 2000:123).

There are criticisms towards this model of reading. Firstly, it is entirely text-driven and the readers are simply passive recipients of the information provided (Paris and Hamilton, 2009). Secondly, meaning can only be constructed separately at word or sentence level, which hinders the process of achieving overall meaning (Nuttall, 1996). The reading speed is also significantly reduced when readers have to focus on every single word and try to understand every single detail.

2.2.2. Top-down models

In contrast, the top-down models take the opposite position and consider the reader and his/her interests, world knowledge, and reading skills as the driving force behind reading comprehension (Goodman, 1968; Graesser, Singer & Trabasso, 1994; Omaggio Hadley, 1979; Barnett, 1989). The top-down models emphasize the use of schemata in processing the information of the texts. Schema is defined as a mental structure of all the particular experiences a reader has, which can grow and change throughout his life (Nuttall, 1996:7). This concept-driven model was also advocated by other authors like Kollers (1972), Smith (1973) or Goodman (1976), emphasizing the active role of readers in approaching meaning. With the activation of schemata, the readers can interact with the texts by making and confirming predictions, asking oneself questions, evaluating the text information, etc. instead of just absorbing the contents passively. A more moderate top-down position is found in Goodman (1968), who depicts the reading process as a "psycholinguistic guessing game" (p. 126) where the reader reduces his or her dependence upon the text itself by employing strategies such as predicting and sampling. In other words the reader uses "general knowledge of the world or of particular text components to make intelligent guesses about what might come next in the text [and] samples only enough of the text to confirm or reject these guesses" (Barnett, 1989:13).

However, this model tends to undervalue the importance of word recognition and decoding in the reading process. According to Carrell and Eskey (1988), if readers do not pay enough attention to words or sentences in the text, they will find it harder to confirm the hypotheses already made. Furthermore, this model may not be appropriate for less fluent readers who lack certain background knowledge to generate predictions (Stanovich, 1980).

2.2.3. Interactive models

By taking the advantages of both above-mentioned models, interactive models suggest that readers should use bottom-up and top-down strategies as two complementary approaches in facilitating comprehension. Nuttall (1996) viewed bottom-up as the action of a "scientist with a magnifying glass examining the ecology of a transect" (17), and top-down as "an eagle's eye view of the landscape" (16). These metaphors illustrate the nature of both reading models: while bottom-up draws readers attention to small details through decoding letters and words, analyzing sentence structures or scrutinizing the lexis and syntax; top-down help readers draw an overview of the text based on their background knowledge and past experiences. The combination of an "eagle's eye view" and "a magnifying glass" is obviously effective for any reader in constructing meaning from the texts.

Stanovich (1980) and Rumelhart (1994) suggest that readers should make use of multiple sources of knowledge simultaneously to generate the best interpretation of the text input. Whether the knowledge is at lexical, semantic or syntactic level, they can be utilized in both bottom-up and top-down modes.

In general, most researchers have now agreed that the two models function as two complementary processes to aid comprehension, Carrell and Eskey (1988), Barnett (1988), McCarthy and Carter (1994), Day and Bamford (1998); Nunan (1999), McDonough and Shaw (2003), etc.

2.3. Definitions of reading strategies

Language learning strategies in general and reading strategies in particular have been defined differently by different researchers.

Winograd & Hare, 1998 (as cited in Anderson, 1999) defined reading strategies as “deliberate actions that learners select and control to achieve desired goal or objectives.” According to Paris et al. (1983:293), reading strategies are "skills under consideration" which closely depend on specific reading contexts as well as readers' awareness, control and intention. A strategic reader is described to have three sources of knowledge: declarative knowledge (what the strategies are), procedural knowledge (how to use the strategies), and conditional knowledge (when and why to use the strategies). Block (1986:465) suggested that reading strategies indicate "how readers conceive a task, what textual cues they attend to, how they make sense of what they read, and what they do when they do not understand". Barnett (1988) defined reading strategies as the mental operations conducted by readers when they purposely read a text for comprehension. Oxford and Crookall (1989) explained reading strategies as learning techniques, behaviors, problem-solving skills, or study skills that can lead learners to more effective and efficient learning

2.4. Review of related literature about reading strategies

There have been many attempts in finding the relationship between reading strategies and language proficiency. However, the results were different because of different subjects and different academic settings. Kate Tzu-Ching Chen and Sabina Chia Li Chen (2015) conducted a study about the use of reading strategies among high school students in Taiwan. The findings were that Students had a preference for global reading strategies, followed by problem-solving strategies and support strategies. Another study by Ngan Mai Hoang (2015) at Northumbria University- UK investigated the relationship between reading strategies use and reading proficiency of Vietnamese students in the United Kingdom. The focus of the study was on the correlation between reading strategy use and reading competence, as well as the differences between higher-proficiency readers and lower-proficiency readers in terms of strategy utilization. The results show that Vietnamese student were medium strategy users, and there was no statistically significant association between overall strategy use and reading comprehension. Poole (2005) used the

Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) to explore the reading strategies of 248 university ESL students from the Midwest and South of the United States. The results revealed that problem-solving strategies were used with high frequency, while global and support strategies were used with medium frequency. Gorsuch and Taguchi (2008) found that Vietnamese college EFL students mostly used bottom-up, top-down, and cognitive strategies to assist comprehension in repeated reading sessions. Karbalaei (2010) compared reading strategy use in Iranian EFL and Indian ESL college students. They found that Indian ESL students used mostly global and support strategies, as well as metacognitive reading strategies, while Iranian EFL students used mostly problem-solving reading strategies.

Most of the above mentioned studies have been conducted outside Vietnam with participants from different academic settings with different purposes. This study firstly, attempts to find the preferred reading strategies used by students at Thai Nguyen University, Vietnam who are struggling the IELTS reading exam. Secondly, we would like to find the correlation between the preferred strategies and the language achievement of those test-takers.

III. METHODOLOGIES

3.1. Participants

The participants in this study consist of 75 students from two institutions of Thai Nguyen University; 30 students are from Foreign Language Faculty and 45 students come from The International School. These students have completed three semester of English focusing on the IELTS exam. The target overall score is 6.0. These students have taken the IELTS (institutional version) several times and the reading module seems to be the most challenge for them.

3.2. Instrument

The instrument used in this study was the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII) version 1.0, which was originally developed by Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) as a tool to measure native English language learners’ awareness of reading strategy usage. Some of the items have been altered or reworded to be closed to the IELTS questions. The MARSII consists of 30 items that measure awareness reading strategies. In this questionnaire each item is accompanied with a 5-point, Likert-type scale, 1 (never or almost never do this), 2 (only occasionally do this), 3 (sometimes do this), 4 (usually do this), 5 (always or almost always do this) in which scores of 2.4 or below demonstrate low strategy use, 2.5 to 3.4 show moderate strategy use, and 3.5 or above signifies high strategy use.

The Cronbach alpha is 0.766 and Cronbach alpha based on standardized item is 0.826 reveal that the questionnaires are highly reliable. (Table 1)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.766	.826	30

Table 1: Reliability statistics

3.3. Procedures and statistical analysis

In this study, the MARSI was translated into Vietnamese to facilitate respondents' understanding. The translated version was then delivered to the students who participated in the study. The quantitative data were collected and analyzed using SPSS 20.0. Descriptive analysis was used to find out participants' preferred reading strategies; Global reading strategies (GLRS), Problem solving reading strategies (PSRS) or Support reading strategies (SRS). An IELTS reading test was given to three groups, the mean score of each group reveals the correlation between preferred reading strategies and the language proficiency.

The study uses Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to test the correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variable as well as between the independent variables for the multi-collinear multipliers, the Pearson correlation coefficient will be used. If two variables are linear, one can model the causal relationship of these two variables by linear regression. The linear multivariable regression equation has the form:
 $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3$

In which
 Y: Mark
 X1: GRS
 X2: PSRS
 X3: SRS

The comprehensive statistical of the above approach for representing, estimating, and testing three hypothesis of the research.

- H1: GRS affect the reading achievement of students.
- H2: PSRS affect the reading achievement of students
- H3: SRS affect the reading achievement of students.

3.4. Results

The descriptive statistics (table 2) shows that most of the strategies are reported using at moderate and high level, except for GRS1, GRS2, GRS3 and PSRS3 (M<2.5). The most preferred strategies include PSRS7, PSRS8, SRS1, SRS2, SRS6, SRS7, SRS9 (M>3.5).

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
GRS1	75	1	5	3.12	1.542	2.377
GRS2	75	1	5	2.19	.940	.884
GRS3	75	1	5	2.12	.958	.918
GRS4	75	1	5	2.97	1.385	1.918
GRS5	75	1	5	2.85	1.430	2.046
GRS6	75	1	5	3.28	.938	.880
GRS7	75	1	5	3.15	1.402	1.965
GRS8	75	2	5	3.47	.920	.847
GRS9	75	1	5	3.49	.876	.767
GRS10	75	2	5	3.71	.731	.534
GRS11	75	1	5	3.40	.870	.757
GRS12	75	1	5	3.37	.897	.805
GRS13	75	1	5	3.40	.885	.784
PSRS1	75	1	5	2.69	1.013	1.026
PSRS2	75	1	5	3.24	.956	.915
PSRS3	75	1	5	2.47	1.031	1.063
PSRS4	75	1	5	2.75	1.116	1.246
PSRS5	75	1	5	2.71	1.075	1.156
PSRS6	75	1	5	2.87	1.166	1.360
PSRS7	75	1	5	3.67	.935	.874
PSRS8	75	1	5	3.64	.939	.882
SRS1	75	1	5	3.77	.924	.853
SRS2	75	1	5	3.71	.882	.778
SRS3	75	1	5	2.92	1.440	2.075
SRS4	75	1	5	3.07	1.536	2.360
SRS5	75	1	5	3.05	1.506	2.267
SRS6	75	1	5	3.84	.855	.731
SRS7	75	1	5	3.88	.900	.810
SRS8	75	1	5	3.23	1.503	2.259
SRS9	75	1	5	3.79	.890	.792
Valid N (listwise)	75					

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the mean scores of the use of reading strategies

In this research, the factor analysis process is repeated in 2 rounds due to the cross-factor loading of the variables. In all 2 rounds of the factor analysis process, KMO is about 0.8 (>0.5) with statistical significance (sig = .000) and each Total Variance Explained is over 70% (>50%) which prove the appropriateness of factor analysis.

In the first round, 4 initial components are converted into 4 components. 10 items are deleted because of cross-loading factor and 20 remaining items are kept for the next step. Finally, these 20 items are tested again in the final round.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.839
Approx. Chi-Square	1293.541
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Df	190
Sig.	.000

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's test

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.515	32.573	32.573	6.515	32.573	32.573	5.507	27.537	27.537
2	4.830	24.149	56.723	4.830	24.149	56.723	4.921	24.604	52.140
3	3.141	15.706	72.429	3.141	15.706	72.429	4.058	20.289	72.429
4	.840	4.198	76.627						
5	.706	3.531	80.158						
6	.640	3.198	83.357						
7	.557	2.784	86.140						
8	.458	2.290	88.430						
9	.403	2.016	90.446						
10	.366	1.830	92.276						
11	.262	1.312	93.588						
12	.214	1.070	94.657						
13	.207	1.034	95.692						
14	.191	.954	96.646						
15	.171	.856	97.502						
16	.164	.820	98.322						
17	.121	.606	98.927						
18	.094	.469	99.397						
19	.068	.341	99.738						
20	.052	.262	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
GRS6		.876	
GRS8		.741	
GRS9		.800	
GRS10		.845	
GRS11		.704	
GRS12		.876	
GRS13		.923	
PSRS1			.828
PSRS2			.790
PSRS3			.749
PSRS5			.877
PSRS6			.892
PSRS7	.791		

PSRS8	.786		
SRS1	.898		
SRS2	.889		
SRS6	.896		
SRS7	.906		
SRS9	.912		
MAR2			.646

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 4 iterations.

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

3.5. Hypothesis testing

The next step includes all the other dependent variables in the model together with the above control variables to assess the overall impact of these control variables on the reading achievement of students dependent variable. Table 5 shows that independent variables that account for 35.3% of the variation of the dependent variable.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Change	Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
1	.616 ^a	.379	.353	.6849	.379	14.464	3	71	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), SRS, GRS, PSRS

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.663	.543		3.063	.003
	GRS	.269	.111	.228	2.432	.018
	PSRS	.520	.094	.542	5.532	.000
	SRS	.033	.105	.030	.310	.757

a. Dependent Variable: MAR2

Table 5: Variable summary

The linear regression model expresses the correlation between the factors as follows:
Mark = 1.663+0.269*GRS+0.52*PSRS

The research results of the author are basically consistent with previous quantitative studies. The test results show that the reading achievement of students is influenced by 2 factors: (1) GRS; (2) PSRS

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the research show that participants use most reading strategies at moderate and high levels, except for GRS1, GRS2, GRS3 and PSRS3. The most preferred strategies include PSRS7, PSRS8, SRS1, SRS2, SRS6, SRS7, SRS9. The reading achievement is affected by GRS and PSRS. There is no significant different between the use of SRS and the reading achievement.

REFERENCES

[1] Aebersold, J., & Field, M.L. (1997). From Reader to Reading Teacher: Issues and Strategies for Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
[2] Barnett, M. (1989). "Teaching Reading Strategies: How Methodology Affects Course Articulation." Foreign Language Annals, 21, 109-21.

[3] Carrell, P. and Eskey, D. (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[4] Day, R. and Bamford, J. (1998) *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[5] Goodman, K.S. (1968). *The Psychological Nature of the Reading Process*. Detroit: Wayne State UP.
[6] Goodman, K. (1976). "Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game", in H. Singer and R. Ruddell (eds) *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.
[7] Gough, P.B. (1972). "One Second of Reading." In J.F. Kavanagh, & I.G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by Ear and Eye* (pp.332-358). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
[8] Graesser, A., Singer, M., & Trabasso, T. (1994). "Constructing Inferences During Narrative Text Comprehension." *Psychological Review*, 101, 1-25.
[9] Kolers, P. (1972). "Experiments in Reading". *Scientific American*, 227/13, pp. 84 - 91.
[10] Martinez-Lang, A. (1995). "Benefits of Keeping a Reading Journal in the Development of Second Language Reading Ability." *Dimension*, 65-79.
[11] McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
[12] McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

[13] McKoon, G., & Radcliff, R. (1992). "Interference during Reading." *Psychological Review*, 99, 440-460

[14] Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). *Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94 (2), 249-259.

[15] Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

[16] Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Heinemann.

[17] Olsen, M. & Gee, T. (1991). Content reading instruction in the primary grades: Perceptions and strategies. *Reading Teacher*. 45(4), 298-307.

[18] Omaggio Hadley, A. (1979). "Pictures and Second Language Comprehension: Do They Help?" *Foreign Language Annals*, 12, 107-116.

[19] Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House Publishers.

[20] Paris, S. and Hamilton, E. (2009) "The Development of Children's Reading Comprehension", in S. Israel and G. Duffy (eds) *Handbook of Research on Reading Comprehension*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

[21] Pritchard, R. (1990). *The effects of cultural schemata on reading processing strategies*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25(4), 273-295.

[22] Rumelhart, D. (1994). "Toward an Interactive Model of Reading", in R. Ruddell, M. RappRuddell and H. Singer (eds) *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

[23] Shrum, J.L., & Glisan, E.W. (2000). *Teacher's Handbook*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

[24] Smith, F. (1973) *Psycholinguistics and Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

[25] Stanovich, K. (1980). "Toward an Interactive – Compensatory Model of Individual Differences in the Development of Reading Fluency". *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16/1, pp. 32 – 71.

[26] Zhang, Z. (1992). *English Reading Strategies*. Beijing: Transportation Press.

AUTHORS

First Author – Le Quang Dung, Ph.D, International School - Thai Nguyen University, Email: dunglq@tnu.edu.vn
Second Author – Nguyen Thi Dieu Ha, Ph.D, School of Foreign Languages - Thai Nguyen University, Email: dieuha.sfl@tnu.edu.vn

APPENDIX A: (MARSI - ENGLISH VERSION)

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

(MARSI) Version 1.0

Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard © 2002

DIRECTIONS: Listed below are statements about what people do when they read academic or schoolrelated materials such as textbooks, library books, etc. Five numbers follow each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

and each number means the following:

- **1** means "I **never or almost never** do this."
- **2** means "I do this **only occasionally**."
- **3** means "I **sometimes** do this." (About **50%** of the time.)
- **4** means "I **usually** do this."
- **5** means "I **always or almost always** do this."

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

PART A: GLOBAL READING STRATEGIES

#	STRATEGIES	SCALE				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I have a purpose in mind when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it.	1	2	3	4	5

4	I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose	1	2	3	4	5
5	I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding	1	2	3	4	5
8	I use context clues to help me better understand what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information	1	2	3	4	5
12	I try to guess what the material is about when I read	1	2	3	4	5
13	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong	1	2	3	4	5

GLOB SCORE

GLOB MEAN

PART B: PROBLEM SOLVING READING STRATEGIES

#	STRATEGIES	SCALE				
1	I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I'm reading	1	2	3	4	5
2	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration	1	2	3	4	5
3	I adjust my reading speed according to what I'm reading	1	2	3	4	5
4	When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
7	When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases	1	2	3	4	5

PROB SCORE

PROB MEAN

PART C: SUPPORT READING STRATEGIES

#	STRATEGIES	SCALE				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read	1	2	3	4	5
2	When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read	1	2	3	4	5
3	I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read	1	2	3	4	5
7	I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text	1	2	3	4	5

SUP SCORE

SUP MEAN

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

SCORING RUBRIC

Student Name: _____ Date: _____

1. Write your response to each statement (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in each of the blanks.
2. Add up the scores under each column. Place the result on the line under each column.
3. Divide the score by the number of statements in each column to get the average for each subscale.
4. Calculate the average for the inventory by adding up the subscale scores and dividing by 30.

5. Compare your results to those shown below.

6. Discuss your results with your teacher or tutor.

KEY TO AVERAGES: 3.5 or higher = High 2.5 – 3.4 = Medium 2.4 or lower = Low

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES: The overall average indicates how often you use reading strategies when reading academic materials. The average for each subscale of the inventory shows which group of strategies (i.e., global, problem-solving, and support strategies) you use most when reading. With this information, you can tell if you are very high or very low in any of these strategy groups. It is important to note, however, that the best possible use of these strategies depends on your reading ability in English, the type of material read, and your purpose for reading it. A low score on any of the subscales or parts of the inventory indicates that there may be some strategies in these parts that you might want to learn about and consider using when reading (adapted from Oxford 1990: 297-300)