

**T.C.**  
**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**AN INVESTIGATION OF AFGHAN EFL LEARNERS' READING  
STRATEGY USE**

**THESIS**  
**Arzoo ZAFAR**

**Department of English Language and Literature**  
**English Language and Literature Program**

**February, 2021**

**T.C.**  
**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**AN INVESTIGATION OF AFGHAN EFL LEARNERS' READING  
STRATEGY USE**

**THESIS**  
**Arzoo ZAFAR**  
**(Y1712.020038)**

**Department of English Language and Literature**  
**English Language and Literature Program**

**Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU**

**February, 2021**

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that this thesis is an original report of my research, that has been written by me and has not been submitted for any previous degree. The experimental work is almost entirely my own work; the collaborative contributions have been indicated clearly and acknowledged. Due references have been provided on all supporting literature and resources. (15/01/2021)

**Arzoo ZAFAR**

## **FOREWORD**

Initially I thank my Allah who is kind and merciful and who has created me, given me all the blessing, knowledge, talent, and the chance of being graduated to be able to get my master's degree from Istanbul Aydin university which is an honor of myself, family and my friends.

Secondly, I would like to thank my husband Shoaib ZAFAR for his supersensible, spiritual and financial support and would like to express my thanks from my parents, especially my father AB. Khaleq WASY who has supported me to make my dreams come true and to have life goals to reach my success. It is worth mentioning that my supervisor Dr. Hulya Yumru's efforts and her nice feedback had the main role in this process. I would like to express my sincere thanks to my advisor. prof, Dr. Hulya YUMRU for her endless support, patience, and motivation as she is a modal teacher and advisor that I have never and ever seen before in my life. Last but not least I would like to thank my friends who helped me in data gathering and for their guidance.

At the end I want to express my feeling about my study that ended successfully whereas I faced many challenges and have given all my efforts to be completed. One admonition that I experience during this process and I want to share as it is expressed in golden written words is: "Explore your own abilities! no one can do what you need, the one who can only do is you, so trust yourself and go ahead".

**February, 2021**

**Arzoo ZAFAR**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Background of the Study .....	1
1.3 Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions .....	3
1.4 Significance of the Study .....	3
1.5 Definitions of the Key Terms .....	4
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	5
2.2 Nature of Reading Comprehension .....	5
2.3 Modals of Reading .....	6
2.4 Reading Strategies .....	8
2.4.1 The classification and arrangement of strategies .....	9
2.4.2 Productive and unproductive readers' strategy use .....	11
2.5 Reading Strategy Instruction .....	12
2.5.1 Methods of reading strategy instruction .....	14
2.5.2 Factors affecting reading strategy instruction.....	15
2.5.3 Difficulties of strategy instruction (challenges and complexities of guidance tactic) .....	16
2.6 Research Findings on EFL Learners' Reading Strategy Use .....	17
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>19</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	19
3.2 Research Design .....	19
3.3 Participants of the Study.....	19
3.4 Data Collection Instrument .....	20
3.5 Data Collection Procedures .....	21
3.6 Data Analysis .....	21
<b>4. FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>22</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	22
4.2 Findings from The Pre-Reading Strategy Use .....	22
4.3 Findings from The While Reading Strategy Use .....	24
4.4 Findings from Post-Reading Strategy Use .....	34
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>36</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	36
5.2 Summary of the Study .....	36
5.3 Conclusions .....	36
5.4 Limitations of the Study .....	39

5.5 Further Recommendations.....	39
5.6 Pedagogical Implications .....	40
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>51</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Table 3.1:</b> Age Distribution of The Participants. ....	20
<b>Table 4.1:</b> The Rank Order of Pre-Reading Strategy Use.....	22
<b>Table 4.2:</b> The Rank Order of While Reading Strategy Use.....	25
<b>Table 4.3:</b> The Rank Order of Post-Reading Strategy Use .....	35

# AN INVESTIGATION OF AFGHAN EFL LEARNERS' READING STRATEGY USE

## ABSTRACT

Reading is a complex skill which involves cognitive process. The learners who use reading strategies as part of learning how to read, they improve their memory, thinking skills, creativity and imagination. They also develop their length of concentration. Reading is a dynamic skill that is important for learners to learn using a variety of sources. It is especially important for those who are learning academic English. The aim of this study was to identify the most and the least frequently used reading strategies by the learners so that the teachers would take-action steps to guide Afghan language learners to learn and to practice those least frequently used reading strategies. This research was conducted with 49 female students at Maarif girls school through a questionnaire in Sheberghan city Jowzjan Afghanistan. The finding of this study stated that majority of the participants rely on Top-down more than Bottom-up reading strategies which is explicit learning and unskilled learners are not able to use Top-down they use implicit learning which is bottom-up reading strategies. Therefore, this study is beneficial for those students who are learning English through exposure to traditional methods in EFL classrooms.

**Keywords:** *Learning English, reading comprehension, reading strategy use.*



# AFGHAN EFL ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN OKUMA STRATEJİ KULLANIMININ İNCELENMESİ

## ÖZET

Okuma, bilişsel süreci içeren karmaşık bir beceridir. Okumayı öğrenmenin bir parçası olarak okuma stratejilerini kullanan öğrenciler hafızalarını, düşünme becerilerini, yaratıcılıklarını ve hayal güçlerini geliştirirler. Ayrıca konsantrasyon uzunluklarını da geliştirirler. Okuma, öğrencilerin çeşitli kaynakları kullanarak öğrenmeleri için önemli olan dinamik bir beceridir. Akademik İngilizce öğrenenler için özellikle önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğrenciler tarafından en çok ve en az sıklıkla kullanılan okuma stratejilerini belirlemek, böylece öğretmenlerin Afgan dili öğrenenlere en az kullanılan okuma stratejilerini öğrenmeleri ve uygulamaları için rehberlik edecek eylem adımlarını atmalarını sağlamaktır. Bu araştırma, Afganistan'ın Sheberghan şehri Cevizcan Maarif kız okulundaki 49 kız öğrenci ile bir anket aracılığıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu araştırmanın bulgusu, öğrencilerin çoğunluğunun yukarıdan aşağıya okuma stratejilerine, yani açık öğrenme olan Aşağıdan yukarıya okuma stratejilerine daha fazla güvendikleri ve vasıfsız öğrencilerin yukarıdan aşağıya okuma stratejileri olan örtük öğrenmeyi kullanamadıkları belirtilmiştir bu nedenle, bu çalışma EFL sınıflarında geleneksel yöntemlerle İngilizce öğrenen öğrenciler için faydalıdır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** *İngilizce öğrenmek, okuduğunu anlama, okuma stratejisi kullanımı.*

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Introduction**

This chapter introduces the background of the study, statement of the problem and its significance alongside the research questions. The final section deals with the definitions of the key terms of the study.

## **1.2 Background of the Study**

Reading is a process of cognition that leads and brings mutual understanding along with the interpretation of a manuscript by asking questions that the learner codifies (Smith, 1982 as cited in Grabe, 1986). It is important to understand that different methods should be used to help students when they struggle with reading comprehension. A brain combination, visual, visual memory, auditory, and tactile interpretation training is necessary to help the learners in comprehending reading materials. It is especially significant in language teaching contexts, where traditional methods have failed to promote learners who are good at reading comprehension. While understanding and evaluating a text or paragraph many mental activities start processing. Therefore, reading comprehension is considered to be a process of cognition (Grabe and Stoller, 2002). According to Silberstein (1994), the person who reads is a dynamic one that tries to construct meaning using different comprehension approaches and styles. This argument implies that reading comprehension involves collecting and connecting information about a topic. For this reason, Chamot (2005, cited in Brown 2007) demonstrates the value of using strategies while reading. Alderson (1991) also points out the same thing. Consequently, understanding to learn the effective usage of strategies is crucial in the process of language learning.

Using strategies while learning a language is a significant approach that enhances learners' reading comprehension; it helps them to get a plan on learning reading and improve their competence of reading; meanwhile by using reading strategies students overcome their reading difficulties. The person who reads a lot writes better and has enough capacity of vocabulary to be able to speak fluently than the person who reads

little. Oxford and Crookall (1989) defined reading strategies as problem-solving skills, behaviors, learning techniques, or study skills that can lead learners to learn more efficiently and effectively. Also, it has been clarified by O'Malley & Chamot (1990) that reading strategies are methods, actions, techniques, or behaviors that are conscious or unconscious; readers apply these strategies to their comprehension and perception problems. Reading strategies have been classified by many scholars in many categories. Goodman (1970) divides strategies into two main categories. The first one is the bottom-up approach and the second one is the top-down. According to him, bottom-up strategies involve linguistic components such as letters, morphemes, syllables, words, phrases, grammatical cues, and discourse markers while top-down approach rely on an individual's knowledge in order to interpret a written material using a method of puzzle-solving, or through inferring significance in determining whether to absorb or not.

By reflecting on related literature, it becomes clear that different levels of cognitive processes are employed in the process of reading comprehension. These cognitive processes are illustrated in three primary reading models: top-down, bottom-up, and interactive methods. Basic goal of reading in the top-down method is to grasp the general connotation of the passage (Anderson, 1999; Carrell, 1984). That is, readers do not need to concentrate on all the textual signs, but they need to get the text's overall meaning. Top-down processing is about using contextual information in pattern recognition. This is because the meaning of the words around it offers a context to support comprehension. In bottom-up processing, the reader focuses at first on the smallest units of a language, letters, and sounds then moves from these to understand the text. The interactive approach assumes that there is a link between the top-down and the bottom-up approaches. It provides relations between the learners and the passage. Interactive reading involves connecting the textual details from the text to the background of the reader (Grabe, 1991). Hence, we assume English language teachers need to introduce and do some practice activities on reading strategies to improve learners' reading skills in a language classroom.

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions**

The aim of the present study was to explore the most and the least frequently used reading strategies by the learners. Therefore, the teachers would take action-steps to guide language learners to learn and to practice those least frequently used strategies in the process of reading comprehension. The following research questions framed the study:

- Which reading strategies are used most frequently by EFL learners?
- Which reading strategies are used least frequently by EFL learners?

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

Investigating this topic is extremely important to me, because I realized the key concepts of teaching English language using recent methods and approaches and learning how to read since I started my M.A study in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). It's also significant for me to carry out this study in my own country in Afghanistan where the teaching of English language in most educational areas takes place in traditional ways. That is, in most of the schools and academic centers, students learn reading in L2 through word-by-word translation, which in turn does not help the improvement of their reading skills and comprehension.

Moreover, investigations show that instructors of language usually are not able to understand what methodologies their learners can use except they do some kind of study (Oxford & Crookall, 1989). Therefore, the findings of this research are to center on both learning approaches, the approaches which learners state to use, and the ones they are capable of utilizing in their reading process.

Consequently, the study findings were believed to be beneficial for those students who are learning English through exposure to traditional methods in EFL classrooms. It would also be useful to English language teachers as it might raise their awareness of the issue when I publish my study.

## **1.5 Definitions of the Key Terms**

Reading strategy: It is “problem-oriented actions and techniques employed to carry out perception or conception of knowledge and goals for development of learning how to read and get comprehension” (Wenden, 1987, p. 157).

Bottom-up Reading: It is a “decoding and linguistic process in which learners build meaning from the smallest units of meaning to comprehend the text” (Goodman, 1970, p. 158).

Top-down Reading: It is a “procedure that allows the understanding of general meaning of the material through the use of previous knowledge and prediction” (Barnett, 1988, p. 12).

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the related theories of the topic. The first section presents information about the nature of comprehension. Then, an exploration of modals of reading and a discussion on reading strategy is provided. Finally, the findings of research on EFL learners' reading strategy use are presented.

### **2.2 Nature of Reading Comprehension**

Reading comprehension is a skill that individuals should gain for educational success, without having this skill students may face reading problems and struggle in many subject areas, and it is a significantly important skill in all areas of school subjects (Baier, 2005). Reading comprehension is a goal of education that all individuals would benefit from developing especially in elementary classes (Sweet & Snow, 2003). Reading comprehension offers the learners the basis for acquiring knowledge in secondary schools (Kirsch et al., 2002). If learners lack the skill of reading comprehension, they fail their academic studies (Alvermann & Earle, 2003).

There are four essential skills each individual needs to be proficient in, reading is one of them to become an educated person and it is especially a required skill for EFL/ESL learners. According to Hasibuan and Ansyari (2007), the process of reading is an active one that learners integrate incoming knowledge to their background knowledge. This is why it is claimed that there is an interaction between the one who reads and the material during the reading comprehension process. Tankersly (2003) assumes that the interaction between the readers and the author is the key comprehension. Furthermore, it is stated that individuals use their background and language knowledge, reading skills also, strategies to comprehend a written material (Brown, 1994). Hence skilled readers use their previous knowledge in addition to their experience to get the messages and make sense of the passage while reading a text. Therefore, a reader uses his knowledge, skills and strategies to

encode the messages of a text which includes words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs. Readers' knowledge, skill, and strategies involve four competence areas. These include linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence (Hasibuan & Ansyari, 2007).

Linguistic competence is a reader's knowledge of how words, phrases come together to produce a sentence while discourse competence is the readers knowledge of the organization of sentences in a paragraph or longer pieces of texts. Sociolinguistic competence is a reader's knowledge of various genres of texts and their format while strategic competence is the reader's knowledge of and his/her usage of bottom-up and top-down approaches (Hasibuan & Ansyari, 2007). According to this viewpoint, a learner can comprehend a text better when s/he uses his/her reading skills and applies reading strategies during the reading process.

Following this line of argument, it becomes clear that teachers' knowledge of the nature of reading comprehension is also important because this knowledge results in an improvement in the establishment of quality learning settings for the students (Tierney & Pearson, 1994). This means that reading comprehension is significant for both teachers and students, if learners have a good learning environment that only teachers can provide for their students, they can get the sense of reading material easily. Grabe and Stoller (2002) describe reading as an activity to unravel the meanings from written sources. More specifically, the person who reads is observed as an effective one that deals through the text for the purpose of building meaning (Silberstein, 1994).

### **2.3 Modals of Reading**

Numerous discussions and investigations have been done in related literature to identify the nature of reading comprehension. An analysis of literature demonstrates the fact that readers use two cognitive processes in the comprehension of reading materials (Grabe, 1991; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). These processes are named as top-down and bottom-up processes.

For Grabe (1991), top-down and bottom-up approaches are equally important in reading comprehension. This is why it is unnecessary to question whether one process is more important than the other. Instead, there should be an equal focus on

both of these processes but rather we need to understand how these two processes work to promote comprehension (Kintsch, 2005). Bottom-up approaches indicate that learners first are supposed to interpret the letters and vocabularies, then phrases and sentence structures (Carrell, 1984). The reading system therefore begins through the text's "lower-level procedures" and then proceeds with "higher-level procedures." However, it is assumed that this type of learning minimizes students' abilities in relation to the impact of background awareness on their comprehending style (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

According to Carrell (1984), "data-driven" patterns of reading begin through higher-level procedure (p. 333). That is, the main concept of the top-down model is that "reading is mainly guided through the objectives and aspirations of readers" (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 32). The two procedures are necessary because "bottom-up procedure assures and guarantees that the person who reads will be responsive to new and recent notification; top-down procedures facilitate the readers removing doubts and ambiguities" (Carrell, 1984, p. 333).

To conclude these assumptions, bottom-up strategy is a linguistic process within which students analyze a text focusing on the words, phrases and then sentences to understand the messages conveyed in it. Research has shown that involvement in this type of strategy only in the comprehension of reading materials does not help student learning as the information achieved through this process may go to the students' short-term memories. In top-down strategy students integrate the new information they receive from reading materials to their background conceptions and so comprehend texts better (Almutairi, 2018).

Oxford (1990) divided reading strategies into four major categories that are named as cognitive, meta-cognitive, social and affective strategies. For Oxford (1990), cognitive strategies are one form of learning techniques that help learners to learn effectively and successfully. These techniques involve repetition, arranging new words, summing up meaning, guessing meaning from context, and using memorization imagery. Meta-cognitive strategies focus on helping learners to 'think' about their 'learning.' These strategies encourage students to understand how to learn better and efficiently. They are developed by thinking about what was learned about the subject- relating the present subject to previous related topics; establishing a reason for reading- deciding mission goals to apply correct reading acts; paying



attention- immediately making a judgment about what to consider and what to disregard; self-assessing- focusing about what has been accomplished while reading a text or a paragraph. For Oxford (1990), social strategies encourage the learners to make use of other's help. Cooperating with others- partnering alongside one or more colleagues for improved results; calling for guidance or proof, asking a teacher or others to repeat, paraphrase, explain or provide examples when students are not sure about what to do when reading assignments or tasks are given by the teacher, etc. The last category, affective strategies, "are illustrated in using constructive calming, deep breathing, or behavior / calming therapy if necessary, sharing feelings with someone else-learning and communicating feelings about the activities of reading / reading language and tasks" (Oxford, 1990, pp. 11-12).

Grellet (1986) divided reading techniques into four categories. These techniques include "a) skimming: reading quickly to identify the idea of the passage; b) scanning: to read quickly as to know the important parts and knowledge; c) extensive reading: reading texts to get pleasure or general understanding of a text or a message and d) intensive reading: reading of short texts for better understanding or reading for details" (p. 4). Based on the above-mentioned arguments, one can conclude that reading is an active process that makes learners receive the language and subject-related information, and that there is an interaction between the reader and the passage.

## **2.4 Reading Strategies**

As mentioned by Cohen (1990), acquisition of strategy is a planned psychological process, which learners use during reading. In Oxford's (1990) description, reading strategies are observed like "detailed proceedings operated by the learners to make learning easier, faster, enjoyable, self-governing, and useful" (p. 8). Reading strategy is explained as a psychological function while readers focus on a phrase or a text, they immediately formulate what they study (Barnett, 1988). Since every person who reads perhaps needs to make content preparation, there isn't any particular system in studying procedures that all learners take advantage of from the reading process. Even though the wide range of studies on reading strategies has been done, there has not been any agreement in the literature on their meaning (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). It is claimed these arguments arise because of the complexity of reading

strategy in addition to other cognitive strategies such as thoughts and opinions, way of thinking, conceptual, studying, or inspirational tactics based on reading style.

The next argument is associated with the scope of studying approach the same as "global" or "specific" (p. 610), as this is not simple to differentiate these kinds of approaches while all of them are complex procedures of thinking that take place in different ways. The third issue includes the concept that reading strategies are unconsciously applied. There are two kinds of opinions related to this issue. The first perspective indicates that strategic activities are supposed to be thought over purposefully for the reason that the implementation of reading strategies requires consciousness (Cohen, 1998). Another issue in identifying the concept of reading strategy which is a complex procedure, and it is related to the discussion between effective and ineffective strategic applications. Some sources consider them to be identical words, while others define them separately (Paris et al., 1991; Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

#### **2.4.1 The classification and arrangement of strategies**

In different sources, there are various classified categories for reading strategies. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990, 1994) there are three types of strategies: social/affective, cognitive, meta-cognitive. Similarly, Anderson (1999) classifies strategy as cognitive, meta-cognitive and analysis of learner's own learning or thinking processes. Oxford (1990) divided reading strategies into two fundamental parts: direct and indirect. Indirect strategies include meta-cognitive, full of feelings and social procedures while, direct strategies involve memory, cognitive and comprehension strategy. Another classification is context-level (top-down) and word-level (bottom-up) strategies; global and limited functioning; and before reading, during and post reading strategies (Paris et al., 1991; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Anderson's (1999) major cognitive reading strategies are: anticipating or predicting, discovering the key concept, differentiating, generating thoughts, expressions, and summarizing.

Meta-cognitive strategies are the subsequent class of approaches that has been investigated by many scholars. Anderson (2006) defines meta-cognitive as the skill which makes things visible in mind during thinking which is a mental process. To impress their own cognitive strategy, readers use meta-cognitive strategies (Block,

1992; Chamot, 1987; Rubin, 1987). Carrell (1989) explains that there have been two fundamentals of meta-cognition (awareness or analysis of a person's own learning and thinking processes) "(1) information of mental process and conscious mental activities, and (2) arrangement of awareness and perception" (p. 122).

The previous information reflects the appreciation by readers of their own cognitive processes, which enables learners to develop consciousness in achievements in reading. In addition, when the students are conscious of their own weaknesses in learning, regulating cognitive procedures can be achieved through the self-assessment of their personal activities (Cohen, 1998). On the other hand, because of the following two basics, meta-cognition (the awareness and analysis of a person's learning and thinking procedure) makes afterward improvement in comparison to the next psychological procedures (Block, 1992).

Different sources refer to an additional classification of studying strategies, text-level and word-level approaches. Bottom-up strategies are linked with the expression functioning, such as understanding the word and references connotations. These strategies encourage text readers starting from the point of the words and working through on them. Top-down approaches are reading quickly, making revision and reading carefully (Barnett, 1988; Carrell, 1989; Wade, 1990).

It is also frequently stated that these strategies are categorized as pre-, while-and after-reading. In order to have a background knowledge of the text and promote the learning procedure, and pre-reading strategies. They also offer readers a chance to formulate hypotheses that will be verified subsequently (Carrell, 1984). With regard to the during-reading strategies, they assist learners to go ahead of text and use from their background knowledge (Paris et al., 1991). Finally, post-reading strategies, such as summing up and assessing the author and the text, allow learners to finish and monitor their own studying and learning procedures (Paris et al., 1991). According to the writer's viewpoint learning and acquisition needs flexible implementation of all of the abovementioned strategies. However, many research findings suggest that not all readers can effectively comprehend them but at different rates (Anderson, 1991; Block, 1992).

### **2.4.2 Productive and unproductive readers' strategy use**

It is mentioned in many studies that there are not any particular strategies good readers use for better comprehension. So, we cannot characterize strategies good or bad, it is all about readers' implementation to make them valuable (Anderson, 1991; Oxford, 2001). As the specialists Pastry and Brown (1984) made it clear that there hasn't been a particular list of strategies or approaches used through excellent readers for better understanding of the context. The "reading in what manner" is necessary for key reading procedure, rather than the concentration of how to use a strategy (as cited in Carrell, 1989, p. 122). This includes vital reading which demonstrates an encouraging effect on readers' reading exposure (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Oxford, 2001).

Anderson's (1991) research in which think-aloud procedure was employed as instrument. The investigation's results have revealed that knowledge of which strategy to use for strategic learning is not sufficient; learners must also be conscious in what manner to practice them. It was pointed out that learners who use more strategies are willing to have better performance in understanding. There are no particular strategies that contribute to the general understanding of reading. In reality, both excellent and poor readers can use the same strategies, but in different ways.

Although recent research has pointed out the use of strategies through both excellent as well as poor readers in different ways, a lot of experimental investigations have raised interest in the various specifications of the use of good and poor readers and learners' strategy (Block, 1992; Oxford). Hosenfeld (1977) contrasted the strategic behaviours of good and poor readers based on their verbal accounts. He noted that good readers tend to use background knowledge in comprehending texts while poor readers preferred word-by-word processing (as cited in Brantmeier, 2002). Similarly, Block (1992) used think-aloud protocols to compare the skilled and unskilled readers' strategy use. The findings showed that good readers prefer utilizing top-down approaches more frequently to understand the general messages of reading materials and less proficient readers preferred using bottom-up strategies such as translating the text into their native language. Similar results were recorded in another research by Oxford et al. (2004). It was noted that good readers at the high-profile level use top-down approaches such as anticipating, discovering, and thinking

the significance of a vocabulary of the book, while poor readers rely more often on bottom-up approaches.

Reflecting on the findings of research, it becomes clear that good readers attach importance on overall meaning reading, whereas poor readers are not able to link or have power to figure out the strategies they use (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 2001). Contrary to the view of the effective usage of top-down strategies by productive learners, it is asserted that top-down modal might arise the problems by readers in decoding texts (Wade, 1990). Because poor readers are unable to comprehend the text at word level owing to their scientific study of language issues, they can depend on top-down strategies such as predicting the meaning of an unknown vocabulary, recalling a previously acquired knowledge in addition to understanding the overall meaning. Because good learners are prepared to quickly understand the sentences in textbooks, they do not have to depend on top-down predictive strategies (Grabe, 1988).

In view of the entire arguments on the subject of effective reading strategies, Grabe and Stoller (2002) assumes that effective learners know their goals and they are experienced enough.

With regard to the results of all research concentrating on the behavioural habits of excellent readers, it appears that poor readers require guidance in learning to use strategies through explicit training highlighting the reciprocal environment of learning where both of the approaches are used.

## **2.5 Reading Strategy Instruction**

Research into the cognitive processes and strategic behaviour of good readers provide the basis for guidance in strategy. Studies in the first and second languages have shown that strategies can be learned and students during the learning process use them when they are being taught (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Janzen & Stoller, 1998). Improving students' reading comprehension results from exposure to explicit strategy training (Duke & Pearson, 2002; Vacca, 2002).

According to Uzunçakmak (2005), the short-term purpose of strategy instruction is making learners to comprehend what they read, and the main goal of reading strategy instruction is creating students as strategic readers, and self-aware of using strategies

during reading and understanding a text. Good readers employ strategies during comprehension, even though less successful learners also can be experienced who read through clear strategy guidance, and this is why it aimed to raise poor readers' awareness (Grant, 1994; McDonough, 1995). Nonetheless, good readers may benefit from strategic guidance as they possibly will face several dilemmas because of not having background knowledge of strategic activities or having complexities in employing strategies for solving their requirements (Rubin, 1987; Simpson, 1984). For making their own experience clear, they draw on what they already know (Rubin, 1987).

Therefore, strategic learning is not about what kind of strategies to use, it is about when, where and in what manner to apply them (Anderson, 1999; Oxford, 2001). Thus, strategy and method training encourage learners to be responsive to their reading procedures, and readers are able to better analyse, assess and implement them while reading. So, strategy learning creates highly motivated and autonomous learners for their personal reading success.

The recent investigation has also shown that strategy teaching has significant outcomes on the evaluation of L2/FLL students in addition to their strategy use (Alfassi, 2004; Salatacı & Akyel, 2002). Alfassi (2004) has suggested that learners who are exposed to comprehensive training are better at understanding what they read compared to those who are exposed to conventional learning of literacy. As a result of an experimental study, Aarnoutse and Schellings (2003) reported similar results and their findings revealed that guidance on strategy results in constructive effect on the process of learning.

The research of Auerbach and Paxton (1997), aimed to enhance the consciousness and analytical learning and thinking processes of knowledge among the students who learn; learners are encouraged to obtain responsibility for exploring their personal understanding progressions. The results of this research, using surveys, and think-aloud method, showed the positive impact of the knowledge-raising system on students' understanding of reading strategies and their own success in learning.

The focal point on meta-cognitive (awareness and analytical learning and thinking processes) perception, Salatacı and Akyel (2002) analysed the impact of meta-cognitive strategy learning, and the strategies employed in L1 and L2. The outcomes

of this study suggested that strategic practice had a useful achievement for the students who implement strategies during reading. The results of this research also indicated that students use less bottom-up strategies.

### **2.5.1 Methods of reading strategy instruction**

In recent approaches of strategy direction, these fundamental models of reading strategy instruction are emphasized as: “(a) clear explanation of strategies, (b) forming of strategies through instructors or learners, (c) Reciprocal teaching, (d) learners’ self-governing use of strategies” (Yetgin, 2003, p. 19). The most commonly listed and accepted strategies are in the literature: Reciprocal Teaching (RT), Transactional Strategy Instruction (TSI) and Questioning the Author (QA) (Yetgin, 2003). Reciprocal strategy is a teaching method that was researched by a Russian scholar named Vygotsky and then developed by Brown and Palincsar (Bimmel, 2001).

Reciprocal Teaching strategy is the procedure that relies on the teacher-learner relationship and the interaction between them during learning and teaching process. This instructional method includes the strategies of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. Initially, the instructor presents a model and then, with the guidance of the instructor, students do activity collaboratively in small groups. Then the students read the subject material in silence and after that one of the learners lead the group for making discussion by using the strategies. The teacher and the students change the role and employ the strategies again, at the same time the instructor gives his/her feedback (Bimmel, 2001; Brand- Gruwel et al., 1998). Another subsequent educational strategy is Transactional Strategy Instruction (TSI) which has some common points with the RT strategy, initially the implementation of both strategies are conducted with small groups of students, secondly teachers provide a model to use the strategies, and the last common point is, there is a discussion about the text. RT and TSI have different points either, which is the theoretical background. TSI instruction occurs directly whereas RT is a social oriented strategy (Corte et al., 2001). The third most important method is Questioning the Author (QA) in which students learn this reading strategy through asking and answering questions about the text. It is a strategy of reading for meaning that helps learners to use the learning process of reading well, and the discussion goes successfully. Teachers ask questions to the students to help their comprehension

of the text and identification of the author's messages (Sinatra et al., 2001; Vacca, 2002).

Consequently, from my own perspective the reading strategy instruction is significant for teachers to employ with their students which make learning easier, faster, and help to make life-long learners.

### **2.5.2 Factors affecting reading strategy instruction**

The main factors influencing strategic instruction effectiveness involve: (a) materials selection and its planning; (b) teacher being a role model; and (c) curriculum integration of instruction (Janzen and Stoller, 1998). For Janzen and Stoller (1998), the initial factor to be considered is the selection of content. It is the most important and primary goal, and it also encourages independent effectiveness as well as self-confidence. The content is supposed to be realistic, but it should be sufficiently difficult to encourage students to use appropriate strategies. While the second principle involves all preparation of the instruction on strategy training, the next rule is to establish the strategy training in accordance with the immediate need of the learners. Eventually, the strategies must be periodically updated to make certain that they are followed in the correct conditions by the learners. In addition, strategic selection is as important as product selection. Since some strategies promote each other's use, they could be viewed like a "cluster strategy" (Cohen, 1998, p. 91).

In contrast with these concepts, strategic learning should be taught through a course program session by session rather than independently, because students' use of strategies in reading can only progress only when they exposed to are subjected to frequent practices in teaching or training programs (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

Schueller (1999) proposed that top-down strategies should be emphasized if there is insufficient space for instruction in both top-down and bottom-up strategies. Her research involved bottom-up and top-down applications of German L2 readers are contrasted, and it pointed out that even though females outperform males in strategic usage, male succeeded in top-down strategies after learning. According to this observation, Schueller concluded that male and female students may benefit in a limited time from tactical training in top-down reading strategies (as cited in Brantmeier, 2002).



Another factor that affects strategy teaching is the role of the teacher. For McDonough (1995), teachers in the early stages of instruction must take the modal role, and then slowly pass the actual responsibility to the learners in order that they know how to agree on their personal goal. To state the matters differently, the final aim of the trainer in strategy training is to facilitate independent learners' recognition and their employment of effective strategies (Rubin, 1987).

Teachers must have knowledge of the strategic manners, they should be conscious of their students' behavior and attempt to guide them to develop the habit of using lists of strategy (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994).

### **2.5.3 Difficulties of strategy instruction (challenges and complexities of guidance tactic)**

For Rubin (1997), the main difficulty in strategy training might stem from the unwillingness of some learners who do not want to take the responsibility for their own learning (as cited in Cohen, 1998). Those learners' unwillingness to take the responsibility for their own learning might be because of their opposition to using the latest methods when reading, or their unwillingness to learn new strategies as they feel they are satisfied with the strategies that they can employ (Hosenfeld, 1984). The choice of strategies to highlight in strategy instruction is another issue. Because of the learners' individual differences, one approach may not be suitable for all students (McDonough, 1995). For different texts, students can also use different strategies depending on their changing goals (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). Finally, the current range of students' strategy can clash with the expectations of learners, which may contribute to a mismatch in teaching (Cohen, 1998).

Furthermore, the difficulties arising from different students, certain weaknesses can exist due to the inexperience of teachers in the implementation of strategy instruction. The essence of strategy teaching demands that teachers should not just be arranged and ready for teaching but prepare students with a framework during the implementation as well. Teachers need to test the use of methods with the students and adjust their strategies appropriately. Furthermore, teachers also must be prepared in advance to specialize in strategic training (Yetgin, 2003). In a long-term training program, strategy preparation should also be offered because it takes enough time and effort (Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

In summary, strategic instruction challenges arise from: (a) different students' needs and interests, (b) inexperienced and unskilled strategy training teachers, and (c) time limitations. Given these challenges, investigations prove that because of trained and planned programs, learners are able to learn in what manner to use reading strategies and succeed in using them.

## **2.6 Research Findings on EFL Learners' Reading Strategy Use**

Research conducted on the EFL learners' use of strategies in reading show almost the same consequences in that good readers use more reading strategies in comprehending written messages and poor learners use less reading strategies during the reading process. For example, Wung (2016) carried out a research with ten students from a high school, the aim of the research was to find out the differences among proficient and less proficient readers in addition to learning the strategies that they use when comprehending reading materials. At the end of the study it became clear that proficient readers use their previous conceptions of a topic, appropriate strategies and rich linguistic knowledge. Another research was done by Yukselir (2014) with 65 prep-class students. This study investigated pre-intermediate learners' reading strategy use. More specifically, the research aimed at finding out reading strategy types used by learners in addition to finding out whether gender and department difference among the participants are important factors when choosing the type of reading strategy. The results of this survey-based research revealed that proficient readers tend to employ the reading strategies frequently. The results also revealed that gender difference is not a determining factor in the reading strategy use. Anderson (1991) investigated 28 ESL college students' individual differences in reading strategy use. In this study, Anderson (1991) concluded that the main difference among those excellent readers and readers with not good comprehension could be attributed to the excellent readers' use of a variety of strategies in text analysis. By examining the differences between 12 readers among which half of them were proficient and the other half was less proficient, Yayli (2010) found out that no difference between the types of reading strategies among the participants. All of the participants were using both cognitive and metacognitive strategies, however the difference between those two groups was the frequency of using a strategy. Nam and Page (2014) investigated EFL Korean university students' usage of reading

strategy and their metacognitive consciousness. They specifically examined the relation between reading strategy use, self-perceived proficiency in language, and self-perceived proficiency in reading, moreover these scholars explored if there are gender and academic classification differences. Their findings showed that gender was not a significant factor in the use of strategy. They also found out that the learners most frequently used problem-solving strategy. Moreover, Nam and Page (2014) found that both the senior and the junior level students use reading strategies very frequently. Another research which was done by Zare and Othman (2013) attempted to examine the frequency of the usage of reading strategy among the ninety-five students from Malaysia. All in all, Zare and Othman (2013) study was an attempt to discover whether reading strategy use and reading comprehension are interrelated or not. According to the findings, Malaysian learners use reading strategies at a high rate and gender was found to be a significant factor in the employment of reading strategies. It also became clear that there exists a direct correlation between strategy use and comprehension. Zare (2013) investigated eighty Iranian EFL learners to explore reading strategy use and reading comprehension success. The findings of this study are in line with those of Zare and Othman (2013), apart from the relationship between gender and comprehension. Nam (2014) investigated high school students' strategy use in reading and their levels of proficiency in reading. In this study the researcher found out that the majority of participants use reading strategy moderately, and they opted for the problem-solving strategy most frequently. Also, the difference between reading strategy use and reading proficiency was not statistically significant. Madhumathi and Ghosh (2012) study was about the awareness of reading strategy use of Indian ESL students and the relationship with reading comprehension achievement. Madhumathi and Ghosh in their research examined 52 Indian ESL first year university students' awareness of reading strategy use. The instruments which Madhumathi and Ghosh use in their study were SORS and RCT which is a version of TOEFL reading comprehension. According to the finding of Madhumathi and Ghosh's research as mentioned that learners attempt to rely mostly on the problem-solving strategy and they least preferred to use global strategies, all in all the reading strategy use is mildly correlated with the Indian learners' comprehension achievement and there was a significant difference in the use of reading strategy among the genders. Thus, female students reported using more reading strategies than male students.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the methodology of current study. The chapter begins with the research design of the study and then it gives information about the participants and the data collection instrument. Finally, the procedures of data collection and analysis are presented.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The purpose of this study was to identify the most and least frequently used reading strategies by the participants of the study. The study was designed as a survey research. We employed quantitative research methods to collect as well as to analyze the data of the study. In quantitative research techniques, numerical data is clearly the basis for producing statistical results at the end of the study process (Creswell, 2003). Williams (2011) points out that quantitative research “employ strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys and collect data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data ” (p. 18). For this reason, it is important to mention that these approaches examine the phenomena and their interactions in a systematic way.

#### **3.3 Participants of the Study**

The study was carried out at Afghan-Turkish Maarif Okulları/ Fazilat Vahab Girls High School, Sheberghan city of Jawzjan, Afghanistan in the 2019 academic year. The learners who participated in this study were 49 female high school students. The participant’s age range was 14-16. The participants’ English language proficiency level was intermediate. The students’ native language was Persian and Uzbek. Table 3.1 below presents the age distribution of the participants.

**Table 3.1:** Age Distribution of The Participants.

Age	f	%
14	20	40.8
15	15	30.8
16	14	28.6
Total	49	100.0

f=frequency %= percentage

As it is shown in Table 3.1, the participants were young adults whose ages ranged from 14 to 16. More specifically, 20 of the participants (% 40.8) were 14 years old and 15 (% 30.8) of them were 15 years old. Sixteen of the participants (% 28.8) were 16 years old.

### **3.4 Data Collection Instrument**

The data of the study was collected through a reading strategy questionnaire which was originally developed by Oxford et al., (2004) and later adapted by Uzunçakmak (2005). The questionnaire is based on a 5-point Likert-type rating scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Almost always*). The reading strategy questionnaire involves a total of 45 items. Out of 45 items, 15 items are concerned with bottom-up reading strategies and 30 items top down strategies (Appendix A). The reading strategy questionnaire has three parts. The first part of the questionnaire involves 6 items (Items 1-6). This pertains to elicit the pre-reading strategies used by the learners. For this reason, Items 1-6 are related to the pre-reading strategies such as setting purposes, making predictions, building knowledge, asking questions, previewing the vocabularies, skimming and scanning. The second part of the questionnaire involves Items 7-43. The questionnaire items in this part pertains to finding out the while-reading strategies such as attending to the organization of reading texts and/or the different elements in a text, guessing, reading silently together with searching for answers to pre-reading questions and confirmation of predictions. The third part of the questionnaire involves items 44 and 45. The questionnaire items in this part pertains

to finding out the students' use of post-reading strategies such as evaluating, mapping, discussing, and returning to initial predictions.

### **3.5 Data Collection Procedures**

The first step in the process of data collection procedure was getting the letter of approval from Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey. Then to conduct my research, I requested permission from the administration of Afghan-Turkish Maarif Okulları/ FazilatVahab Girls High School of Sheberghan city Jawzjan, Afghanistan. After receiving the confirmation from the administration from the school administration, I conducted my research. Before distributing the questionnaire, the students were informed that their answers would be used only for research purposes. The completion of the questionnaire took roughly 30 minutes. The data collection process was stable and effective because the language level of the questionnaire items was consistent with the participants' level of English language proficiency.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the data gathered from the questionnaire through SPSS software version 22 (SPSS Inc. USA).

## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to identify the most and the least frequently used reading strategies by EFL learners. This chapter presents the findings of the current study in three sections: Findings from the pre-reading strategy use (Section 4.2), Findings from the while reading strategy use (Section 4.3) and Findings from post-reading strategy use (Section 4.4).

### 4.2 Findings from The Pre-Reading Strategy Use

The section reveals the findings about the participants' preferences for the use of the pre-reading strategies in reading comprehension. Table 4.1 shows the rank order of pre-reading strategy used by the participants in this study.

**Table 4.1:** The Rank Order of Pre-Reading Strategy Use

No	Items	N		R		S		O		Aa	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
5	I pay attention to visuals such as graphs, pictures, portables.	0	0	2	4,1	8	16,3	9	18,4	30	61,2
1	I use the title to predict the contents.	0	0	1	2	14	28,6	6	12,2	28	57,1
6	I use my prior Knowledge about the topic to predict the content.	2	4,1	1	2	8	16,3	14	28,6	24	49,0
2	I consider what type of text it is, such as a newspaper article, a scientific paper, or a novel.	1	2	2	4,1	10	20,4	16	32,7	20	40,8
4	I look through the text to spot specific information such as dates, names, or numbers.	1	2	6	12,2	7	14,3	15	30,6	20	40,8
3	I skim it first, and later I read for details.	1	2	5	10,2	12	24,5	12	24,5	19	38,8

N= never R= rarely S= sometimes O= often Aa= almost always f= frequency %= percentage

As can be seen in Table 4.1, the most frequently used pre-reading strategy is Strategy 5. Out of 49 learners, 30 learners at the rate of 61,2% stated that they *almost always* consider visuals that surround reading materials. While 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% stated they *often* use Strategy 5, 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% pointed out that they often use this strategy. Only 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% mentioned that they *rarely* use Strategy 5. None of the students opted for *never*.

The second most frequently used pre-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 1. Twenty-eight learners at a rate of 57,1% mentioned that they almost always read the title of a reading material to anticipate the messages conveyed in a text. While 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% use Strategy 1 often, 14 learners at the rate of 28,6% sometimes use this strategy. It became clear that only 1 learner at the rate of 2,0% rarely uses the title of a text to guess its content.

The third most frequently used pre-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 6. The findings showed that 24 learners at the rate of 49,0% *almost always* capitalize background knowledge to guess the subject matter before they start reading a text. Meanwhile, 14 learners at the rate of 28,6% stated that they *often* use the strategy. Eight students at the rate of 16,3% *sometimes* use Strategy 6. When only one learner at the rate of 2,0% *rarely* uses the item and 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the same item before reading a text.

Strategy 2 was found to be the fourth most frequently used pre-reading strategy. Twenty learners at the rate of 40,8% stated that they *almost always* think about the genre of the material before reading a text or a paragraph while learners at the rate of 32,7% mentioned that they *often* use it. Ten of the learners at the rate of 20,4% mentioned that they *sometimes* use this strategy. When 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *rarely* use item 2 and, only 1 learner at the rate of 2,0% pointed out s/he *never* uses Strategy 2 before reading a text.

The fifth most frequently used pre-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 4. The findings for the use of Strategy 4 are very similar to those given to Strategy 2. That is, 20 learners at the rate of 40,8% stated that they *almost always* scan the material to find out particular facts like numbers and names. Fifteen learners at the rate of 30,6% pointed out they *often* use this strategy before reading a text while 7 learners at the rate of 14,3% stated they *sometimes* Strategy 4. 6 learners at the rate of 12,2%



pointed out that they *rarely* use the strategy whereas only 1 learner at the rate of 2,0% mentioned that she *never* uses the strategy before reading a text or paragraph.

The responses given for Strategy 3 showed that 19 learners at the rate of 38,8% *almost always* go through the text to get an overall understanding before reading it in detail. We found out that 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% *often* use the item before reading a text. Again, with the same percentage, 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% *sometimes* use Strategy 3. Five learners at the rate of 10,2% *rarely* use the same strategy before reading a text, while only one learner at the rate of 2,0% *never* uses Strategy 3.

All in all, the responses given to the pre reading strategy use indicate that the most frequently used top five strategies by the participants of the study in respective order are: *paying attention to the visuals that surrounds the reading material (Item 5); using the title in order anticipate the content of the reading material (Item 1); using background conceptions about the subject-matter knowledge about the topic to anticipate the theme (Item 6); considering the genre of the text (Item 2) and scanning the reading texts to find specific information (Item 4)*. This could be one part of the answer for the first question of current study. It is important to mention that the least frequently used strategy in pre reading by the learners is: *skimming first later reading for details (Item 3)*, even though the usage of percentage of this strategy is not very low but it is highlighted as the least frequently used strategy in pre- reading section.

### **4.3 Findings from The While Reading Strategy Use**

The section reveals the findings about the participants' preferences for the employment of the while-reading strategies in reading comprehension. Table 4.2 informs the rank order of while-reading strategy used by the participants of the study.

**Table 4.2:** The Rank Order of While Reading Strategy Use

No	Items	N		R		S		O		Aa	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
12	I start reading from the first paragraph and read all the way through the last paragraph.	5	10,2	1	2	3	6,1	8	16,3	32	65,3
8	I pay attention to the beginning and the end of each paragraph.	4	8,2	5	10,2	6	12,2	4	8,2	30	61,2
27	I make a picture in my mind about what the text is saying.	0	0	3	6,1	4	8,2	12	24,5	30	61,2
10	I try to understand the meaning of every word in a text.	0	0	0	0	6	12,2	15	30,6	28	57,1
23	I underline important parts.	0	0	1	2	12	24,5	9	18,4	27	55,1
29	I try to connect information within the text.	1	2	3	6,1	7	14,3	13	26,5	25	51
28	I try to understand the meaning without translating the text into my native language.	3	6,1	4	8,2	11	22,4	7	14,3	24	49
13	I pay attention to sentence structure, such as objects and subjects.	4	8,2	4	8,2	8	16,3	11	22,4	22	44,9
9	I focus on the tense of a verb, such as present tense and past tense.	0	0	10	20,4	7	14,3	11	22,4	21	42,9
18	I link the content with what I already know.	2	4,1	4	8,2	11	22,4	11	22,4	21	42,9
19	I try to understand the meaning of an unknown word by dividing it into parts.	3	6,1	5	10,2	12	24,5	8	16,3	21	42,9
24	I mark important parts, using colored pens or drawing stars.	0	0	10	20,4	9	18,4	9	18,4	21	42,9
7	I pay attention to parts of sentences such as phrases and clauses.	2	4,1	5	10,2	13	26,5	9	18,4	20	40,8
11	I translate each sentence into my native language.	2	4,1	10	20,4	12	24,5	6	12,2	19	38,8
20	If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using clues from the text.	2	4,1	6	12,2	15	30,6	7	14,3	19	38,8
21	If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using information I know about the topic.	3	6,1	7	14,3	8	16,3	12	24,5	19	38,8
40	I try to figure out the main idea of each paragraph.	0	0	3	6,1	10	20,4	17	34,7	19	38,8
15	I change reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text.	2	4,1	5	10,2	13	26,5	11	22,4	18	36,7
32	I follow the line I am reading with my finger or my pen.	8	16,3	10	20,4	9	18,4	4	8,2	18	36,7

N= never R= rarely S= sometimes O= often Aa= almost always f=frequency %= percentage

**Table 4.2 (cont.):** The Rank Order of While Reading Strategy Use

No	Items	N		R		S		O		Aa	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
43	I read the comprehension questions first and then read the text.	5	10,2	8	16,3	15	30,6	3	6,1	18	36,7
30	I try to connect information within the text.	3	6,1	2	4,1	15	30,6	12	24,5	17	34,7
38	I write down keywords.	5	10,2	10	20,4	6	12,2	11	22,4	17	34,7
25	I go over difficult parts several times.	3	6,1	10	20,4	15	30,6	5	10,2	16	32,6
42	I pay attention to indirectly stated ideas and try to make inferences about them.	0	0	6	12,2	17	34,7	10	20,4	16	32,7
26	I read aloud the entire text.	9	18,4	11	22,4	6	12,2	8	16,3	15	30,6
31	I ask questions related to the text or what I have read.	1	2	7	14,3	13	26,5	13	26,5	15	30,6
14	I continue reading even if I have difficulty.	4	8,2	4	8,2	10	20,4	17	34,7	14	28,6
33	I use slashes to divide a sentence	0	0	10	20,4	9	18,4	17	34,7	13	26,5
36	I try to confirm or disconfirm the predictions, guesses, or inferences I have made.	1	2	7	14,3	14	28,6	14	28,6	13	26,5
34	When I cannot understand a sentence even if I know every word, I skip that sentence.	8	16,3	8	16,3	11	22,4	10	20,4	12	24,5
39	I try to distinguish between factual sentences and the writer's subjective opinions in the text.	2	4,1	6	12,2	12	24,5	17	34,7	12	24,5
41	I try to distinguish between the main idea and the supporting details in the text.	3	6,1	4	8,2	15	30,6	15	30,6	12	24,5
16	I read aloud the difficult parts of the text.	15	30,6	2	4,1	10	20,4	11	22,4	11	22,4
22	I check what each pronoun refers to grammatically.	4	8,2	3	6,1	15	30,6	16	32,7	11	22,4
35	I predict what will come next.	3	6,1	6	12,2	14	28,6	15	30,6	11	22,4
37	I pay attention to linking words such as "however" and "besides" so that I can understand the structure.	5	10,2	9	18,4	11	22,4	13	26,5	11	22,4
17	I skip unknown words.	15	30,6	8	16,3	8	16,3	8	16,3	10	20,4

N= never R= rarely S= sometimes O= often Aa= almost always f=frequency %= percentage

The responses for Item 12 showed that 32 learners at the rate of 65,3% *almost always* read a text from the beginning until the end. Whereas 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% mentioned that they *often* use Strategy 12. We found out that 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text and only one learner at the rate

of 2,0% *rarely* use the item. In addition, 5 learners at the rate of 10,2% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

The second most frequently used while-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 8. Thirty learners at a rate of 61,2% mentioned that they almost always consider the first and the last paragraph of a text. While only 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% use Strategy 8 *often*, 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% *sometimes* use this strategy. It became clear that 4 learners at the rate of 8,2 % *rarely use* Item 8.

The third most frequently used while-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 27. Out of 49 learners, 30 of them at the rate of 61,2% stated that they *almost always* visualize the messages conveyed in the text. While 12 learners at the rate of 24,5 % stated they *often* use Strategy 27, 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% pointed out that they often use this strategy. Only 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% mentioned that they *rarely* use Strategy 5, none of the students opted for *never*.

The responses given for item 10 showed that 28 learners at the rate of 57,1% *almost always* do their best to conceive the meaning of each single vocabulary item in a reading material which is the fourth most frequently used item by the learners. While 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% *often* use Strategy 10, 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. None of the learners opted for *rarely* and *never*.

The fifth most frequently used while-reading strategy was found to be Strategy 23. For item 23, 27 learners at the rate of 55,1% stated they *almost always* highlight the significant sections of a text while reading. Nine learners at the rate of 18,4% pointed out that they *often* use strategy 23, while 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% mentioned they *sometimes* use this strategy. Only one learner at the rate of 2,0% stated that she *rarely* uses item 23. None of them opted for *never*.

The responses for item 29, showed that 25 learners at the rate of 51,0% *almost always* reread the former sections whenever they experience a problem in reading a text whereas 13 learners at the rate of 26,5% *often* employ this approach. Seven participants (14,3%) pointed out they *sometimes* capitalize on the strategy while 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% mentioned they *rarely* use the item. Only one learner at the rate of 2,0% pointed out that she *never* uses the strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

The responses given to Item 28, showed that 24 learners at the rate of 49, 0% *almost always* avoid translation yet attempt to comprehend the stated ideas in a text when reading. While seven learners at the rate of 14,3% *often* use Strategy 28, 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. Four learners at the rate of 8,2% *rarely* use Item 28 and three of them at the rate of 6,2% *never* use the strategy while reading a text.

For Item 13, twenty-two learners stated that they *almost always* consider the syntax to comprehend a text at the rate of 44,9%. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% *often* use this strategy, while eight learners *sometimes* use the strategy at the rate of 16,3%. Four learners at the rate of 8,2% *rarely* use Item 13 while reading a text. Again 4 participants at the rate of 8,2% *never* use the same approach when involved in reading.

Responses for Item 9, showed 21 learners *almost always* pay attention to the use of tense at the rate of 42,9%. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% *often* use the strategy 9. While seven learners at the rate of 14,3% *sometimes* use Item 9, 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% *rarely* use the strategy during text reading. And none of the participants opted for *never*.

For Item 18, twenty-one learners at the rate of 42,9% stated that they *almost always* relate what they know about the topic to the message of the material while 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% pointed out they *often* use the strategy when reading a text. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% mentioned that they *sometimes* use Strategy 18 while 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% opted for *rarely*. Two learners at the rate of 4,1% stated they *never* use Strategy 18 while reading a text or a paragraph.

The responses given to Item 19 revealed that 21 learners at the rate of 42,9% *almost always* attempt to predict the meaning of a vocabulary item through analyzing its parts while reading a text, but 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *often* use it. Twelve learners at the rate of 22,4% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. It also became clear that five learners at the rate of 10,2% *rarely* use Item 19 and only 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% *never* use the strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

The responses given to Item 24 showed that 21 learners at the rate of 42,9% *almost always* label the significant sections using certain highlighters while 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% *often* use the strategy, 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% *sometimes* use it

and 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% stated they *rarely* use this strategy, none of them opted for *never*.

The findings from the responses given to Item 7 showed that 20 learners at the rate of 40,8% *almost always* consider parts of a syntax while reading a text, whereas 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% *often* use the Strategy 7. Thirteen learners at the rate of 26,5% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. Five learners at the rate of 10,2% *rarely* use the item 7, and 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the item when reading a material or a paragraph.

For Item 11, 19 learners at the rate of 38,8% stated that they *almost always* translate every sentence into their mother tongue. While 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% *often* use the same strategy when reading a text, 12 of them at the rate of 24,5% *sometimes* use the strategy. It is also observed that 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% *rarely* use it while only 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the strategy while reading a text.

The findings from the responses given to Item 20 revealed that 19 learners at a rate of 38,8% *almost always* use contextual clues to arrive at a meaning of a vocabulary item while reading a text. Seven learners at the rate of 14,3% *often* use it, while 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% *sometimes* use the strategy. Six learners at the rate of 12,2% *rarely* use Item 20. And 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the strategy while reading a text.

The responses given to Item 21 showed that 19 learners at the rate of 38,8% *almost always* predict the meaning of a vocabulary item using what they already know about the subject matter, whereas 12 learners at the rate of 18,4% *often* use it. Findings also found out that 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *sometimes* use the strategy while 7 learners at the rate of 14,3% *rarely* use it. Furthermore, 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

To Item 40, nineteen learners at the rate of 38,8% stated that they *almost always* attempt to predict the main idea of paragraphs while 17 learners at the rate of 34,7% mentioned that they *often* use it while reading a text. Additionally, 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% pointed out that they *sometimes* use Item 40 while 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% stated they *rarely* use it. None of the participants opted for *never*.

The findings from the responses given to Item 15 revealed that 18 students at the rate of 36,7% *almost always* modify their speed in accordance with the difficulty level of

a material while reading, eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% *often* use this item. Thirteen learners at the rate of 26,5% *sometimes* use the strategy while 5 students at the rate of 10,2% *rarely* use the item. 2 learners at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the same item while reading a text or a paragraph.

The results for Item 32 showed almost the same percentages as those with the responses given to Item 15. That is, 36,7% of the participants (18 learners) stated that they *almost always* trace the sentences with a pen or a finger while reading a text while 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% declared that they *often* use it. It became clear that 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% *sometimes* use Item 32. Ten learners at the rate of 20,4% *rarely* use the same strategy, and 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

The findings from the responses given to Item 43 showed that 18 learners at the rate of 36,7% *almost always* go through the questions before reading the material, whereas 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% *often* use the strategy 43. Fifteen learners at the rate of 30,6% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. While 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *rarely* use the item, 5 learners at the rate of 10,2% *never* use it.

As for the responses given to Item 30, we found out that 17 learners at the rate of 34,7% *almost always* attempt to relate the subject-matter in the text while 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% *often* use it. Additionally, it became clear that 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% *sometimes* use the strategy while 2 students at the rate of 4,1% *rarely* use the item. In addition, 3 of the participants at the rate of 6,1% *never* use this strategy while reading a text.

The responses given to Item 38 showed that 17 learners at the rate of 34,7% *almost always* note the important vocabulary while reading a text. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% *often* use the strategy while 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. Ten learners at the rate of 20,4% *rarely* use Item 38 and 5 learners at the rate of 10,2% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

To Item 25, 16 learners (32,6%) pointed out that they *almost always* review the problematic sections multiple times while 5 learners at the rate of 10,2% *often* use this item. Fifteen learners at the rate of 30,6% *sometimes* use Item 25 while reading

a text but 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% *rarely* use the item. And 3 of them at the rate of 6,2% *never* use the strategy while reading a text.

To Item 42, 16 learners at the rate of 32,7% stated that they *almost always* attend to the implicitly stated messages so as to understand the topic and 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% pointed out that they *often* use this strategy. While 17 learners at the rate of 34,7% *sometimes* use the same strategy, six learners at the rate of 12,2% *rarely* use item 42, whereas none of the participants opted to *never*.

The finding of responses for Item 26 showed that 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% *almost always* read out a reading text loud. Whereas 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *often* use Strategy 26. While six learners at the rate of 12,2% *sometimes* use the strategy, 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% *rarely* use the item. And 9 learners at the rate of 18,4% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

To Item 31, 30,6% of the participants (15 learners) mentioned that they *almost always* question the reading material. Thirteen learners at the rate of 26,5% stated that they *often* use it, again the same percentage of the participants (26,5%) pointed out that they *sometimes* use the same strategy. Seven learners stated that they *rarely* use item 31 at the rate of 14,3%, only one learner at the rate of 2,0% mentioned she *never* uses the strategy while reading a text.

The finding of responses for Item 14 showed that 14 learners at the rate of 28,6% *almost always* carry on reading even if they experience trouble in comprehension while reading a text. Seventeen learners at the rate of 34,7% stated that they *often* use Strategy 14. Ten learners at the rate of 20,4% *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text whereas 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% mentioned that they *rarely* use item 14. Again 4 learners at the rate of 8,2% *never* use the Strategy 14 while reading a text or a paragraph.

To Item 33, 26.5% of the participants (13 learners) stated that they *almost always* utilize marks to divide a sentence while reading. Seventeen learners at the rate of 34,7% mentioned that they *often* use Strategy 33. 18,4% of participants (9 learners) pointed out that they *sometimes* use the same Strategy. Ten learners *rarely* use Strategy 33, at the rate of 20,4%. While none of learners at the rate of 0,0% *never* use the strategy while reading a text.



The finding of responses for Item 36 showed that 13 learners at the rate of 26,5% *almost always* affirm their predictions while reading. While 14 learners at the rate of 28,6% mentioned that they *often* use the strategy, again 14 learners at the rate of 28,6% pointed out that they *sometimes* use it while reading, seven learners at the rate of 14,3% *rarely* use Strategy 36 whereas only 1 learner at the rate of 2,0% stated that she *never* uses the same strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

As for given responses of Item 34, 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% stated that they *almost always* leave out the section when they do not understand it. While ten learners at the rate of 20,4% stated that they *often* use the Item 34. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% mentioned that they *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. Additionally, eight learners at the rate of 16,3% opted for *rarely*, while they use Strategy 34. Again 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% *never* use the same strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

To Item 39, 12 learners at the rate of 24,5% pointed out that they *almost always* attempt to differentiate facts from the author's thoughts in the reading material. Seventeen learners at the rate of 34,7% opted for *often* while they use Strategy 39. It is clear that Twelve learners at the rate of 24,5% rely on *sometimes* while they use Strategy 39 while reading a text. As it's shown in findings that 6 learners at the rate of 12,2% *rarely* use Strategy 39. And 2 of them at the rate of 4,1% opted for *never* when they use Strategy 39 while reading a text.

The analysis of the answers for Item 41 indicated that the 12 students (24,5%) *almost always* do their best to find out the main idea and the supporting examples and/or explanations, while 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% stated that they *often* use Strategy 41. Again, the same percentage 30,6% from the (15 learners) sometimes use the strategy while reading a text. Therefore, four learners at the rate of 8,2% *rarely* use it and only 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% mentioned that they *never* use Strategy 41.

To Item 16, 22,4% of participants (11 learners) stated that they *almost always* read out the troublesome sections of a material while reading. Again 11 learners at the rate of 24,5% *often* use it, 20,4% from 10 learners *sometimes* use the same strategy. Two learners *rarely* use Strategy 33, at the rate of 4,1% while 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% opted to *never* during reading a text.

The findings from the responses given to Item 22 showed that 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% *almost always* pay attention to what the pronouns used in a sentence indicate. While 16 learners at the rate of 32,7% clearly stated that they *often* use the strategy, 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% pointed out that they *sometimes* use it while reading, therefore Three learners at the rate of 6,1% stated that they *rarely* use Strategy 22, whereas 4 learners at the rate of 8.2% *never* use the same strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

The responses given for Item 35 showed that 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% *almost always* anticipate the possible focus of the rest of the material. At the same time 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% pointed out that they *often* use the Strategy 35. So, it has been clarified that Fourteen learners at the rate of 28,6% opted for *sometimes* when they use strategy while reading a text. Six learners at the rate of 12,2% *rarely* use Strategy 35. Finally, 3 learners at the rate of 6,1% *never* use the item while reading a text or a paragraph.

As for the responses given to Item 37, we found out that 11 learners at the rate of 22,4% *almost always* consider the conjunctions as they believe those help them understand the messages conveyed in reading texts. Thirteen learners at the rate of 26,5% stated that they *often* use Strategy 37. Eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% clearly mentioned that they *sometimes* use the strategy while reading a text. Nine learners at the rate of 18,4% *rarely* use Strategy 37. Therefore 5 learners at the rate of 10,2% *never* use the strategy while reading a text or a paragraph.

Item 17 is the least frequently used strategy by learners while reading a text or a paragraph. The findings showed that 10 learners at the rate of 20,4% almost always leave out unfamiliar vocabulary items. It became clear that eight learners at the rate of 16,3% rely on it often when they use the strategy. Again 8 learners at the rate of 16,3% pointed out that they sometimes and rarely use the same strategy, whereas 15 learners at the rate of 30,6% opted never for item 17.

Drawing on the findings, we understand that more than half of the participants (65.3%) use Item 12 *Start reading from the first paragraph and read all the way through to the last*, which makes this strategy the most frequently used while reading strategy. It is also the most frequently cited strategy among the pre- and post- reading strategies by the participants of the study. The second most frequently used strategy

by the participants during reading comprehension is *paying attention to the beginning and end of each paragraph (Item 8)*. This is followed by Item 27, *making pictures in my mind about what the text is saying*. The fourth most frequently used while-reading strategy by the learners during reading comprehension is *trying to understand the meaning of every word in a text (Item 10)*. The fifth most frequently used reading comprehension strategy by the students at while-reading stage is *underlining important parts (Item 23)*.

As for the five least frequently employed five while-reading strategies by learners in respective order are: *I skip unknown words (Item 17)*; *I pay attention to linking words such as “however” and “besides” so that I can understand the structure (Item 37)*; *I predict what will come next (Item 35)*; *I check what each pronoun refers to grammatically (Item 22)* and *I read aloud difficult parts of the text (Item 16)*. Reflecting on the least frequently employed while-reading strategies as indicated by the participants of the study, we may conclude that the students rarely use bottom-up strategies. It is important to mention that the percentage for the usage of *I skip unknown words (Item 17)* received the lowest rate (20.4%) which means that students rarely use this strategy and they always want to be aware of every word that they read in a text. It is also significant to clarify that the third least frequently used strategy “*I predict what will come next*” (Item 35) is about prediction and it is one of top-down strategies that might mean the students are not aware of this strategy, maybe they are not interested in this strategy or they have not been taught through this strategy. This assumption can be the answer for the second question of current study.

#### **4.4 Findings from Post-Reading Strategy Use**

The finding of this section presents participants’ responses for items 44 and 45. This section reveals after reading strategies used by the learners which includes the evaluating, mapping, discussing, returning to initial predictions, answering pre-reading questions, and following up with a written assignment. As can be seen Table 4.3 below:

**Table 4.3:** The Rank Order of Post-Reading Strategy Use

No	Items	N		R		S		O		Aa	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
44	I summarize it in my own words.	0	0	2	4,1	8	16,3	11	22,4	28	57,1
45	After reading the text in detail, I evaluate the text and the writer's viewpoint.	2	4,1	7	14,3	10	20,4	12	24,5	18	36,7

N= never R= rarely S= sometimes O= often Aa= almost always F= frequency %= percentage

Table 4.3 reveals that the most frequently used item by learners for post-reading is the Strategy 44. Findings showed that 28 learners at the rate of 57,1% *almost always* summarize the reading materials using their own words. Strategy 44 is the most frequently used strategy after reading a text by learners. Therefore, eleven learners at the rate of 22,4% stated that they *often* use the strategy. Eight learners at the rate of 16,3% mentioned that they *sometimes* use Strategy 44. Two of the participants at the rate of 4,1% *rarely* use it while none of them opted for *never*.

Item 45 was found to be the least frequently used strategy by the learners. The responses showed that 18 learners at the rate of 36,7% *almost always* assess the reading material and the author's opinion once they finish the task of reading. Twelve learners at the rate of 24,5% pointed out that they *often* use the Strategy 45. Ten students at the rate of 20,4% rely on, *sometimes* when they use the Strategy 45 after reading a text. Additionally, 7 learners at the rate of 14,3% stated that they *rarely* use Strategy 45, whereas two of participants at the rate of 4,1% *never* use the strategy from post-reading strategies.

To conclude, the responses given to the post-reading strategy use reveals that more than half of students (%57.1) *summarize the reading texts using their own words* while only less than half of the participants evaluate the messages conveyed in the reading materials and consider the author's point of view.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter first brings forward the summary of the current research then it provides the conclusions of the study. Finally, the limitations of the study are stated.

### **5.2 Summary of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate Afghan EFL learners' reading strategy usage. That is, the purpose was to determine the most and the least frequently used reading strategies by the participants of the study. The participants of this study were 49 learners. The learners' English language proficiency level was intermediate, and their native languages were Persian and Uzbek. The main instrument for data collection was a questionnaire that was originally developed by Oxford et al., (2004) and then assorted by Uzunçakmak (2005). The data were gathered through Uzunçakmak's (2005) adapted version of the questionnaire. The data was analyzed through SPSS software version 22. The research questions mentioned below were examined to reach the aim of the study:

- Which reading strategies are used most frequently by EFL learners?
- Which reading strategies are used least frequently by EFL learners?

### **5.3 Conclusions**

The first research question of the study aimed at finding the types of reading strategies that the students utilize the most in comprehending reading materials. The findings of the present study demonstrated that the most frequently used pre-reading strategies by the majority of the participants in respective order are *Paying attention to visuals*, *Using the title and Prior knowledge for prediction* and *Underlining important parts*. The frequent use of these pre-reading strategies reveals that the students in this study are conscious of the contribution of these strategies to their reading comprehension. It may also be argued that their English language teachers

should consider to train their students the pre-reading strategies to promote effective readers and this might be the reason why they have laid the grounds for their students to use these strategies in reading comprehension. As for the conclusions in relation to the while-reading strategy use, we found out that at this stage most of the students use top-down reading strategies the most. That is, out of five most frequently used while-reading strategies four of them are considered as top-down, while only one of the most frequently used while-reading strategies is categorized as bottom-up strategy. This conclusion is in line with that of Salatacı and Akyel (2002) who conducted a research on students' use of reading strategies. More specifically, the most frequently used strategy among the participants of the study is *I start reading from the first paragraph reading all the way through the last paragraph*. In fact, this is the most frequently cited strategy in use among all the strategies listed in the questionnaire. This finding indicates that the majority of the learners tend to read the whole reading passage to get an overall impression of the messages conveyed in a text. We also concluded that most of the students consider reading the first and the last sentences of the paragraph. The use of this strategy reveals that most of the students know where in a text they can find the topic sentence of a paragraph. The third most frequently used strategy among the participants of the study is *making the picture in their mind about the text*, while the fourth most frequently used strategy is *trying to understand the meaning of every word in a text*. The fifth most frequently used reading strategy by learners is *Underlining important parts*. All in all, we may conclude that most of the participants in this study use the top-down strategies more than the bottom-up ones in comprehending the written materials. On analyzing the responses given to the post-reading strategy use, we observed that more than half of students *summarize the reading texts using their own words* while only less than half of the students evaluate the messages conveyed in the reading materials and consider the author's point of view. Based on this finding, we may conclude that the participants' English language teachers spare time on summary writing while they don't focus on the evaluation of the messages conveyed in reading texts.

The second research question of the study aimed at finding the least frequently used strategies in the reading comprehension process. The findings of the present study revealed that the least frequently used pre-reading strategy by some of the students in respective order is: *first skimming and later reading for details*. Even though the

usage of the percentage is not very low. According to this finding it seems that students sometimes use this Top-down pre-reading strategy, and they may not be aware of this strategy at all or they have not been taught through this strategy by their English language teachers.

As for the conclusions in relation to the while-reading strategy use, the findings showed that the least frequently used strategy by learners in respective order are *Skipping the unknown words*, *Paying attention to linking words*, *Predicting for the next parts of text*, *Checking what each pronoun refers to grammatically* and *Reading aloud the difficult parts of text*. Drawing on these findings, we may conclude that the students need explicit training on how to use the least frequently used while-reading strategies. For example, modeling ways of guessing the meanings of unknown vocabulary items using contextual clues and sparing a certain amount of time for its practice in the classroom would have a positive impact on the students' motivation for reading. Similarly, the students' attention should be drawn on the importance of linking words and the pronouns to highlight their contribution to the coherence of reading materials. These types of awareness raising activities, we believe, would contribute to the students reading efficacy. The findings on the least used strategy during post-reading showed that most of the students do not evaluate the text and the writer's viewpoint. This might mean the teachers neglect the use of this strategy in reading instruction.

The finding of the present study is in line with research of Kantarci (2006) and Wung (2016). The study conducted by Wung (2016) investigated the differences between more successful and less successful EFL learners in their comprehension performance and the reading strategy that they use in comprehending English texts. Yuksiler (2014) investigated the pre-intermediate learners reading strategy use. Anderson's (1991) research was about individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing similar to Yayli (2010). Nam and Page (2014) examined metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use of EFL Korean university students. Another research which was done by Zare and Othman (2013). The researchers attempted to uncover the rate of reversion of reading strategy use among ninety-five Malaysian learners. Zare (2013) investigated eighty Iranian EFL students to explore their use of strategy and reading comprehension success. Madhumathi and Ghosh (2012) study was on finding out Indian ESL students'

employment of strategies in reading and whether their habit is related to their levels of proficiency in reading comprehension. Nam (2014) investigated the ELL high school students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use and reading proficiency. In all of the above studies, it is highlighted that learning reading strategy is an important approach that students should be aware of to enhance reading comprehension and they need to take straightforward steps to utilize these effective strategies to promote their reading skills and to be able to get enough input and produce output easily while learning the target language.

#### **5.4 Limitations of the Study**

This case study involved some limitations. First, only 49 Afghan EFL female learners participated in this study. Second, the researcher selected only one school in one city in Afghanistan to collect the data of the study. Third, in order to collect the relevant data, only one type of instrument was utilized that is a questionnaire. Fourth, this study aimed to investigate the most and the least frequent reading strategies which were used by EFL learners. Fifth, the participants were merely female learners.

#### **5.5 Further Recommendations**

The result of this study showed positive consequences in which learners use more top-down reading strategies. I claim that Afghan students are clever enough and somehow unconsciously use these strategies whereas the teaching takes place in a traditional way in most academic areas. So, I suggest the next researchers in Afghanistan or could be in other countries there is a need for the students' consciousness and unconsciousness of reading strategy use that they can have an investigation about.

Therefore, this case study paves the way for other researchers to conduct more research in the related discipline, for instance, the number of participants can be increased, and the researcher can utilize more than one school from different cities in Afghanistan to conduct proper case studies. Also, more data collections can be utilized to gather relevant information including observations, interviews along with questionnaires. Similarly, the participants can be mixed of male and female English



learners to examine if both genders give similar results or there is a significant difference among them. Other research can be conducted to investigate more preferable strategies utilized by EFL like writing strategies, speaking strategies and vocabulary learning strategies.

### **5.6 Pedagogical Implications**

The current study lay the foundations to all foreign language teachers to utilize suitable reading strategies according to the students' demands and needs. Also, teachers can encourage their students to be more achiever in academic fields and in learning foreign languages. Moreover, curriculum can be more interesting when the curriculum developer focuses more on using challengeable activities where students can apply different strategies to accomplish the learning process successfully.

## REFERENCES

- Aarnoutse, C. & Schellings, G.** (2003). Learning reading strategies by triggering reading motivation. *Educational Studies*, 29/4, 387-409.
- Aebersold, J. A. & Field, M. L.** (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alfassi, M.** (2004). Reading to learn: Effects of combined strategy instruction on high school students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97/4, 171-184.
- Allen, S.** (2003). An analytic comparison of three models of reading strategy instruction. *IRAL*, 41, 319-338.
- Almutairi, N. R.** (2018). Effective Reading Strategies for Increasing the Reading Comprehension Level of Third-Grade Students with Learning Disabilities. Western Michigan University. Kalamazoo, Michigan United State. ScholarWorks at WMU. Dissertations. 3247. <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/3247>
- Alvermann, D., & Earle, J.** (2003). Comprehension instruction. In A. P. Sweet & C. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension* (pp. 12– 30). New York: Guilford Press.
- Anderson, N.** (1999). Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies. Canada: Heinle & Heinle.
- Anderson, N.** (2006). Developing metacognitively aware readers. Paper presented at 40th Annual TESOL Convention and Exhibit. Florida, Tampa.
- Anderson, N. J.** (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75/4, 460-472.
- Auerbach, E. R. & Paxton, D.** (1997). “It’s not the English thing”: Bringing reading research into the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31/2, 237-261.
- Baier, R.** (2005). Reading comprehension and reading strategies. University of Wisconsin Stout. Menomonie Wisconsin
- Barnett, M. A.** (1988). Reading through context: How real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73/2, 150-162.
- Bimmel, P.** (2001). Effects of reading strategy instruction in secondary education – A review of intervention studies. *Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 1, 273-298.
- Block, E.** (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20/3, 463-494.
- Block, E.** (1992). See how they read: Comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26/2, 319-343.
- Brand-Gruwel, S., Aarnoutse, C. A. J., & Boss, K. P. P.** (1998). Improving text comprehension strategies in reading and listening settings. *Learning and Instruction*, 8 (1), 63-81.

- Brantmeier, C.** (2002). Second language reading strategy research at the secondary and university levels: Variations, disparities, and generalizability. *The Reading Matrix*, 2/3, 1-14.
- Brown, H. D.** (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall Regents.
- Carrell, P. L. & Eisterhold, J. L.** (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17/4, 553-573.
- Carrell, P. L.** (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. (p. 333). *The Modern Language Journal*, 68/4, 332-343.
- Carrell, P. L.** (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (2), 121-134.
- Chamot, A. U. & O'Malley, J. M.** (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing cognitive academic language learning approach*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publication.
- Chamot, A. U.** (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 71-85). Cambridge: Prentice Hall.
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B. & Robbins, J.** (1999) *The learning strategies handbook*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Chamot, A.U.** (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130.
- Chen, K.T.C.** (2015) The Use of EFL Reading Strategies among High School Students in Taiwan. Chaoyang University of Technology. *An international online Journal*.
- Cohen, A. D.** (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. New York: Newbury House.
- Cohen, A. D.** (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Pearson Education. (p. 91).
- Corte, E. D., Verschaffel, L., & Ven, A. V. D.** (2001). Improving text comprehension strategies in upper primary school children: A design experiment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 531-559.
- Creswell, J.** (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach* (2nd ed.).
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D.** (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205-241). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Goodman, K.** (1970). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. In Brown, H. D. (3rd ed.), *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (pp.357-389). Oxford, UK: Pearson Longman.
- Grabe, W. & Stroller, F. L.** (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. London: Longman.
- Grabe, W.** (1986). The transition from theory to practice in teaching reading. In F. Dubin, D. E. Eskey & W. Grabe (Eds.), *Teaching second language reading for academic purposes* (pp. 25-48). New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Grabe, W.** (1988). Reassessing the term "interactive". In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 56-70). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Grabe, W.** (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25/3, 375-406.
- Grant, R.** (1994). Comprehension strategy instruction: Basic considerations for instructing at-risk college students. *Journal of Reading*, 38/1, 42-48.
- Grellet, F.** (1986). *Developing Reading Skills: A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension Exercises*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasibuan, K. & Ansyari, M, F.** (2007). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press. Riau Indonesia.
- Hosenfeld, C.** (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and non-successful second language learners. *System*, 5(2), 110–123.
- Hosenfeld, C.** (1984). Case studies of ninth grade readers. In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 231-244). New York: Longman.
- Janzen, J. & Stoller, F. L.** (1998). Integrating strategic reading in L2 instruction. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12/1, 251-269.
- Janzen, J.** (1996). Teaching strategic reading. *TESOL Journal*, 6/1, 6-9.
- Kantarci, F.** (2006). Students' awareness of reading strategies. Bilkent University. Ankara Turkey. <http://hdl.handle.net/11693/29819>
- Kern, R. G.** (1989). Second language reading strategy instruction: Its effects on comprehension and word inference ability. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73/2, 135-149.
- Kintsch, W., & Kinstch, E.** (2005). Comprehension. In S. G. Paris, & S. A. Stahl (Eds.), *Children's Reading Comprehension and Assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Ablex.
- Kirsch, I., de Jong, J., LaFontaine, D., McQueen, J., Mendelovits, J., & Monsieur, C.** (2002). *Reading for change: Performance and engagement across countries*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- McDonough, S. H.** (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mosenthal, J. H., Schwartz, R. M. & MacIsaac, D.** (1992). Comprehension instruction and teacher training: More than mentioning. *Journal of Reading*, 36/3, 198-207.
- Nassaji, H.** (2006). The relationship between depth of vocabulary knowledge and L2 learners' lexical inferencing strategy use and success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 387– 401.
- Nam, K. H, & Page, L.** (2014). Investigating Metacognitive Awareness and Reading Strategy Use of EFL Korean University Students. *Texas A&M University-Commerce, Commerce, Texas. Reading Psychology*, 35:3, 195-220, 10.1080/02702711.2012.675418
- Nam, K. H.** (2014). ELL High School Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Use and Reading Proficiency. Texas A & M University – Commerce, Texas, USA. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language. Volume 18, Number1*.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U.** (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshavsky, J. E.** (1977). Reading as problem solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12(4), 654–674.

- Oxford, R. L.** (1990). *Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L.** (2001). Language learning strategies. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan, (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 166-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R., & Crookall, D.** (1989). Research on language learning strategies; methods, findings, and instructional issues. *The modern language Journal*, 73(4), 103-114.
- Oxford, R., Chao, Y., Leung, S. & Kim, H.** (2004). Effects of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *IRAL*, 42, 1-47.
- Madhumathi, P. & Ghosh, A.** (2012). Awareness of Reading Strategy Use of Indian ESL Students and the Relationship with Reading Comprehension Achievement. Pondicherry university, India. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n12p131>.
- Palincsar, A. S. & Brown, A. L.** (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1/2, 117-175.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C.** (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson, (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 609- 640). Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pearson, P. D. & Fielding, L.** (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research Volume II* (pp. 815-860). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rubin, J.** (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-31). Cambridge: Prentice Hall.
- Salataci, R. & Akyel, A.** (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14/1, 1-16.
- Samuels, S. J. & Kamil, M. L.** (1988). Models of the reading process. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 22-37). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schueller, J.** (1999). The effects of two types of strategic training on foreign language reading comprehension. An analysis by gender and proficiency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI.
- Silberstein, S.** (1994). *Techniques and resources in teaching reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, M. L.** (1984). The status of study strategy instruction: Implications for classroom teachers. *Journal of Reading*, 28, 136-142.
- Sinatra, G., Brown, K. J., & Reynolds, R. E.** (2001). Implications of cognitive resource allocation for comprehension strategies instruction. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp. 62-75). New York: Guilford Press.
- Sweet, A. P., & Snow, C. E.** (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tankersley, K.** (2003). *The Threads of Reading: Strategies for Literacy Development*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, p. 90.

- Thompson, I.** (1987). Memory in language learning. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 43-57). Cambridge: Prentice Hall.
- Tierney, R.J., Pearson, P.D.,** (1986). Schema theory and implications for teaching reading: a conversation. *Reading Education* No. 67. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 140). <https://www.science-direct.com/science/article/pii/S2210831911000373#bb0260>
- Urquhart, A. H. & Weir, C. J.** (1998). *Reading in a foreign language: Process, product and practice*. New York: Longman.
- Uzunçakmak, P.** (2005). *Successful and unsuccessful readers' use of reading strategies*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Vacca, R. T.** (2002). Making a difference in adolescents' school lives: Visible and invisible aspects of content area reading. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 184- 204). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Wade, S. E.** (1990). Using think alouds to assess comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, March, 442-451.
- Wang, Y. H.** (2016). reading strategy use and comprehension performance of more successful and less successful readers: think aloud study. Chihlee University of Technology.
- Wenden, A. L.** (1987). Conceptual background and utility. In Rubin, J., & Wenden, A. (Eds), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 3-13). London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Williams, C.** (2011). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 5(3).
- Yayli, D.** (2010). A think-aloud study: Cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies of ELT department students. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 10(38), 234–251.
- Yetgin, E.** (2003). Evaluation of reading strategy instruction in an EFL reading textbook and teachers' perceptions of that reading strategy instruction. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Yukselir, C.** (2014). An investigation into the reading strategy use of EFL pre-class students. Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Turkey.
- Zhang, L. J., Gu, P. Y., & Hu, G.** (2008). A cognitive perspective on Singaporean primary school pupils' use of reading strategies in learning to read in English. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(2), 245–271.
- Zare, P. & Othman, M.** (2013). The Relationship between Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategy Use among Malaysian ESL Learners. University Putra Malaysia. 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia.
- Zare, P.** (2013). Exploring Reading Strategy Use and Reading Comprehension Success among EFL Learners. Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 22 (11): 1566-1571

## APPENDIX

### Appendix A

#### Reading Strategy Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to get information about how you read a text in English. The information gathered via this questionnaire will be used in a master's thesis on reading strategies.

Show how often you use strategies by checking the appropriate number. While 1 means "never", 5 means "almost always".

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	2	3	4	5

Answer the statements by thinking of what you are doing while reading in English, not in terms of what you should do. The score you obtain will not affect your lesson grades, and your answers to the questionnaire will be kept confidential.

#### Before I read a text

No	Statements	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
1	I use the title to predict the contents.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I consider what type of text it is, such as a newspaper article, a scientific paper, or a novel.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I skim it first, and later I read for details.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I look through the text to spot specific information such as dates, names, or numbers.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I pay attention to visuals such as graphs, pictures, or tables.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I use my prior knowledge about the topic to predict the content.	1	2	3	4	5

### While I am reading a text

No	Statements	N	R	S	O	Aa
7	I pay attention to parts of sentences such as phrases and clauses.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I pay attention to the beginning and the end of each paragraph.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I focus on the tense of a verb, such as present tense and past tense.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I try to understand the meaning of every word in a text	1	2	3	4	5
11	I translate each sentence into my native language.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I start reading from the first paragraph and read all the way through the last paragraph.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I pay attention to sentence structure, such as objects and subjects.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I continue reading even if I have difficulty.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I change reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I read aloud the difficult parts of the text	1	2	3	4	5
17	I skip unknown words.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I link the content with what I already know.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I try to understand the meaning of an unknown word by dividing it into parts.	1	2	3	4	5
20	If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using clues from the text	1	2	3	4	5
21	If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using information I know about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I check what each pronoun refers to.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I underline important parts.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I mark important parts, using colored pens or drawing stars.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I go over difficult parts several times.	1	2	3	4	5



<b>No</b>	<b>Statements</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>Aa</b>
26	I read aloud the entire text.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I make a picture in my mind about what the text is saying.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I try to understand the meaning without translating the text into my native language.	1	2	3	4	5
29	If I'm having trouble, I go back to previous sentences	1	2	3	4	5
30	I try to connect information within the text.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I ask questions related to the text or what I have read.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I follow the line I am reading with my finger or my pen.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I use slashes to divide a sentence grammatically.	1	2	3	4	5
34	When I cannot understand a sentence even if I know every word, I skip that sentence.	1	2	3	4	5
35	I predict what will come next.	1	2	3	4	5
36	I try to confirm or disconfirm the predictions, guesses, or inferences I have made.	1	2	3	4	5
37	I pay attention to linking words such as "however" and "besides" so that I can understand the structure.	1	2	3	4	5
38	I write down key words.	1	2	3	4	5
39	I try to distinguish between factual sentences and the writer's subjective opinions in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
40	I try to figure out the main idea of each paragraph	1	2	3	4	5
41	I try to distinguish between the main idea and the supporting details in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
42	I pay attention to indirectly stated ideas and try to make inferences about them.	1	2	3	4	5
43	I read the comprehension questions first and then read the text.	1	2	3	4	5

**After I read a text**

<b>No</b>	<b>Statements</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>AA</b>
44	I summarize it in my own words.	1	2	3	4	5
45	After reading the text in detail, I evaluate the text and the writer's viewpoint.	1	2	3	4	5

**Thank you for answering the questionnaire.**

## Appendix B

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 11.03.2021-7123



T.C.  
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ  
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı :E-88083623-020-7123  
Konu :Etik Onay Hk.

Sayın Arzoo WASY

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 18.06.2019 tarihli ve 2019/09 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur. Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Alper FİDAN  
Müdür a.  
Müdür Yardımcısı

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : BEKR31B6D Pin Kodu : 89881

Belge Takip Adresi : <https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/istanbul-aydin-universitesi-ebys>

Adres : Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / İSTANBUL

Telefon : 444 1 428

Web : <http://www.aydin.edu.tr/>

Keş Adresi : [iau.yazisleri@iau.hs03.kep.tr](mailto:iau.yazisleri@iau.hs03.kep.tr)

Bilgi için : Bülke KENDER

Unvanı : Yazı İşleri Uzmanı



## RESUME

### Information Data:

Name: Arzoo Wasy

Mobile: 05466398338

Father Name: Abdul Khaliq

Email: wasyazu@gmail.com

Date of Birth: 10.06.1994

Place of Birth: Baghlan Province

Address: Istanbul Turkey

Gender: Female

Marital Status: Single

### Academic and Education Qualifications:

- Graduated from high school, and Education Faculty of Jawzjan University.
- Major: Uzbek and English literature.
- Participate in YOUTH AND SOLIDARITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE (YSEL) Camp in Hoshiarpur India, 2011.
- Participate in (YSEL) Follow up workshop in Kabul Afghanistan, 2011.
- Participate in (YSEL) Alumni transformational leadership (TLT) workshop in Kabul Afghanistan, 2015.
- Having recommendation letters from DIWA Social Services and Development organization.
- Participated as a couch in (YSEL 9) camp in Antalya, Turkey, 2016.
- Recommendation letters from teachers of Jawzjan University.
- Reference letter from head of Jawzjan university presidency.

### Work Experiences:

- Has taught English to students of high school about 6 months.
- Has taught English in Diwa social services and development organization for one year.
- Has taught English in Lincoln learning center (LLC) Sheberghan for two years.

**In addition, has done some volunteerism projects by financial supports of ACIE Small grants, taking place in Jawzjan province:**

- Celebrating youth day.
- Had an exhibition of women crafts.
- Success dialogue in Jawzjan University.
- Teaching social behavior for orphanage students.
- Teaching leadership skills for school students.
- Basic health information.
- Presentation of YSEL camp for 400 school students.
- Clean up our environment.
- Tree planting.
- Informing addicted people from harms of drugs.
- Started a new project of a “book reading club” for orphanage kids and it’s in progress.

**Language Skills:**

Excellent (Reading, Writing, Speaking, and understanding) and communication skills in:

1. Dari
2. Uzbek
3. Turkish
4. English
5. Pashto

**Interests:**

Group working, drawing and painting, studying new books and novels, traveling, sports, cooking, watching American movies and listening to the Music.

**To:**

**Date: - -2021**

**Subject: applying for the position of English teacher.**

---

**Dear sir\Madam**

I am writing to apply for the position of joining as a teacher of this center as needed: this is my application along with my up-date resume.

The opportunity presented in this listing is very interesting, and I believe that my strong technical experience and education degree will make me very competitive for applying in this position. The key strengths that I possess for success in this position include:

- I graduated from high school in 2012 and also graduated from the education faculty (English literature) of Jawzjan University in 2016.
- I have more than three years of English teaching experience in Diwa social services and development organization. And at the LLC Sheberghan Afghanistan.
- Also, I have coaching experience, because I participated in YSEL 9 program as a couch in 2016, in Antalya Turkey, which was supported by the U.S. embassy.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to receiving your positive response and venue of the interview where you can better judge my qualification for this membership.

Please see my resume for additional information on my experiences.

Sincerely yours,

**Arzoo WASY**

Mobile: 05466398338

Email: wasyarzu@gmail.com

Address: Istanbul, Turkey.