COGNITIVE STRATEGIES USED BY UNIVERSITY NON-ENGLISH MAJORED STUDENTS IN READING COMPREHENSION

Nguyen Thi Bich Thuy, MA.
Faculty of Foreign Languages- College of Techniques,
Economics and Trade (CTET), Vietnam
E-mail: bichthuy.ctet@gmail.com

Abstract- **Reading comprehension is a problem-solving behavior that actively involves the reader in the process of deriving and assigning meaning. Individual readers employ different strategies while engaged in reading process, some being more efficient than others. Knowing what strategies students use in reading process, indeed, is very important to good reading teachers.**

180 Vietnamese university non-English majored students participated in the study. Three- pre tests were given to the students to define successful and unsuccessful readers. The results of the study reveal that successful and unsuccessful readers showed great differences in their choice of cognitive strategies. The research also points out some factors affecting readers' strategy use. They are gender, length of time of English learning and students' interest in English learning.

The study proposes the need to conduct a strategy training program for students, to conduct a more comprehensive strategy research on students' types of strategies applied in reading and to get more information about the different ethnographic variables that may affect students' choice of reading strategies in particular and in learning in general.

Index terms- **reading strategies, reading comprehension, successful/unsuccessful readers, genders**.

I. INTRODCUTION

To have a good command of English, students are required to master all four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among the four skills, reading is considered to be the most important because it provides the basis for a substantial amount of learning in education [2], [12], [15]. Reading will facilitate and enhance language learning. Reading also facilitates readers to develop themselves in various situations such as general knowledge, writing skills, and spelling [1], [9].

Hammadou (1991) points out:

Reading comprehension is not just understanding words, sentences, or even texts but involve a complex integration of the reader's prior knowledge, language proficiency and their language strategies. [9]

However, in the real life of English teaching, the researcher herself and many other teachers realize that most students are unfamiliar with the utilization of English reading strategies, and as a result, it reduces their reading comprehension. In their learning process, most students meet great challenges when dealing with reading texts. They usually do not understand texts and cannot complete the tasks so they feel tired and uninterested in reading lessons.

Considering all those mentioned above, it is essential to conduct a research on reading strategies, particularly on cognitive strategies used by non-English majored university students to help them improve their reading skill in particular and English learning in general.

This research is conducted to pursue the following aims:

-To discover if there are any differences in the cognitive strategies used between designated successful and unsuccessful readers.

-To find out factors affecting students' cognitive strategy choice.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Methods of the study

Considering all the advantages and disadvantages of methods applied in language learning strategy researching, Learning Strategy Questionnaire is the most preferably chosen for this study.

The questionnaire consists of two parts (See the Appendix). Part I requires the subjects to supply the ethnographic data, such as gender, age, years of English study, major fields, and their interest in English.

Part II includes 18 statements. These questionnaire statements were adopted, with some modification, from ones designed by Honsenfeld, C., Arnold, V., Kirchofer, J., Lacuira, J., and Wilson, L. (1981), and Oxford (1990) [10], [22].

B. Subjects

The participants in this study were 180 non-English majored students from different universities in Vietnam. These students have completed their General English program in their university curriculum. The table below gives details of the subjects:

TABLE I. Profile of the Respondents

Profile of the Respondents				
Gender	**No.**		**Major Fields**	**No.**
Male	73		Accounting	54
Female	107		Business Management	80
			Finance and Banking	46
English Liking	**No.**		**Years of English Study**	**No.**
English Liking	161		Less than 1 year	30
English Disliking	19		One year to 4 years	108

C. Procedures

The participants were divided into two groups: successful and unsuccessful readers, based on their pre- three reading test results. The results of the tests showed that there were 42 successful and 37 unsuccessful readers.

After three pre-tests had been done, the questionnaires were given to the participants in the classroom.

After the questionnaires had been collected, the researcher started to analyze to find out data which are appropriate to given research questions.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Cognitive strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers

Obviously, there was a significant difference in the choice of cognitive strategies when reading between successful and unsuccessful readers. The research results indicate that successful readers used more strategies than unsuccessful readers (TABLE II).

The results show that 11 of 18 given cognitive strategies were used by successful readers with high frequency while main strategies which were used by unsuccessful readers were only three. This corresponds to the assessment by some researchers when they claim that more effective students used a greater variety of strategies and used them in ways that helped the students complete the language task successfully [14], [19].

According to Pardon and Maxman (cited in [19]), all strategies which were used by successful readers were positive ones. They (listed gradually decreasing in frequency) are the followings: *Skipping Unimportant Words, Reading for Meaning rather than for Words, Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns, Transferring, Highlighting, Imagery, Skimming, Scanning, Repeating, Taking Notes,* and *Summarizing.*

The study reveals that most of successful readers (90.8%) considered *Skipping Unimportant Words* their most major strategy compared with very small percentage of unsuccessful readers who used that strategy (7.2%). This finding is quite the same as Li and Munby's (1996), and Block's (1986) outcome [13], [3]. In their study, Li and Munby (1996) demonstrate that competent readers skipped the unknown or unimportant words that were considered not essential to overall comprehension. Meanwhile bad readers tend not to skip such unimportant words. This is also the result of Honsenfeld et al.'s (1981) study when they investigated strategies used by high-scored readers [11]. In addition, Clark (cited in [4]) points out: "Good readers focused on the meaning of the text; they seemed far less concerned with the syntactic acceptability of this oral reading than with the semantic acceptability."

The third strategy used by most successful readers is *Reading for Meaning rather than for Words or Guessing Unknown Words.* Block (1986) and Stern (1975) studies show that successful learners searched for meaning and tried to engage in real communication by seeking out opportunities for nature use or to predict the meanings of the words or phrases by examining their relationship with other items in the sentence [3],[25].

TABLE II. Cognitive Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers

	Cognitive Strategies Applied in Reading	Frequency (%)									
		Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always	
		S	U	S	U	S	U	S	U	S	U
	Practicing										
1	Repeating	4.8	13.5	4.8	37.8	52.3	43.2	16.7	5.5	21.3	0.0
2	Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns	2.4	8.1	2.7	32.4	2.1	40.5	8.6	84.2	84.1	5.5
3	Practicing Naturalistically	3.1	20.8	12.9	40.5	15.4	20.6	14.3	54.3	54.3	8.7
	Receiving and Sending Messages										
4	Getting the Idea Quickly	2.4	63.6	1.0	21.6	9.0	3.2	31.4	56.2	56.2	4.2
5	Using Resources for Receiving and Sending Messages	2.4	10.8	9.5	37.8	35.7	29.7	14.3	38.1	38.1	13.5
6	Inferencing	55.4	0.0	16.7	4.3	15.8	3.7	6.4	5.7	5.7	90.0
7	Skipping Unimportant Words	0.8	8.1	1.1	16.2	6.2	40.5	3.2	88.6	88.6	18.9
8	Reading for Meaning rather than Words as a Guessing Strategy	0.0	63.3	1.4	15.2	4.4	6.2	4.2	22.4	90,0	7.2
	Analyzing and Reasoning										
9	Reasoning Deductively	0.4	45.0	1.3	16.2	6.2	23.2	12.3	12.1	86.1	10.2
10	Reasoning Contrastively	2.7	29.7	30.0	43.2	4.4	18.9	2.7	9.2	37.1	0.0
11	Analyzing Expressions	52.3	43.2	31.0	35.1	6.2	13.5	0.0	4.7	4.7	2.6
12	Translating	16.7	40.5	35.7	18.9	28.6	24.3	11.9	7.1	7.1	5.3
13	Transferring	24.8	8.1	23.8	2.6	28.6	7.8	16.7	6.1	6.1	73.5
14	Imagery	2.8	32.4	2.0	21.6	6.7	29.7	10.5	79.0	79.0	5.4
15	Comparing Knowledge Domains in Vietnamese Language	1.8	21.6	2.2	43.2	6.1	27.1	13.1	76.7	76.7	0.0
	Creating structure for Input and Output										
16	Taking Notes	1.9	10.8	4.3	32.4	6.2	27.0	26.2	61.4	61.4	10.9
17	Summarizing	2.7	13.1	2.6	2.6	19.0	32.4	13.5	54.3	54.3	5.5
18	Highlighting	1.4	8.4	2.4	2.1	1.0	27.6	21.7	86.2	86.2	13.5

Notes: S = Successful Readers   U = Unsuccessful Readers

Table 2 also shows that successful readers who used *Inferencing* strategy chose *Imagery Strategy*. This result once more shows a significant difference in strategy choice between successful and unsuccessful readers. Almost every successful student chose these two strategies with high frequency versus very low frequency of unsuccessful readers.

However, unsuccessful readers were not likely to use *Inferencing* strategy. Instead of that, they preferred using resources such as dictionaries or glossaries for the first source. All unsuccessful readers tented to use dictionary with highest frequency. This result also proves Grellet's ideas (1981) that students who did not use *Skimming* and *Scanning* strategies frequently were unsuccessful readers and vice versa [7].

The results also reveal that *Repeating and Practicing Naturalistically* strategies which are categorized in *Practicing Strategies* were used differently by successful and unsuccessful readers. Rubin (1975) concludes: "The good language leaner practices" [23]. It can be explained that successful readers were more hard-working than unsuccessful ones. During reading lesson, the researcher could observe this very clearly. Whenever they had free time, successful readers tried to read the text again or read in English whatever interesting for them. Unsuccessful readers, perhaps, because of their poor reading competence, did not like reading in English very much.

Another strategy, which received a great difference in the use of successful and unsuccessful readers, is *Transferring*. Almost every successful reader chose this strategy while nearly half of the unsuccessful readers never used it.

In brief, the study shows that there is a great difference in the use of cognitive strategies in reading comprehension by successful and unsuccessful readers. Successful readers tended to use more strategies than unsuccessful ones and the strategies chosen by them are useful ones. The study result corresponds to Oxford, Nyikos, and Crookal's (1987) study when they conclude that differences between successful and unsuccessful were reflected in the range of strategies used and the way in which individual strategies used. In general, more effective readers used a greater variety of strategies and used them in ways that help students complete the language task successfully [20]. Less effective readers not only had fewer strategy types in their repertories but also frequently used strategies that were inappropriate to the task or that did not lead to successful task completion. This may lead to the fact that it is necessary to conduct a strategy training course for unsuccessful readers.

B. Factors affected students' cognitive strategy choice
1. Gender

The first difference is that females preferred *Practicing* strategies (*Repeating,* and *Practicing Naturalistically)* and they liked *translating* when reading much more hard-working than males (Table 3). They tried to understand reading texts such more in details as they initiate more "negotiation of meaning" trying to understand clearly [6]. In fact, males seem to master ideas much faster than females so they do not need repeat reading or translating.

Another difference is that male students used *Reading for Meaning rather than for Words* strategy much more than females.

The last big difference is that male readers *skipped unimportant words* more than females and they preferred *Getting the idea quickly*. This can be explained that masculine behavior has been seen as aggressive and impulsive, whereas feminine behavior has been viewed as less assertive or reflective [24].

TABLE III. Cognitive Strategies Used by Male and Female Readers

	Cognitive Strategies Applied in Reading	**Frequency (%)**									
		Never		**Rarely**		**Sometimes**		**Usually**		**Always**	
		M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
	Practicing										
1	Repeating	12.3	4.7	27.4	7.8	39.7	45.8	16.4	16.7	4.2	25.0
2	Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns	6.8	11.2	21.9	26.2	37.0	31.8	21.9	12.1	12.4	18.7
3	Practicing Naturalistically	19.2	10.6	31.5	31.1	27.4	24.3	13.7	5.6	8.2	28.4
	Receiving and Sending Messages										
4	Getting the Idea Quickly										
4.1	Skimming	6.8	6.5	23.3	15.2	30.1	35.5	30.1	19.6	9.6	23.1
4.2	Scanning	5.5	7.5	17.4	14.0	26.5	35.5	26.9	21.5	23.7	21.5
5	Using Resources for Receiving and Sending Messages	5.5	5.1	23.3	12.8	24.7	38.5	26.0	19.7	20.5	23.9
6	Inferencing	8.2	5.6	19.2	8.4	27.4	35.5	23.3	35.5	21.9	15.0
7	Skipping Unimportant Words	17.8	17.8	11.5	23.4	15.1	30.8	12.3	15.9	43.3	12.1
8	Reading for Meaning rather than Words as a Guessing Strategy	9.6	5.6	4.5	5.9	15.1	31.8	9.4	22.4	63.2	34.3
	Analyzing and Reasoning										
9	Reasoning Deductively	21.9	24.3	35.6	32.7	23.3	27.1	12.3	12.1	6.9	3.8
10	Reasoning Contrastively	32.9	50.5	42.5	27.4	17.8	9.2	2.7	9.2	4.1	3.7
11	Analyzing Expressions	20.5	21.5	31.5	33.6	26.0	31.8	15.2	8.4	6.8	4.7
12	Translating	6.9	4.4	20.5	14.0	42.5	24.9	12.3	17.5	17.8	59.2
13	Transferring	6.8	5.3	21.9	14.6	43.8	43.0	21.5	15.0	22.6	22.1
14	Imagery	15.1	15.9	34.2	23.1	21.9	19.0	12.3	15.9	16.6	26.1
15	Comparing Knowledge Domains in Vietnamese Language	30.1	44.9	39.7	35.5	17.8	15.0	6.8	3.7	5.6	0.9

	Creating structure for Input and Output									
16	Taking Notes	8.2	12.1	26.0	20.6	37.0	25.2	13.7	26.2	15.1	15.9
17	Summarizing	11.0	13.1	31.5	33.6	26.0	29.9	20.5	16.8	11.0	6.5
18	Highlighting	12.3	8.4	17.8	21.5	20.5	29.0	28.8	19.6	20.5	21.5

Notes: M = Male Readers　　　　　　　　　　　　　　F = Female Readers

Furthermore, males are considered to be more logical than females, which enables male readers understand reading test without reading word-by-word.

In short, gender, however, affects students' cognitive strategy use during their reading. This research shows that males seemed to use more strategies in number and used them more often than females. This finding is quite contradictory to Oxford and Ehrman's (1989) outcome when they find out that females use significantly more learning strategies than men and use them more often [21]. It is perhaps because of social differences between Oxford and Ehrman's research subjects and the participants in this research when Oxford and Ehrman's are European and the participants of this study are Asian (Vietnamese). These two kinds of participants are of great cultural and social differences. However, this is only a tentative explanation. Further research is needed to explain if different cultures and societies have any influences on males and females' learning strategy choice.

2. English liking and disliking

The study shows that English liking students tended to use much more useful strategies and with higher degrees of frequency than English disliking readers (Table 4).

The most significant difference can be seen is the choice of *Practicing* strategies of students of the two groups. It can be explained simply that because of their unwillingness to learn, English disliking readers did not tend to practice their reading. By contrast, the more students like English, the more they want to look for opportunities to practice it.

Another great difference is that English liking students preferred using *Reading for Meaning rather than for Words as a Guessing strategy* much more than English disliking readers.

Jones et al. (1999) prove that willingness to learn is probable the most important characteristic that students bring to a learning task [11]. Students with high interest in English are likely to find useful strategies to help them in skill improving. In contrast, students with low interest in English are the ones who may be the least motivated to try now strategies and therefore may not consider it worthwhile to make an effort to improve their own language learning.

TABLE IV. Cognitive Strategies Used by English Liking and English Disliking Readers

	Cognitive Strategies Applied in Reading	Frequency (%)									
		Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always	
		L	D	L	D	L	D	L	D	L	D
	Practicing										
1	Repeating	7.5	40.5	10.5	31.6	13.5	12.1	47.4	10.5	21.1	5.3
2	Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns	9.9	5.3	12.4	48.1	34.2	31.6	17.4	5.3	26.1	9.7
3	Practicing Naturalistically	7.4	42.1	12.1	42.1	27.3	10.5	19.9	0.0	44.1	5.3
	Receiving and Sending Messages										
4	Getting the Idea Quickly										
4.1	Skimming	6.8	5.3	13.0	36.8	34.2	26.3	23.6	26.3	22.4	5.3
4.2	Scanning	6.2	10.5	19.9	15.8	34.8	26.3	19.3	42.1	19.8	5.3
5	Using Resources for Receiving and Sending Messages	5.6	5.3	18.6	10.5	28.0	22.1	23.0	26.3	24.8	35.8
6	Inferencing	5.3	25.3	12.4	25.8	32.3	21.6	29.8	16.8	21.2	10.5
7	Skipping Unimportant Words	10.2	5.3	25.5	36.8	23.6	31.6	24.3	15.8	16.4	10.5
8	Reading for Meaning rather than Words as a Guessing Strategy	6.8	10.5	9.3	5.3	29.2	47.4	21.1	10.5	33.8	26.3
	Analyzing and Reasoning										
9	Reasoning Deductively	23.0	26.3	33.5	36.8	24.8	31.6	13.0	5.3	5.7	0.0
10	Reasoning Contrastively	42.5	52.6	38.1	42.1	14.4	0.0	1.9	0.0	3.1	5.3
11	Analyzing Expressions	19.9	31.6	31.7	42.1	29.8	26.3	12.4	0.0	6.2	0.0
12	Translating	8.7	0.0	17.4	10.5	37.9	36.8	13.7	31.6	22.3	21.1
13	Transferring	6.8	21.1	19.9	31.6	44.1	36.8	17.4	0.0	11.8	10.5
14	Imagery	6.8	25.3	28.0	47.4	25.5	11.6	18.6	5.3	21.1	10.4
15	Comparing Knowledge Domains in Vietnamese Language	40.4	26.3	37.3	36.8	13.6	36.9	5.6	0.0	3.1	0.0
	Creating structure for Input and Output										
16	Taking Notes	9.3	31.1	22.4	26.3	30.4	26.3	22.4	10.5	15.5	5.8
17	Summarizing	11.8	26.3	32.3	36.8	28.0	31.6	19.9	5.3	8.0	0.0
18	Highlighting	9.3	15.8	18.6	31.6	26.7	15.8	23.0	26.3	22.4	10.5

Notes: L = English Liking Readers　　　　**D** = English Disliking Readers

3. Length of English studying time

Three strategies which received the most difference among the three groups are *Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns, Reading for Meaning rather than for Words as Guessing strategy, and Taking Notes strategy.*

This research reveals that students who have learnt English for longer time were reported to use more useful strategies with higher degrees of frequency than students who have learnt English for a shorter time period. As Oxford et al.

(1987) conclude: "Students with at least five years of study in the language used functional practice strategies significantly more frequently than students with four of fewer years" [20].

In fact, students of long leaning time have more chance to work with different teachers of which some might show them the way to deal with reading. Furthermore, students could get more experiences of how to read effectively through time. This is related firmly to what strategies they should use.

TABLE V. Cognitive Strategies Used by Students of Different English Learning Time

	Cognitive Strategies Applied in Reading	Frequency (%)														
		Never			Rarely			Sometimes			Usually			Always		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	Practicing															
1	Repeating	10.0	8.3	4.8	23.3	25.5	11.9	43.3	34.8	64.3	23.2	15.7	14.3	0.0	15.7	4.7
2	Recognizing and Using Formulas and Patterns	10.0	10.2	7.1	20.0	23.1	3.1	33.3	33.3	15.7	26.7	12.0	19.0	10.0	21.4	45.1
3	Practicing Naturalistically	26.7	20.4	14.3	33.3	33.3	30.0	26.7	29.6	14.3	6.7	8.3	19.9	6.6	8.4	29.5
	Receiving and Sending Messages															
4	Getting the Idea Quickly															
4.1	Skimming	13.3	3.7	9.5	20.0	25.9	23.8	30.0	36.1	28.6	26.7	21.3	28.6	10.0	13.0	9.5
4.2	Scanning	0.0	7.4	9.5	33.3	16.7	14.3	23.3	36.1	38.1	30.0	19.4	21.4	13.4	20.4	16.7
5	Using Resources for Receiving and Sending Messages	0.0	6.5	7.1	10.0	20.4	9.5	20.0	27.8	40.5	40.0	17.6	26.2	30.0	27.7	16.7
6	Inferencing	0.0	10.2	2.4	23.3	10.2	11.9	30.0	34.3	28.6	33.4	28.7	33.3	13.3	16.6	23.8
7	Skipping Unimportant Words	13.3	20.4	7.1	36.7	26.9	21.4	20.0	26.8	26.2	13.3	9.2	26.2	16.7	16.7	19.1
8	Reading for Meaning rather than Words as a Guessing Strategy	13.3	4.6	9.5	16.7	22.2	7.1	30.0	34.3	23.8	20.0	18.5	23.8	20.0	20.4	35.8
	Analyzing and Reasoning															
9	Reasoning Deductively	23.3	25.9	16.7	40.0	33.3	31.0	16.7	23.1	38.1	20.0	11.1	9.5	0.0	6.6	4.7
10	Reasoning Contrastively	33.3	45.4	45.2	56.7	34.3	38.1	10.0	12.0	14.3	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	2.4
11	Analyzing Expressions	16.7	24.1	16.7	23.3	33.3	38.1	30.0	28.7	31.0	20.0	9.3	9.4	10.0	4.6	4.8
12	Translating	0.0	13.0	0.0	13.3	11.1	16.2	42.7	35.2	40.5	10.0	14.8	21.4	34.0	25.9	21.9
13	Transferring	16.7	7.4	4.8	13.3	23.1	21.4	40.0	43.5	45.2	13.3	13.9	21.4	16.7	12.1	7.2
14	Imagery	23.3	18.5	2.4	33.3	29.6	18.6	13.3	26.9	33.3	16.7	14.8	23.8	13.4	10.2	21.9
15	Comparing Knowledge Domains in Vietnamese Language	23.3	40.7	45.2	40.0	36.1	38.1	23.3	35.2	9.5	10.0	3.7	4.8	3.3	2.8	2.8
	Creating structure for Input and Output															
16	Taking Notes	0.0	15.7	4.8	30.0	18.5	18.6	33.3	28.7	21.0	20.0	21.3	21.4	16.7	15.8	34.3
17	Summarizing	16.7	10.2	7.1	36.7	12.0	20.5	16.7	30.6	38.1	23.3	25.0	9.5	6.6	22.2	24.8
18	Highlighting	10.0	12.0	4.8	13.3	19.4	26.2	30.0	24.1	26.2	26.7	25.0	16.7	20.0	19.5	21.2

Notes: 1 = English Learning Time < 1 year   **2** = 1 year < English Learning Time < 4 years
3 = English Learning Time > 4 years

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The research results have revealed that there was a great difference in the use of cognitive strategies by successful and unsuccessful readers. Successful readers tended to use a wider variety range of strategies than unsuccessful readers, and successful readers were also reported to be effective and appropriate strategy users.

The study has also found out that there are different factors affecting the students' cognitive strategy use. They are gender, English liking or disliking, and English learning time. However, much more research needs to be conducted to confirm the results of the current study and to get more information about the different ethnographic variables that influence students' cognitive strategy choice in reading comprehension in particular and in language learning in general as well.

The study is significant because it has provided a detailed account of the cognitive strategies employed by participants in their reading comprehension. The research has shown that readers have to employ a wider range of strategies in order to read effectively. More immediately, there should be an introduction to English learning strategies in university English syllabus. That means it is necessary to conduct a cognitive strategy training to improve students' reading skills. It is necessary to let students know the significance of awareness of language learning strategies in order to help them study more effectively [5], and furthermore, to help them develop their autonomy in applying appropriate strategies. In addition, it needs to conduct a more comprehensive strategy research on students' types of strategies applied in reading and to get more information about the different ethnographic variables that affect students' learning strategy choice.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmadi, M. R., & Hairul, N. I. (2012). Reciprocal teaching as an important factor of improving reading comprehension. Journal of studies in education, 2(4), pp. 153-173.

[2] Alvermann, D. E., & Earle, J. (2003). Comprehension instruction Adolescents and their multiple literacies. In A. P. Sweet & C. Snow 9Eds.), Rethinking reading comprehension, pp.12-30. New York: Guilford Press.

[3] Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. TESOL Quarterly, 20 (3), 463-494.

[4] Carrell P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and ESL/EFL reading. Instructional Science: An International Journal of the Learning Sciences, 26, pp. 97–112.

[5] Cohen, A. D. (1998). Strategies in learning and using a second language. New York: Longman.

[6] Gass, S. and E. Varonis. 1986. 'Sex differences in non-native speaker - non-native speaker interactions' in R. Day (ed.). Talking to Learn (pp. 327-52). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

[7] Grellet, Francoise (1981) "Developing Reading Skills", Cambridge University Press.

[8] Hammadou, J. (1991). Interrelationships among prior knowledge, inference, and language proficiency in foreign language reading. The Modern Language Journal, 75, pp. 27–38.

[9] Harmer, J. (2007).The Practice of English Language Teaching (4th Edition) (Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers. England: Pearson Longman.

[10] Hosenfeld, C., Arnold, V., Kirchofer, J., Laciura, J., & Wilson, L. (1981). Second language reading: A curricular sequence for teaching reading strategies. Foreign Language, 14 (5), pp. 110-123.

[11] Jones, G., Langrall, C., Thornton, C. and Mogill, T. "Students' Probabilistic Thinking in Instruction." Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 1999, 30 (5), pp. 487–519.

[12] Kirsch, I., de Jong, J., Lafontaine, D., McQueen, J., Mendelovits, J., & Monseur, C. (2002). Reading for change: Performance and engagement across countries. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

[13] Li, S. & Munby. H. (1996). Metacognitive in Second Language Academic Reading: A Qualitative Investigation. English for Specific Purposes, 15 (3), pp. 199-216.

[14] Littlewood,W. (1984). Foreign and Second Language Learning. Cambridge University Press.

[15] Martin-Chang, S., & Gould, O.N. (2008). Revisiting print exposure: Exploring differential links to vocabulary, comprehension and reading rate. Journal of Research in Reading, 31, pp. 273-284.

[16] Mokhtari, K., & Richard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. Journal of educational psychology, 94, pp. 249-259.

[17] Mokhtari, K,. Reichard, C. A & Sheorey, R. (2008). Metacognitive awareness and use of reading strategies among adolescent readers. In K. Mokhtari & R. Sheorey (eds.), Reading strategies of first- and second-language learners: See how they read. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers., pp. 99-112.

[18] Nyikos, M. (1990). Gender-related differences in adult language learning: Socialization and memory factors. Modern Language Journal, 74 (3), pp.273-287.

[19] O' Malley, J.M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

[20] Oxford, R.L., Nyikos, M. & Crookall, D. (1987). Learning Strategies of University Foreign Language Students: A Large-scale Study. Washington, DC: Center for applied linguistics.

[21] Oxford, R.L. & Ehrman, E. (1989). Second language research on individual differences. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13, pp. 188-205.

[22] Oxford, R.L. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

[23] Rubin, J (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, pp. 41-51.

[24] Shipman, S. & Shipman, V. (1985). Cognitive styles: Some conceptual, methodological, and applied issues. In E. Gordon (Ed.), "Review of research in education,", 12, pp. 229-291. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

[25] Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, pp. 304-318.

[26] Xiaoqiong Zhou & Yonggang Zhao. (2014). A Comparative Study of Reading Strategies Used by Chinese English Majors. English Language Teaching, 7 (3), pp. 13-18.

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE ON COGNITIVE STRATEGIES USED BY STUDENTS IN READING COMPREHENSION

PART I

Please fill in the following truly:

Full name: .... Gender: Male: ☐ Female: ☐ Age: .... Major: ....

How long have you been studying English? .... Do you like learning English? Yes ☐ No ☐

PART II

This questionnaire has been designed to identify cognitive strategies you use in reading comprehension.

Read each statement below. Please write the respond 1,2,3,4 or 5 that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE TATEMENT IS

      1: for Never true of me   2: for Rarely true of me

      3: for Sometimes true of me   4: for Usually true of me   5: for Always true of me

No.	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1.	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible.					
2.	I recognize and use routine formulas and patterns to understand specific sentences in the text.					
3.	I read anything I have in English to improve my reading skill.					
4.	I seek for specific details in what I read.					
5.	I use reference materials such as glossaries or dictionaries to understand the text better.					
6.	When I do not understand all the words I read I guess the meaning by using any clue I can find, for example, clue from the text or situation.					
7.	I skip words that may add relatively little to total meaning.					
8.	I try to read to identify the meaning rather than words.					
9.	I guess the meaning of new information by using general rules I already know.					
10.	I analyze elements (sounds, words, syntax) of English to determine likeness and differences in comparison with Vietnamese.					
11.	I break down a new word, phrase, sentence or even a paragraph into its component parts to understand it better.					
12.	I translate the text into Vietnamese to understand it more easily and better.					
13.	I apply previous knowledge directly to facilitate new knowledge in English.					
14.	I relate new information to visual concepts in memory.					
15.	I look for similarities and contrasts between English and Vietnamese for specific information in the text.					
16.	I take notes of what I have read.					
17.	I summarize what I have read.					
18.	I emphasize the major points of the reading text through boxes, circles, underline, etc.					

Thank You for your corporation.