USING METACOGNITIVE STRATEGY OF ACROSS GENDER AND ENGLISH PROFICIENCY IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Nur Fadhilah Tisnawati
English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Email: nurt1@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Artikel ini memuat penelitian tentang strategi yang siswa lakukan ketika membaca bacaan dalam bahasa inggris. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah (1) untuk mengetahui perbedaan antara strategi membaca metakognitif siswa dengan tingkat dasar, menengah dan atas kemampuan bahasa Inggris (2) untuk mengetahui perbedaan stategi membaca metakognitif siswa antara siswa laki-laki dan perempuan. Subjek peneltian ini adalah kelas 2 SMP. Sampel penelitian diantaranya 25 siswa laki-laki dan 25 siswa perempuan didalam kelas yang berbeda dan guru yang berbeda. Penelitian ini menggunakan ex post facto penelitian untuk mengkorelasikan tingkat kemampuan bahasa Inggris siswa dan perbedaan gender dengan kesadaran metakognisi. Data penelitian dikumpulkan menggunakan nilai formatif bahasa inggris siswa di kelas dan tes MARSI. Peneliti juga memakai wawancara kepada siswa untuk menyempurnakan data penelitian. Penelitian ini menggunakan one way ANOVA analisis untuk menganalisis level kemampuan bahasa inggris dan juga memakai independen sampel t-test analisis untuk mengkomparasi data perbedaan gender di kesadaran metakognisi dalam strategi membaca. Kesimpulannya, tidak ada perbedaan signifikan antara laki-laki dan perempuan dalam menggunakan strategi metakognisi didalam perbedaan tingkatan pemahaman bahasa Inggris.
Kata Kunci: Strategi Metakognitif, Strategi Membaca, Membaca, MARSI

Abstract

This article contains study about strategies that students use when they read English text. The purpose of this study is (1) to know the differences student's metacognitive reading strategy in low, middle, and high level of English proficiency (2) to know the differences metacognitive awareness of Male and Female in reading comprehension. The subject of this study is second grade junior high school student. The samples are 25 male students and 25 female students in different class and teacher. This study presents ex post facto study to compare level of English proficiency and across gender with Metacognitive Awareness. The data collected by using Formative score in class and Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) test. The researcher also interviews the students to complete the data. This study use one way ANOVA analysis to analyze different English Proficiency and Independent sample t-test analysis to compare data of across gender in metacognitive awareness of reading strategy. In conclusion, there is no significant differences between male and female using metacognitive reading strategy in different level of English proficiency.
Keywords: Metacognitive Strategy, Reading Strategy, Reading, MARSI

1. INTRODUCTION

Students conduct the effective learning situation with different way and strategy. They have self-way to learn in class, then the teacher just need to coordinate the students' thinking development. Students use their own language in learning strategy to improve English proficiency and greater self-confidence. Language learning strategy is used to relate language factor and language outcome as the result of learning process. Students have differences language learning strategy that related to the situation factors (Sung, 2011). Students' self-characteristic and personal differences are one of part of education psychology in learning process. Mind-reading attributes mental states based on introspective access to their own mental states that made all of self-interpretation. Students have their own mind in process of learning to form of the mental states that includes as one of the educational psychologist (Carruthers, 2009). Generally, to be success in this learning process depends on students' thinking, strategy and cognitive condition. This is a transformation of learning to effective direction of students' own thinking. In addition, Teacher should understand the students' thinking development that include of knowledge dimension in learning process. It relates to general

awareness and knowledge about one's own cognition (Krathwohl, 2002).

Comprehension is one of component in learning process, if this component is missing, there is no learning completely. Caldwell (2008) described three component of learning process, they are comprehension, memory and application. Caldwell said about her experience when she learned poetry in elementary school. She did not understand the context of poetry, then automatically she did not remember it. The problem of students is they do not understand what they read in the text (Caldwell, 2008). This problem relate to students' problem in reading class activities. Reading ability is not only about learning new knowledge, but it is about a process of learning information. Then, comprehension is one essential component of reading (Alderson, 2000).

Therefore, the students' problem usually in process of reading comprehension. Learning process will be success when students could understand, memorize, and use the information. If they do not understand what they read, they do not remind and implicate the knowledge as an output of learning process. In fact, Indonesian students have difficulties in comprehending English text because of they do not understand English language. Junior high school student is a beginner in learning English because they still do not comprehend the text much and this condition often happen in the class during the lesson that makes the student to use a simple strategy that is just read the text. This simple strategy just makes the students read the text, not comprehend the text. That is why some students do not get the information of the text that they read. This condition will affect the student motivation to try to solve the problem in English text.

In addition, metacognitive process is one way to make students aware of their thinking. Using this process, student create strategies of learning that appropriate to self-knowledge and criteria. Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) developed that students enhance their learning by become aware their thinking of read, write and solve problem, then teacher promote this awareness by simply giving information of effective problem solving, discussing and motivational characteristic of thinking. Student are planning, monitoring, revising, and reflecting that activities to solve problem in reading processes. Then, metacognitive transform students' learning tool into a self-aware and self-improvement system (White et al., 2005: 215). Metacognitive process is some important process of students' thinking, they need to know the problem that they can elaborate this problem to self-strategy, and the last student get the solution of the problem based on their thinking of the way to solve of problem (Scanlon, 2010).

Metacognitive strategy improves students' reading comprehension, increases awareness, controls and evaluates reading comprehension. Metacognitive is a higher level of learning process. Shen & Liu (2011) indicated that metacognitive is a high level of learning related to students' ability to plan, monitor, and recognize the process of learning. Students get awareness of this process, they are using knowledge to adapt all strategy to think and operate of cognition process. The procedure of metacognitive is being natural way, effective and accurate. Metacognitive knowledge is representation of cognitive process. While, metacognitive skill controls of cognitive, it means that metacognitive skill controls all of cognitive proses. Planning, monitoring and evaluating strategies (McCormick, Dimmitt, & Sullivan, 2012).

Many researchers identified this strategy in senior high school, pre-university students and also college students. Some researchers use experiment test and questionnaire to see the students' background of metacognitive awareness in reading activities. They interested in conducting the subject of research in college student. They found positively effect of self-regulation, self-efficacy and metacognitive strategies to improve academic achievement (Gutiérrez-braojos, 2015; Yusri, Rahimi, Shah, & Wah, 2013). Other researchers focused on metacognitive awareness to change the effective problem solving, increase reading comprehension and motivate character of thinking (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002; Thomas & Barksdale-Ladd, 2000; White, Frederiksen, White, & Frederiksen, 2005). All participants of this research are university students with different country and background of study. Because of this reason, the researcher interests to know the awareness of metacognitive reading strategy engage reading comprehension in junior high school.

Meanwhile, Afsharrad & Sadeghi Benis (2017) proved that female is better than male in using cognitive and metacognitive process. Metacognitive strategies between monolingual and bilingual have significant differences in reading comprehension. Students have differences of metacognitive competences, self-efficacy, a value of learning, self-regulation, and learning evaluation. For the two metacognitive aspects that are self-efficacy and value of learning, females are better than males. Female have effective strategies that use self-regulation and self-evaluation of reading process (Mok, Fan, & Pang, 2007).

Reading is a skill that connects cultural background, schemata and individual psychological differences (Wang lu, 2015: 4). The point is reading as a skill needs to focus on the concept of learning process. Metacognitive process with strategy of thinking is suitable thing to give facilitation for student understanding. Thus, students as readers should have plan before reading a text, monitor and solve problem, and evaluate after reading. This process makes improvement of self-processing. As a

result, the complex thing in reading activity based on students' understanding of many text, it means that teacher needs to use the best way to elaborate metacognitive students' thinking. The researcher interest to study this subject.

This study tries to understand the correlation between metacognitive reading strategies in different gender and level of English proficiency. Therefore, there are two main objectives of this study, namely (1) Metacognitive awareness of junior high school students across English proficiency (2) Metacognitive awareness of junior high school student across gender.

METHOD

Research Design

This study is designed as an ex post facto research and focuses on looking for relationship between two variables without manipulation. Motivation, strategies, and comprehension are the subject of study being naturally condition of classes. In ex post facto research, researcher cannot manipulate condition of variable. Students' metacognitive skill and knowledge is naturally process of comprehension. Some processes of thinking are created as a prior-knowledge. This reason that makes researcher choose method of research by using ex post facto. Student comprehension is effect of metacognitive that students have. Researcher use casual comparative for this study. (Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C, Soremsem, C. Razavieh., 2010). The researcher compare data of English proficiency in class as product of learning to MARSI test. The goal is knowing factor and strategies between male and female in different level of English proficiency.

Research Participant

The study was aimed to the second grade students in junior high school that has 50 students that are divided into two classes based on gender because the class of male and female are separated in different location and teacher. The one class that is contained of 25 female students and another class that contained of 25 male students. This condition gives good effect to this study that wants to know differences effect of gender. The teacher was grouped students into three different levels of English proficiency according to the affirmative score. As showed in Table 1.

Table 1. Student Classification of English Proficiency

Level of English Proficiency	**Frequency Score**	**Male**	**Female**
Low	40-69	10	2
Middle	70-84	9	4
High	85-100	6	19

Research Instrument

This study is quantitative research. The researcher used Metacognitive Awareness (MARSI) questionnaire and interview for collecting the data and adapted the instrument based on the one previous study of metacognitive reading strategy awareness. Mokhtari & Reichard (2002) found Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) to assess metacognitive awareness. The purpose of this study is knowing the statistical correlation of significant differences across gender, English proficiency and metacognitive awareness in reading strategy. The researcher compared the data of student in MARSI and English Proficiency.

Validity and Reliability of MARSI

Validity is important process to check validity of instrument that the researcher used in this study. This study used Pearson correlation to calculated data instrument on SPSS. The result of validity instrument shows that based on the output calculation of SPSS, The researcher found that the significantly value all point of questionnaire are lower than .05. The highest significantly score is .033 in question number 10. The instrument of this study is valid. All of significance. (P = < .05), the level significant 5% of questionnaire is .279. If significance are lower than .05, it means all of question item in questionnaire is valid.

This study used Cronbach's Alpha to calculate the reliability of instrument that is checked by SPSS and it was discovered that The Cronbach's Alpha for all item of MARSI was .900, means that the instrument was reliable to be used in this study. However, the three subscales that are Global Reading Strategies (GLOB), Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB), and Support Reading Strategies (SUP) were also reliable when the instrument were checked. The results showed that Global Reading Strategies (GLOB) .795; Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB) .750; and Support Reading Strategies (SUP) .740. Based on these data, MARSI test is reliable to measure metacognitive reading strategy awareness of student.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

This section presents the results to analyze the two main objectives of this study, namely (1) Metacognitive awareness of junior high school students across English Proficiency (2) Metacognitive awareness of junior high school student across gender.

1. Students' Metacognitive Awareness Across Level of English Proficiency

In order to answer the first main objective, that is students' metacognitive awareness reading strategy in different level of English proficiency, this study uses one way ANOVA to conduct data of metacognitive awareness across level of proficiency. First of all, the researcher will check normality and homogeneity data. The descriptive statistics students' level of English proficiency were calculated in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of LEP and MARSI

	N			Std. Error of Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing	Mean		
Low	12	13	96.58	6.306	21.844
Middle	13	12	97.15	4.601	16.587
High	25	0	89.96	3.790	18.951

Based on Table 2. Students in the middle (M = 97.15) level of English proficiency are highest average among high (M = 89.96) and low (M = 96.58) level of proficiency. Next step, the researcher test the normality of data. The output of normality test showed in Table 3.

Table 3. Test of Normality Variance of LEP and MARSI

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Groups	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
MARSI	**High**	.121	25	.200*	.939	25	.141
	Middle	.199	13	.169	.911	13	.189
	Low	.158	12	.200*	.909	12	.208

As Table 3 shows, the students' in high (Sig. p = .141), middle (Sig. p = .189) and low (Sig. p = .208) level of English proficiency have more than .05 significance. It means that the spread of variable is normal. This condition make possible to check assumption the homogeneity of variances. It calculated in Table 4.

Table 4. Test of Homogeneity of Variances MARSI

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
MARSI	**Based on Mean**	.811	2	47	.450
	Based on Median	.774	2	47	.467
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.774	2	46.639	.467
	Based on trimmed mean	.791	2	47	.459

Table 4 showed that the result of significantly score is 0.459 > 0.05, the significantly score more than 0.05. It means that three variables is homogeny variables. Because of the variances is homogeny, the researcher can check in the next step. The researcher use one way ANOVA analysis to see metacognitive awareness in different level English proficiency. The result of one way ANOVA analysis can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. One Way ANOVA Analysis of LEP and MARSI

ANOVA

MARSI

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	600.611	2	300.306	.822	.446
Within Groups	17169.569	47	365.310		
Total	17770.180	49			

As Table 5 shows that the average of MARSI score in different level of English proficiency is an equal and also detected there is no significant differences between student in low, middle, and high level of English proficiency (sig. p = .446 > .05).

Then, the researcher used the interview in Bahasa and then translate it into English to complete data analysis. Researcher interview all of the students based on group level of English proficiency. The high level of proficiency have special strategy in reading activities. In this level of proficiency, students both male and female have plan to manage their activities in process of reading so that they can solve the text based on the script that has been translated below,

"If I get some text, I will to read the whole of text. When I do not understand the context of text, I will take relationship context with text previously in order to understand the context of text. The second, I will read all of question, then find the answer in text to take it easy." (Male 1)

"I will read all paragraph and try to understand of the context of text, then search the meaning of text one by one. When I get some question, I will read question and find answer in text." (Male 2)

"I will get meaning of word one by one."(Male 3)

"I will read text repeatedly." (Male 4)

"I will know the context of text, when I confuse, I ask my teacher for help me." (Male 5)

"I will read the whole of text, and take Google translate to search the meaning of word." (Male 6)

The quotations above are the answers of Male students in interview section. They also spontaneous to answer question from researcher. The answer reflect strategies that they used. They know to plan and monitor in reading activities. Moreover, some of Male student take prior-knowledge to understand text in monitoring activities. Female have same opinion in planning and monitoring activities of metacognition.

"I will know the meaning of sentences by sentences and answer the question of text. Or I will read question before read text, then find information in text that relate to the question." (Female 1)

The researcher takes one sample Female student in group of high proficiency. She said all about planning activities when she have some text in reading activities. She should know the context of text and question. She focus on context and the meaning of sentences. Same as high proficiency, middle proficiency have planning and monitoring their activities. Some of activities focus on the meaning of word and sentences. As we can see in quotation, they said

"I will get meaning of word by word. If I do not understand the context, I ask my friend who have higher score in class to help me." (Male 7)

"I will guess context of text." (Male 8)

"I will connect the meaning of word by word" (Male 9)

Student in middle of level English proficiency focus on meaning of word. They have awareness to understanding of text, but they do not know to plan and manage reading activities well. If they stagnate, they only ask to their friend to help. All of Male student have problem to planning and monitoring activities in reading comprehension. They also cannot imagine the activities when the teacher give them text. They have many problem to know the context of text, this is the reason, they only think to get meaning word by word.

While, sample of female student in middle proficiency think same as male student. She have problem to understanding of context. She said that,

"I will know the meaning of word by word. I always do not understand the context all of question and text" (Female 2)

It means that she need to attention for planning in understanding of context. She know her weaknesses in reading comprehension. This reason motivate her to understand from the meaning of word. In low level of English proficiency, student less than high and middle proficiency in metacognitive awareness. They use lillte bit of strategy in reading comprehension. They said,

"When the teacher give me some text, I am shock. When I don't understand all words and context in the text, I stop try to understand the text." (Male 10)

"I always hopeless when I cannot understand English text" (Male 11)

"I will get the meaning word by word."(Male 12)

Based on this quotation, researcher know this student have different characteristic of planning reading strategy. They do not motivate themselves to try more understanding about context and meaning of text. They are very difficult to learn English as second language. In fact, they have not awareness to read English text. But, they plan to try find the meaning of word, when they cannot understand. They stop it. Female have same problem with male in this metacognitive awareness and reading strategy. She said,

"I will read whole text and find the meaning of word by word."(Female 3)

Based on the script of the interview before, male and female students have resemble strategy however the condition is not possible for the students to share their strategy when read the text because of the separated class. As they said,

"I do not know that the boy use strategy as me" (Female student)

"I do not know that the girl do like this. Perhaps, they do better than male in reading strategies" (Male Student)

2. Students' Metacognitive Awareness Across Gender

In order to answer the second research question, the researcher try to know students' metacognitive awareness of male and female. The first step, researcher checked Normality and Homogeneity data. Then, the descriptive statistics group were calculated, in Table 6.

Table 6. Descriptive Analysis of Gender and MARSI

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LEP	Female	25	89.44	9.879	1.976
	Male	25	77.00	14.315	2.863
MARSI	Female	25	94.16	19.744	3.949
	Male	25	95.48	15.278	3.056

Based on Table 6, Female (M = 89.44) is upper than Male (M = 77.00) in English proficiency. But, actually Male (M = 95.48) is higher than Female (M = 94.16) in Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) test. Hence, to test significant differences, researcher compare the means to independent samples t-test. Researcher test significant differences of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) score. The result are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7. Independent Sample t-test MARSI Score

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	M. Difference	S. E. Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
MARSI	E. v assumed	1.773	.189	-.264	48	.793	-1.320	4.993	-11.359	8.719
	E. v not assumed			-.264	45.157	.793	-1.320	4.993	-11.375	8.735

As can be seem Table 7, the significant value in Levenes' Test for MARSI was .189 indicate equal variances assumed of statistic. The first researcher can interpret, there was no significant differences Female and Male in MARSI score. It is t = -.264, and p = .793 > .05, it means that significant is bigger than .05 did not significant differences of the whole of MARSI test between Female and Male.

The researcher will know significant differences of male and female in MARSI component to complete of data analysis. First of all, the researcher tested to check normality of element and t-test for two groups. Before check correlation of all MARSI element, researcher process descriptive analysis as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive Analysis of MARSI Element Score

		N			Std. Error of Mean	Std. Deviation
		Valid	Missing	Mean		
GLOB	F	25	25	38.68	1.601	8.004
	M	25	25	40.04	1.528	7.640
	Total	50	0	39.36	1.099	7.774
PROB	F	25	25	28.76	1.142	5.710
PROB	M	25	25	29.96	.895	4.477
	Total	50	0	29.36	.723	5.114
SUP	F	25	25	26.72	1.489	7.447
SUP	M	25	25	25.48	1.121	5.606
	Total	50	0	26.10	.927	6.554

As Table 8, reported the level of Student's awareness, researcher saw the Mean of Male in MARSI element, have high level of awareness in two strategies. For GLOB (Male = 40.04, Female = 38.68) and PROB (Male = 29.96, Female = 28.76). While, Female have high score in one of strategies, this is SUP (Female = 26.72, Male = 25.48). Furthermore, the researcher check the normality of MARSI element in Independent t-test, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Independent Sample t-test MARSI Element

Independent Samples Test					
			GLOB	PROB	SUP
Levene's Test	F	E. v. assumed	.478	2.945	.882
	Sig.	E. v. assumed	.493	.093	.352
t-test for Equality of Means	t	E. v. assumed	-.615	-.827	.665
		E. v. not assumed	-.615	-.827	.665
	df	E. v. assumed	48	48	48
		E. v. not assumed	47.897	45.413	44.589
	Sig. (2-tailed)	E. v. assumed	.542	.412	.509
		E. v. not assumed	.542	.413	.509
	Mean Difference	E. v. assumed	-1.360	-1.200	1.240
		E. v. not assumed	-1.360	-1.200	1.240
	Std. Error Difference	E. v. assumed	2.213	1.451	1.864
		E. v. not assumed	2.213	1.451	1.864
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower E. v. assumed	-5.810	-4.118	-2.508
		Lower E. v. not assumed	-5.810	-4.122	-2.516
		Upper E. v. assumed	3.090	1.718	4.988
		Upper E. v. not assumed	3.090	1.722	4.996

Based on Table 11 above, the researcher interpret that is no significant differences between male and female in

MARSI element. GLOB (t = -.615, and p = .542 > .05), PROB ((t = -.827, and p = .412 > .05), SUP (t = .665, and p = .509 > .05), it means that significant is bigger than .05 did not significant differences between Male and Female in score of MARSI element. In other word, to answer the second research question is negative because Female and Male do not significant differences in all item of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) test.

Discussion

In fact, student have problem of language based on their experiences. They do not choose the best condition to conduct English achievement. They have problem planning and monitoring of cognition. The problem of students as second language is understanding the meaning of language. The wrong perception make trouble of context then student difficult to learn English. The effect is many student difficult understanding the meaning of text when they read. They difficult to understanding content and context. As they said in interview above, they have problem to understand what purpose of text and question based on text. Mok et al. (2007) stated that different culture of Asian to Western make some problem of learner's metacognitive reading strategies. Asian learner is lower self-efficacy and self-perception than Western learner in English language activities.

This finding is contradiction with study of ESL and EFL Learner, Alderson (2004) found that there are no significant differences between ESL and EFL learner in the overall of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness. But, based on his study, Alderson found differences of Problem-Solving Strategies (PROB) that ESL and EFL learner used. However, in two component of MARSI, Global Reading Strategies (GLOB) and Support Reading Strategies (SUP), Learners have same strategies. Alderson suggested that the potential of Metacognitive Reading Strategy can increase when teacher conduct learner to used it by teaching instruction (Anderson, 2004). It means that, there is no significant differences Asian student and native student in Metacognitive Reading Strategies. This is possible condition that student have more difficulties to comprehend text, but they can manage and plan what is strategy to going understand of text. Metacognition is a representation of cognition in process of monitoring and controlling (Efklides, 2006).

Student's Metacognitive awareness across level of proficiency

The researcher found many strategies that student used in reading comprehension. Based on data, the researcher only found no significant differences of student in low, middle and high proficiency. But, after researcher interview student in class, we found that student in high level of proficiency have more strategies than middle and low level of proficiency. This is related to the previous study that Reading comprehension have not significant differences in variables. Reading comprehension is not one of Metacognitive Reading Strategy factor, but the result report student have different strategies used (Hope, Paul, Gualberto, Led, & De La, 2009).

The researcher found that student in low proficiency have a little bit plan and monitor reading activities. They do not aware the text given by teacher. Student poor monitoring skill do not take action for solve the problem (Veenman, 2015). This fact related to Anderson (2000), he instead that poor reader do not process their knowledge of strategies, and not aware what they do to connect their information. They have difficulties all of reading system work, difficulties to evaluate text for clarity, consistency and plausibility (Alderson, 2000).

While, the student in high level of proficiency have many strategies to understand and solve the problem. They plan and monitor of reading activities. When they do not understand, they repeat read text, connect the prior-knowledge, find question clue in text, and ask teacher or use media information that can help them. Hong-Nam & Page (2014) concluded that advanced reader have naturally process of metacognitive strategy. They focus to control of cognition and frequently use metacognitive strategy. They have more strategies than beginning and intermediate reader.

In short based on result above, students' have metacognitive process but not completely process. They have problem to make regularly process of evaluation. They can make some planning and monitoring process of reading, but they do not aware to get information and output of learning process. They only focus on comprehend context. When they do not understand context, they do not get all of information related to output of learning activities. The awareness of comprehension process in while reading is important to make strategic and thoughtful reader. Student can monitor the understanding of academic material as output of learning activities (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002)

Students' Metacognitive Awareness across Gender

Furthermore, the researcher found that there is no significant differences Males and Females in overall Metacognitive Reading Awareness and all of element strategies in Metacognitive Awareness. Hong-Nam & Page also found no differences metacognitive between male and female in their research. Follow this research, female have more attention than male in problem-solving task and monitoring cognitive strategies that they used (Hong-Nam & Page, 2014).

But, in different study of detail strategies in metacognitive process, female and male have significant differences. Different gender have not different in general metacognitive reading strategies, but in specific factor strategies. Females is higher than males in rehearsal, organization and metacognitive strategy. But, not in elaboration and critical thinking in reading process. the significant differences between males and females is on rehearsal and organization of language activities (Yusri et al., 2013). In other word, female have some strategies to make them stay learn and try to get information. They also use planning strategies to make an easy reading process.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on previous section of analysis and discussion, the researcher conclude of this study in two conclusion. First, Student in different level of proficiency have not significant differences in metacognitive awareness reading strategy. It means that the differences level of proficiency do not significant effected by Student's Metacognitive Strategy Awareness. Student in low and middle level of proficiency have same a few strategies in planning and monitoring of cognition. All of student have different background of knowledge that made some prior knowledge for experience in learning process. They use prior knowledge to control and monitor process of cognition. The students' metacognitive resources is qualities of learning experiences and prior knowledge. This characteristic of metacognition contribute students' awareness become at the longest learning (Taylor, 1999). Second, the result of calculation MARSI score of Males and Females, showed that there is no significant differences between male and female in metacognitive awareness in reading strategy. They have different class condition, but it does not make a significant differences in using metacognitive reading strategy. Male and female have same processes of learning in metacognitive awareness based on each group level of English proficiency.

Suggestion

The researcher tried to give suggestion as contributed toward the metacognitive awareness in reading strategy to English learning process.

First, for English teacher, metacognitive reading strategy could be used effectively in English class when the student know the role of metacognitive strategies in reading process. Then, the teacher should guide student to know specific metacognitive reading strategy. Teacher could tell about how to planning, monitoring, evaluating strategies in metacognitive strategies to student in class. This tradition can improve metacognitive awareness of student when they read a text. When teacher aware metacognitive process of comprehension, they can instruct and reflective of teaching process for student (Hacker, Dunlosky, Graesser, Williams, & Atkins, 2016)

Second, for future researcher, this research give opportunity to conducting research in Reading comprehension to complete the uncover aspect from this research. The purposes of this research is to know as far as metacognitive awareness in reading strategy of student. For the next researcher, it is hoped to cover the weak of this research. Furthermore, not only know background strategy but also conduct strategy to improve of Student's reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

Afsharrad, M., & Sadeghi Benis, A. R. (2017). Differences between monolinguals and bilinguals/males and females in English reading comprehension and reading strategy use. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *20*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1037238

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, N. J. (2004). Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness of ESL and EFL Learners. *The CATESOL Jornal*, *16*(1), 11–27.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C, Soremsem, C. Razavieh., A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. California: Wadswroth Cengage Learning.

Caldwell, J. S. (2008). *Comprehension Assessment*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Carruthers, P. (2009). How we know our own minds: The relationship between mindreading and metacognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *32*(2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09000545

Efklides, A. (2006). Metacognition and affect: What can metacognitive experiences tell us about the learning process? *Educational Research Review*, *1*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2005.11.001

Gutiérrez-braojos, C. (2015). Future time orientation and learning conceptions : effects on metacognitive strategies , self-efficacy beliefs , study effort and academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, *35*(2), 192–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.858101

Hacker, D. J., Dunlosky, J., Graesser, A. C., Williams, J. P., & Atkins, J. G. (2016). *Handbook of Metacognition in Education Publication details Published online on : 23 Jun 2009 How to cite :* -

Joanna P . Williams , J . Grant Atkins . 23 Jun 2009 , The Role of Metacognition in Teaching Reading Comprehension to Primary Students from : Hand. (10996). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203876428.ch3

Hong-Nam, K., & Page, L. (2014). Investigating Metacognitive Awareness and Reading Strategy Use of EFL Korean University Students. *Reading Psychology*, *35*(3), 195–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2012.675418

Hope, M., Paul, C., Gualberto, J., Led, C., & De La, T. (2009). The Development of Metacognitive Reading Awareness Inventory. In *Salle University-Manila TESOL Journal* (Vol. 1).

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview. *Theory into Practice*, *41*, 212–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2

McCormick, C. B., Dimmitt, C., & Sullivan, F. R. (2012). Metacognition, Learning, and Instruction. In *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop207004

Mok, Y. F., Fan, R. M. T., & Pang, N. S. K. (2007). Developmental patterns of school students' motivational- and cognitive-metacognitive competencies. *Educational Studies*, *33*(1), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690600948281

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(2), 249–259. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249

Scanlon, D. (2010). *Metacognitive Processes*.

Shen, C.-Y., & Liu, H.-C. (2011). Metacognitive Skills Development: A Web-Based Approach in Higher Education. In *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology* (Vol. 10).

Sung, K. Y. (2011). Factors influencing Chinese language learners' strategy use. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *8*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2010.532555

Taylor, S. (1999). Better learning through better thinking: Developing students' Metacognitive abilities. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *30*(1), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.1999.10850084

Thomas, K. F., & Barksdale-Ladd, M. A. (2000). Metacognitive processes: Teaching strategies in literacy education courses. *Reading Psychology*, *21*(1), 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/027027100278356

Veenman, M. V. J. (2015). Handbook of Individual Differences in Reading Reader, Text, and Context. *Handbook of Individual Differences in Reading Reader, Text, and Context*, (10103). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203075562.ch3

White, B., Frederiksen, J., White, B., & Frederiksen, J. (2005). A Theoretical Framework and Approach for Fostering Metacognitive Development A Theoretical Framework and Approach for Fostering Metacognitive Development. *Educational Psychologist Psychologist*, *40*(4), 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4004

Yusri, G., Rahimi, N. M., Shah, P. M., & Wah, W. H. (2013). Cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies among Arabic language students. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *21*(3), 290–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2011.555840