

## Reading Strategy Instruction in L2 (English): An Investigation into Effects of L2 on L1 (Persian) (Strategi Pengajaran Pembacaan dalam L2 (Bahasa Inggeris): Satu Penyelidikan terhadap Kesan L2 ke atas L1 (Bahasa Parsi))

SEYED HASSAN TALEBI\* & ABDOLREZA SERAHATI

### ABSTRACT

*This study intended to find out which language (English as L2 or Persian as L1) would benefit more as a result of reading strategy instruction in L2. Forty students were given tests of reading comprehension and reading strategy questionnaires both in L2 and L1 as pretest and posttest. The control group was taught in the traditional way through teaching of vocabulary and grammar; but the experimental group received these along with reading strategy instruction (RSI). Results indicated the experimental group outperformed the control group on reading strategy questionnaire and reading performance in L2 and L1. Moreover, differences in improvements from pretest to posttest of reading strategies were not significant between L2 and L1, though this was significant for the reading test as the participants gained more in L2 than in L1. Although reading strategies transfer cross linguistically, it seems the language in which RSI is given benefits more in reading performance. Through teaching reading strategies in L2, awareness and use of reading strategies as well as reading ability of EFL students can be improved both in L2 and L1.*

*Keywords: Reading strategies; reverse transfer; first language; second language*

### ABSTRAK

*Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui bahawa mana-bahasa (Bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua-B2 atau Parsi sebagai bahasa pertama-B1) akan memberi manfaat kepada lebih akibat daripada membaca arahan strategi dalam B2. Empat puluh pelajar diberikan ujian pemahaman bacaan dan membaca soal selidik strategi kedua-dua dalam B2 dan B1 pra dan ujian pos. Kumpulan kawalan diajar dengan cara yang tradisional melalui pengajaran perbendaharaan kata dan tatabahasa, tetapi kumpulan eksperimen menerima ini bersama-sama dengan arahan strategi membaca (RSI). Keputusan menunjukkan kumpulan eksperimen mengatasi kumpulan kawalan membaca strategi soal selidik dan membaca prestasi dalam B2 dan B1. Selain itu, perbezaan dalam penambahbaikan daripada ujian pra ke pasca strategi bacaan tidak ketara antara B2 dan B1, walaupun ini adalah penting untuk ujian bacaan sebagai peserta mendapat lebih dalam B2 daripada di B1. Walaupun membaca pemindahan strategi silang linguistik, ia seolah-olah bahasa yang RSI diberikan manfaat lebih dalam membaca prestasi. Melalui strategi membaca pengajaran di B2, kesedaran dan penggunaan strategi membaca serta keupayaan bacaan pelajar EFL boleh diperbaiki dalam kedua-dua B2 dan B1.*

*Kata kunci: Strategi pembacaan; pemindahan terbalik; bahasa pertama; bahasa kedua*

### INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension is, undoubtedly, a very important skill and the most important way of gaining academic knowledge in an EFL context. Reading is viewed by many students as something that happens automatically, without any need for the reader to be active while doing reading tasks. (Taraban et al. 2000) Since the late 1970's, researchers (Jimenez et al. 1995; Carrell 1998) have begun to recognize the importance of reading strategies in L1 and L2 reading tasks. One of the goals of reading research has been to investigate learners' reading strategies (Kern 1994). Reading strategies are of interest not only for what they reveal about the ways readers manage their interactions with written text, but also for

how the use of strategies is related to effective reading comprehension (Carrell 1998). Grabe (2009) described reading strategies as "processes that are consciously controlled by readers to solve reading problems." Effective readers are aware of their cognitive and linguistic problems in reading comprehension, and direct their attention to the appropriate clues in anticipating, organizing and retaining text information. Such readers are strategic and their reading behavior is referred to as 'strategic reading.' (Koda 2005)

It is commonplace in language transfer studies to state the first language would have effects on the second language. The influence of L1 on L2 is called "substratum transfer." (Odlin 1989) However, transfer direction may also be the reverse, referred to as "borrowing transfer"

(Odlin 1989), reverse or backward transfer (Kecskes & Papp 2000). The idea of the effects of L2 on L1 arose out of the notion of 'multi-competence'. (Cook 2003) Multi-competence was employed to reconsider the existence of L1 and 'interlanguage' (Selinker 1972) which were regarded to be two separate systems in one mind. As Cook (2004) states, this concept suggests that, "since the first language and the other language or languages are in the same mind, they must form a language super-system at some level rather than completely separate systems." Therefore, according to the notion of multicompetence the first language of people who know other languages is different from their monolingual peers' language in various ways considering pronunciation, vocabulary, structure, pragmatics, etc.

Chamot (2001) called for more studies on the transfer of strategies. According to Chamot (2007) little research has been conducted to examine the transfer of learning strategies (from L1 to L2, L2 to additional languages, and L2 to L1). Most of the learners studying in the Iranian educational system do not receive any strategy instruction to improve their reading comprehension skills in their mother tongue (Persian). This also happens in their English classes. Regarding the above mentioned perspective on the effect of L2 on L1, it seems plausible to tackle L2 as well as L1 reading problems through reading strategy instruction (RSI) in L2. Therefore, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Does RSI in L2 have any effects on awareness and use of reading strategies in L2 among students of intermediate general English proficiency level?
2. Does RSI in L2 have any effects on reading performance in L2 among students of intermediate general English proficiency level?
3. Does RSI in L2 have any effects on awareness and use of reading strategies in L1 among students of intermediate general English proficiency level?
4. Does RSI in L2 have any effects on reading performance in L1 among students of intermediate general English proficiency level?
5. Does RSI in L2 impact awareness and use of reading strategies in L2 and L1 differently?
6. Does RSI in L2 impact reading comprehension scores in L2 and L1 differently?

A null hypothesis has been suggested for each of the questions.

#### METHODOLOGY

##### PARTICIPANTS

Forty university students were selected based on convenience sampling because of their convenient accessibility to the researchers. They were undergraduate freshmen who were admitted to the University of Mazandaran for full-time academic study in accounting

and computer sciences. They had already graduated from high school in Math-Physics. In the Iranian educational system there are English language courses right after the elementary education continuing to higher education. The university entrance examination also includes general English questions. Age and gender Variables were not controlled in this study.

#### INSTRUMENTS

**Language Proficiency Test** In order to determine the general English proficiency level of students, a test of *Nelson*, series 400B was employed. It consisted of four parts, including reading comprehension, cloze passage, vocabulary, and pronunciation. All parts were in the form of multiple-choice questions. The total number of items was 50 and the time allotted was 30 minutes as it was determined at the piloting stage. The test was piloted against a similar group of 15 students and the reliability of the test scores according to the KR-21 formula turned out to be .79.

**Test of Reading Comprehension in English** This test was adopted from Talebi (2014) and contained two passages. The first passage was entitled '*What is information processing?*' and the second passage was entitled '*The Need for Accounting*'. Each passage had 12 items and the whole number of items was 24. The number of words in the selected passages ranged from 610 to 560 words. The reliability of the test of reading in English was also taken care of at the piloting stage through the KR-21 formula and turned out to be 0.74. The time allowed was 30 minutes as determined at the piloting stage.

**Test of Reading Comprehension in Persian** As there was no standardized Persian reading comprehension test available, the authors developed a teacher made-test containing two passages, each containing 12 items (24 items in total). The two passages were related to the fields of Computer Sciences and Accounting. The nature of the items in terms of recognizing main ideas, vocabulary knowledge, and inferencing was the same for the two passages. After administering this test to a similar group of fifteen students, the reliability of the scores of this test was calculated according to the KR-21 formula at the piloting stage which turned out to be 0.77. This test was also shown to two experts in the fields of Computer Sciences and Accounting in order to have their comments on the suitability of the text for the students. The time allotted for the reading test in Persian was 20 minutes which was determined at the piloting stage.

**Reading Strategy Questionnaire for Content Reading** The students' awareness and use of reading strategies was assessed through the use of the *Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory* (MARS) (Mokhtari & Reichard 2002) The MARS instrument measures three broad categories including: (1) Global Reading Strategies (setting purpose for reading, previewing text content,

predicting what the text is about, etc.); (2) Problem-Solving Strategies (checking one's understanding upon encountering conflicting information, re-reading for better understanding, etc.); and (3) Support Reading Strategies (use of reference materials like dictionaries and other support systems). This instrument offers an immediate retrospective picture of the reading behavior. The instrument was translated into the participants' L1 (Persian) so that the participants felt more comfortable with the questionnaire and for better understanding of the purpose of each item. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study and that there was no right or wrong answer for the items of the instrument. The instrument was given to 20 freshmen students at the University of Mazandaran, the faculty of basic sciences. The internal consistency reliability coefficient for the whole instrument using the KR-21 formula was 0.88. To make sure of the content validity of the questionnaire, the instrument was finally shown to two experts in the field for getting their opinion about strategy items. They confirmed the clarity of the translation.

#### PROCEDURE

The researchers first approached the participants by explaining to them the general purpose of the study. They found the study interesting and volunteered to participate. The participants were from the fields of Accounting and Computer Sciences. To homogenize the participants based on the general proficiency level in English, they were distributed the Nelson test of English language proficiency, series 400B. As a result, those who scored within  $\pm 1$  SD (17.5-32) were considered as the intermediate level students to be involved in the study. There were 40 students who scored within this range of scores. The students were already assigned to three different classes as the researchers could not control their random assignment to two groups of control and experimental; therefore, placement of students was accepted as it was and the researchers had to employ quasi experimental design for furthering the purpose of research.

The next session, the participants took the reading test in English as a pretest. This test would determine the ability of the participants in L2 reading. Immediately after this test, the reading strategy questionnaire as a measure of the strategic reading behavior of the participants while reading material in English was administered among the participants. This instrument would inform the researchers about the participants' awareness and use of these strategies right at the beginning of the study.

In the next session the reading test in Persian was administered as the second pretest followed by the reading strategy questionnaire determining what strategies students would use while reading in Persian. After the pretests, the experimental group received reading strategy instruction as

a treatment along with their regular classroom materials, but the control group was only taught their routine classroom materials which did not focus on reading strategies and just focused on learning vocabulary and grammar for a good and faster translation from English into Persian.

"An essential aim of direct instruction, is to make the reader aware of the active nature of reading and the importance of employing problem-solving, troubleshooting routines to enhance understanding" (Baker & Brown 1984 cited in Carrell 1998). The MARSII inventory of reading strategies was introduced and illustrated through examples in an eight-session program. Each of these thirty strategies was firstly introduced by the teacher with explicitly describing *what* the strategies are (declarative knowledge), *how* to use them (procedural knowledge), and *when* and *why* to use them and *how to evaluate* them (conditional knowledge). (Winograd & Hare 1988, in Carrell 1998) An effective instructional technique is the teacher think-aloud method (Pressley et al. & Brown, 1992: 112) which is "the act of thinking aloud regarding cognitive processing as well as engaging in observable behaviors" (McEwan 2004). The teacher, for example, can model the strategy of *comprehension monitoring* using the thinking aloud technique by saying *I failed to understand this sentence, so I will read it again*. The researchers read the text by using the think-aloud technique and showed the students how to deal with the text strategically.

Therefore, as *declarative* knowledge, the researchers described important features of all strategies and provided a definition for each of them. As *procedural* knowledge, the researchers used modeling by thinking aloud to the participants how each strategy would be employed when the situation arose. For the *conditional* knowledge, the researchers specified the appropriate conditions (when and why) for applying each strategy (based on the text characteristics) and how to evaluate effective strategy use. The following example shows how the researchers taught reading strategies to the participants.

#### STRATEGY

##### PREDICTING (OR GUESSING) WHAT THE TEXT IS ABOUT

At first, the researchers asked students what the term *predicting* or *guessing* would mean. After receiving students' answers, the researchers gave a simple definition of the strategy. Then, the researchers asked the class the reason(s) for using the prediction or guessing strategy. Like the first question, after listing to the students' answers, the teacher again gave the following explanations:

When you predict a topic you will be more motivated to understand the text by focusing on the text to check whether your guesses were correct..... no matter if your predictions are correct, it can help you remember better what you read before.

The researchers also explained how/when/where this strategy can be used: *Prediction is possible by having a glance at titles and subtitles, typographical aids like bolded and italic words and considering other features like tables, figures, graphs, and pictures. It is also an ongoing process that could be possible both before reading a text and/or while reading it.*

The researchers encouraged students to give their opinion about the effect of prediction on their successful reading comprehension, the ease of employing this strategy, and the challenges they faced in employing this strategy. Little by little as students showed more independency and ability in the application of the strategies, teacher modeling and feedback was decreased and learners were encouraged towards autonomous use of strategies. Then, as homework all students received texts similar to those in reading tests to work with and mention what strategies they applied to comprehend the text and discuss them in the next sessions.

## RESULTS

In this section the six research hypotheses will be tested using Paired Sample Test as the *means* of two dependent groups (pre-test and post-test) are to be compared. One of the most important assumptions for using parametric tests is having normal distribution for the main variables of the research. Examination of the normality of the distribution of the scores was done by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in this study. If the observed result is at or above 0.05, the normality of the distribution of data is confirmed (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Normality test of variables

Variables	English reading test scores	Persian reading test scores
N	20	20
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup> Mean	7.5000	5.8500
Std. Deviation	.76089	.74516
Most Extreme Differences Absolute	.294	.230
Positive	.206	.223
Negative	-.294	-.230
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1.317	1.028
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.242

According to the above table, the observed P-Value for both main variables of the research was above 0.05. This indicates that the variables followed a normal distribution. For testing the first research hypothesis, paired samples t-test was applied. The results for both groups (control and experimental) are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Statistics for differences in pre-test, post-test mean scores in English strategy questionnaire for both control and experimental groups

Group		Mean	N	SD	t-Value	df	p-Value
Control	Pre	3.5317	20	.49765	.775	19	.448
	Post	3.4033	20	.70768			
Experimental	Pre	2.933	20	.50880	-8.081	19	.000
	Post	3.8533	20	.37077			

Based on the above table, the P-Value observed for the Control group was greater than 0.05. This showed that the null hypothesis was confirmed for the control group. In other words, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test means of the control group. But this difference was significant for Experimental group, as the P-Value was less than 0.05. This implies that the treatment (RSI in L2) was effective on raising awareness and use of content reading strategies in English.

For testing the second research hypothesis paired samples t-test was applied. The results for both groups (control and experimental) are presented in the Table 3.

TABLE 3. Statistics for differences in pre-test, post-test mean scores in Persian strategy questionnaire for both control & experimental groups

Group		Mean	N	SD	t-Value	df	p-Value
Control	Pre	3.5400	20	.51590	.920	19	.369
	Post	3.3800	20	.65234			
Experimental	Pre	2.9283	20	.47650	-8.706	19	.000
	Post	4.0233	20	.40712			

Based on the above table, the P-Value observed for the control group was greater than 0.05. This would imply that the null hypothesis was confirmed for control group. In other words, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test means of the control group. But this difference was significant for experimental group, as the P-Value was less than 0.05. This suggests that RSI in L2 was effective on raising awareness and use of content reading strategies in Persian as well.

For testing the third research hypothesis paired sample t-test was applied. The results for both groups (control and experimental) are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4. Statistics for differences in pre-test, post-test mean scores in English reading comprehension test for both control & experimental groups

Group		Mean	N	SD	t-Value	df	p-Value
Control	Pre	3.3000	20	1.34164	.804	19	.431
	Post	2.8500	20	1.92696			
Experimental	Pre	5.6500	20	.98809	-10.56	19	.000
	Post	7.6000	20	.68056			

Based on the above table, the P-Value observed for the control group was greater than 0.05. This showed that the null hypothesis was confirmed for the control group. In other words, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test means of the control group. But this difference was significant for the experimental group, as the P-Value was less than 0.05. This indicates that the treatment (RSI in L2) was effective on the L2 reading ability of students in this group.

For testing the fourth research hypothesis paired sample t-test was applied. The results for both groups (control and experimental) are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5. Statistics for differences in pre-test, post-test mean scores in Farsi reading comprehension test for both control and experimental groups

Group		Mean	N	SD	t-Value	df	p-Value
Control	Pre	4.1500	20	1.30888	1.846	19	.081
	Post	3.300	20	1.21828			
Experimental	Pre	4.7500	20	1.25132	-3.317	19	.004
	Post	5.8500	20	.74516			

Based on the above table, the P-Value observed for the Control group was greater than 0.05. This showed that the null hypothesis was confirmed for control group. In other words, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test means of the control group. But this difference was significant for experimental group, as the P-Value was less than 0.05. This indicates that the treatment (RSI in L2) was effective on the L1 reading ability of students in experimental group.

Regarding the fifth research question, as the difference from pretest to posttest in the control group was not statistically significant, the mean difference between the pretest and post-test was calculated only for the experimental group. (Table 6)

TABLE 6. Statistics for differences between pre-test and post-test mean scores in Persian and English reading strategy questionnaire for experimental group

Questionnaire	Mean	N	SD	t-Value	df	P-Value
Difference between pre-test & post-test	English	.9000	20	.49807	-1.591	38
	Persian	1.0950	20	.59250		

Based on Table 6 the difference between the Persian reading strategy questionnaire pre-test and post-test was .195 more than the difference between the English reading strategy questionnaire pre-test and post-test. However, the difference was not significant here. In other words, as a result of RSI in L2, both L2 and L1 gained significant improvements from pretest to posttest and there was no significant difference between the means of the two languages from pretest to posttest in degree

of improvement as far as awareness and use of reading strategies was concerned.

Regarding the sixth research question, as the difference from the pretest to posttest in the control group was not statistically significant, the mean difference between the pretest and post-test was calculated only for the experimental group.

TABLE 7. Statistics for differences between pre-test and post-test mean scores in Persian and English reading test for experimental group

Test	Mean	N	SD	't' value	Df	P-Value
Difference between pre-test & post-test	English	1.85	20	.93330	2.162	38
	Persian	1.20	20	1.48324		

Based on Table 7 the difference between the English reading pre-test and post-test scores was .65 more than the difference between the Persian reading pre-test and post-test scores and the difference was significant here. In other words, as a result of RSI in L2 both L2 and L1 gained improvements from pretest to posttest and there was a significant difference between the means of the two languages from pretest to posttest in degree of improvement in reading comprehension ability. This means that although in both languages (L2 and L1) improvements were observed as a result of RSI in L2, it was L2 which showed more improvement in reading score rather than L1.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study showed that RSI in L2 had significant effects on Iranian EFL learners' strategy awareness and use as well as performance in reading both in L2 and L1; the experimental group made more progress in reading strategy awareness and use in L1 than in L2, though the degree of improvements between the two languages was not significant. However, these learners gained significantly more improvement in their L2 reading ability than in their L1, and the degree of this improvement was significant between the two languages.

Talebi (2012) investigated the effect of strategy training in L2 on high school students' reading comprehension strategy awareness and use and reading performance in L2 (Persian) and L1 (English). Findings of his study are in line with the findings of the present study. Both have shown the effects of RSI in L2 on the process and product of reading both in L2 and L1. However, in the current study the participants were university students. Though in both studies reading strategy awareness and use as well as reading performance showed improvements, in the current study one interesting finding was that in the score of reading the difference in the degree of improvements

between L1 and L2 was significant. The reason might be that all tasks and interventions were in L2, not in L1. It seems more improvements in L1 reading might be observed if students receive RSI through L1 reading tasks. However, this difference in the process of reading (awareness and use of reading strategies) from pretest to posttest between L2 and L1 was not significant, though L1 showed more improvements.

In another study, Salataci & Akyel (2002) investigated the effects of RSI in English (L2) on use of reading strategies in English and Turkish (L1), among Turkish students in a Turkish university and found that reading strategy instruction had a positive impact on reading strategies used in English and Turkish, and reading performance only in English. In fact, their study showed support for the reverse transfer of reading strategy use from L2 to the L1. The findings in Salataci & Akyel (2002) are in line with the findings of this study. However, in the current study more findings were reported. First, in this study RSI in L2 impacted reading performance in L1 as well, a finding that was not reported in Salataci & Akyel (2002). Second, this study showed which language would benefit more in the process and product of reading as a result of RSI in L2.

The effective role of RSI has been recognized in many studies. Hardin (2001) observed the strategies transferred from one language to the other among bilingual Spanish-English fourth graders. Hua (1997, in Koda 2005) showed that readers in their two languages benefited equal strategies for their comprehension tasks. Jimenez et al. (1995) also found that bilingual readers were likely to have a unitary view of reading and would think of many similarities between reading in their L1 and L2. However, the direction of transfer in these studies was from L1 to L2. The current study showed that an increase in L2 reading strategies awareness and use and reading ability can lead to an increase in L1 reading strategies awareness and use as well as reading ability due to transfer of reading strategies from L2 to L1.

#### CONCLUSION

It is implied from the findings of this study that through RSI in L2 we can promote the reading process of EFL learners and help them manage their L2 reading difficulties and take a step forward toward their autonomy in reading. Another implication is that for the best outcome of the effect of reading strategy instruction on reading performance in the target language to which reading strategies are transferred, it is best to model employment of these strategies with texts in the target language. However, this instruction will surely not take much time as the strategic competence of students is already shaped. The results of this study also imply that material developers should design textbooks which can lead learners towards strategic learning and reading

so that our learners learn how to read autonomously in the language in which RSI is given and in any other language(s) as a result of cross-linguistic transfer of reading strategies.

In fact, it is the responsibility of the teacher to specify the situation for the learners and instruct them how to select appropriate strategies. It is also implied that as reading strategies transfer cross-linguistically, it is best to teach the process of reading, in particular, and learning in general, in L1, so that L2 or any further language(s) teachers would not spend most of their time on teaching the reading process and invest most on the product, supposing that students know enough about the processes involved in language learning. In addition, in L2 classes it is best to conduct a needs analysis on reading strategies so that the teacher of such courses knows how much to spend on teaching for the processes and products.

Regarding the importance of proficiency level on transfer of reading strategies from L2 to L1, Tsuyuki (2012) revealed that there was no significant difference in reading strategy use in the L1 for the intermediate group. One limitation of the current study was that the impact of general English proficiency or reading proficiency levels was not considered. It is recommended for further research to investigate the possible impact of the general English proficiency level of the reading proficiency level in English on the transfer of reading strategies from L2 to L1 academic reading tasks. As Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) state proficiency in L2 is one of the factors that impact reader's metacognitive knowledge about reading.

#### REFERENCES

- Baker, L. & Brown, A.L. 1984. Metacognitive skills and reading. In *Handbook of Reading Research*, edited by Pearson, P.D. New York: Longman.
- Carrell, P.L. 1989. SLA and classroom instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 9: 233-242.
- Chamot, A.U. 2001. The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition. In *Language Learners of Tomorrow: Process And Promise!*, edited by Breen, M.P. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Chamot, A.U. 2007. Instruction and good language learners. In *The Good Language Learner: Lessons From Research*, edited by Griffiths, C. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook Vivian. 2003. *Effects of the Second Language on the First*. Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Cook Vivian. 2004. *Bilingual Cognition and Language Teaching. Draft of Paper for Talk in Taiwan*. (Online paper). <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/vivian.c/writings/papers/bilcog&teaching.htm>.
- Grabe, W. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardin, V. 2001. Transfer and variation in cognitive reading strategies of Latina fourth-grade students in a late-exit program. *Bilingual Research Journal* 25(4): 1-21.

- Hua, T. 1997. The relationship between reading comprehension processes in L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub>. *Reading Psychology* 18: 249-301.
- Jimenez, R., Garcia, G. & Pearson, P. 1995. Three children, two languages, and strategic reading: Case studies in bilingual/monolingual reading. *American Educational Research Journal* 32: 67-97.
- Kecskes, I. & Papp, T. 2000. *Foreign Language and Mother Tongue*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kern, R.G. 1994. The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16(4): 441-461.
- McEvan, E.K. 2004. *Seven Strategies of Highly Effective Readers. Using Cognitive Research to Boost K-8 Achievement*. Corwin press.
- Mokhtari, K. & Reichard, C.A. 2002. Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 94: 249-259.
- Odlin, T. 1989. *Language Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pressley, M., Beard El-Dinary, P. & Brown, R. 1992. Skilled and not-so-skilled reading: Good information processing and not-so-good information processing. In *Promoting Academic Competence and Literacy in Schools*, edited by Pressley, M., Harris, K. & Guthrie, J. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Salataci Reyhan & Akyel Ayse. 2002. Possible Effects of Strategy Instruction on L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub> Reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 14(1). (Online paper). <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/Aprill2002/salataci/Salataci.htm>.
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* X(3): 209-231.
- Sheorey R. & Mokhtari, K. 2001. Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System* 29(4): 431-449.
- Talebi, S.H. 2012. Reading in L2 (English) and L1 (Persian): An investigation into reverse transfer of reading strategies. *English Language Teaching* 5(3).
- Talebi, S.H. 2014. An investigation into the effect of L1 reading product on the process and product of reading in EGP and ESP. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature* 6(1).
- Taraban, R., Rynearson, K. & Kerr, M. 2000. College students' academic performance and self-reports of comprehension strategy use. *Reading Psychology* 21: 283-308.
- Tsuyuki Cheryl, S. 2012. an investigation into the reverse transfer of reading strategies in an eap context. Masters Scholarly Paper Department of Second Language Studies.
- Seyed Hassan Talebi\* & Abdolreza Serahati  
Department of English Language and Literature  
University of Mazandaran  
Babolsar, Iran
- \*Corresponding author; email: htalebi1@yahoo.com  
Received: 3 March 2016  
Accepted: 31 July 2016

