

\*

(242)

( )

:

.(2006

)

.(Murray, 1989)

%70

(Imel, 2002)

)

.(2006

.(Fisher, 2002)

:

(self- assessment)

:

.(Yang, 2002)

:

(Leather

.(Imel, 2002)

(Craig

and Mcloughlin, 2001)

and Yore, 1992; Pearson, 1993)

\*

2008/2/12

(2003)

.2008/10/7

:  
:  
:  
:  
(Metacognitive Thinking)  
(Higher Order Thinking)  
(Schunk, 1991)  
(Livingston, 1997)  
(Barell, 1991)  
)  
(2005)  
(Marzano et al., 1998)  
(Leather and Mclughlin, 2001)  
(Wilson, 1998)  
(Borkowski et al., 1987)  
( )  
(Lin, 2001; Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1991)  
(Ormrod, 1995)  
(Sprinthall et al., 1994)  
(Flavel, 1981)  
:  
(Brown, 1987)  
(Paris and Winogard, 1990)  
(Schunk, 1991)

( )

.(Schied, 1993)

:

-1

-2

(0.05= $\alpha$ )

:

:

.(Phakiti, 2003)

:

:

(1)

:

:

(Chamot, 1988)

(El-Hindi, 1993)

(43)

:

(12)

(Yore and Craig, 1992; Craig and  
Yore, 1992; Yore, Craig and Maure, 1993)

(Young and Oxford, 1997)

(21)

(23)

(21)

(63)

(113)

(109)

(93)

(Cattell, 1999)

( )

(18)

(Everson et al., 1992)

(2005)

(117)

:

---

(318)

(2000)

(30)

( )

(374)

(54)

(2002)

(1197)

(Yore and

Craig, 1992)

(Vandergrift, 1997)

(21)

(Phakiti, 2003)

(1999)

(384)

(250)

:  
(Phakiti, 2003)

(0.85)

(10)

(8)

.(%80)

2007/2006

(32)

(5250)

.(0.85)

(0.54-0.16)

(242)

(5)

(1)

(12)

(0.76)

(30)

( )  
(1) ( ) (5) (1) ( )  
(3) ( ) (2) ( )  
( ) (5) (4)

(150)

(30)

(35)

(90)

(30)

(3)

(5)

(90)

(30)



4	1.264	3.19		25
5	1.423	3.16		3
6	1.431	3.14		12
7	1.389	3.12		9
8	1.311	3.12		4
9	1.240	3.12		24
10	1.320	3.09		26
11	1.471	3.06		2
12	1.317	3.01		15
13	1.420	2.98		17
14	1.443	2.96		7
15	1.464	2.93		11
16	1.318	2.83		23
17	1.275	2.79		13
18	1.424	2.72		16
19	1.281	2.64		22
20	1.240	2.59		28
21	1.281	2.57		27
22	1.249	2.55		21
23	1.256	2.53		18
24	1.358	2.52		5
25	1.429	2.36		30
26	1.362	2.35		19
27	1.291	2.33		29
28	1.241	2.31		6
29	1.304	2.22		14
30	1.209	2.16		20
	1.34	2.82		

" "

(1)

" "

"

.(3.61) (2.16)

.(2.33 -1)

(3.67-2.34)

(2.82)

"

.( 3.67)

" "

( ) (4.53) (90)

(2) (85.47) (20.01)  
(2)

( )

<b>90 =</b>					
				<b>85.47</b>	
.001	3.52-	241	4.53	90	

(2)

"

"

-2

(3) (0.05 =  $\alpha$ ) (3)

19.51	85.98	116		
20.54	85.00	126		
21.35	83.28	78		
16.01	79.13	64		
20.54	91.21	48		
19.41	91.27	52		
18.86	88.54	48		
22.21	86.71	14		
19.20	86.46	70		
22.24	82.67	12		
24.86	75.67	6		
22.43	84.82	68		
10.95	71.40	10		
10.03	88.57	14		
<b>20.01</b>	<b>85.47</b>	<b>242</b>		

(20.54) (3)

(19.51) (85.98)  
(85.00)

(86.46) (91.27)  
 (84.82)  
 (82.67) (91.21)  
 (75.67) (83.28)  
 .(71.40) .(79.13)  
 .(4) .(90) (88.57)  
 (88.54)  
 (86.71)  
 (4)

0.483	0.493	187.06	1	187.06	
0.002	5.15	1952.776	3	5858.328	
0.352	1.118	424.30	7	2970.10	
		379.37	231	87253.94	
			242	96269.43	

(4)

.(5)

(5)

7.99	7.93	4.16		
*12.14	*12.08			
07.				

(5)

(Chamot, 1988)

(El-Hindi, 1993)

---

(2000) (Yore et al., 1992, (2002) 1993)  
(Yore et al., 1992, 1993) (1999) (2000)  
(2005)

(1999)

(2000) (Vandergrift, 1997)  
(Young and Oxford, 1997)  
(2005) (1999)

(Phakiti, (Yore et al., 1992, 1993)  
2003)

-1 (2002)

-2

-3

-4

- Craig, M.T. and Yore, L. 1992. Middle school students metacognitive knowledge about science reading and science text: an interview study, a dialogue search from ERIC database. 2000
- EL-Hindi, Amelia. 1993. Supporting college learners: metacognition, locus of control, reading comprehension and writing performance, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364852). 2003 .14-1 :(1)28
- Everson, Howard.1992. Exploring the relationship of test on anxiety and metacognition on reading test performance. A cognitive analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363624). : 3 2006
- Fisher, R. 2002. Shares Thinking.Metacognitive Modeling in the Literacy Hour. Reading Literacy and Language.UK: UKRA Blackwell Publishers. -417 :(2)33 .435 2002
- Flavell, H. 1981. Cognitive monitoring. In W.P. Dickenson(ED), Children oral communication skills (pp-35-60), New York. : 2005
- Imel, S. 2002. Metacognitive Skills for Adult Learning, in Trends and Issues, Alert no.39. [Online]. Available: <http://ericacve.org/docs/tia00107.pdf> [2003, November 25]. : .(1 ) 2005
- Leather, C. and McLoughlin, D. 2001. Developing task specific metcognitive skills in literate dyslexic adult. London: Adult dyslexia and skills development centre. www.bdainternationalconference.org. 1999
- Lin, X. 2001. Designing metacognitive activities. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 49(2): 23-40. .341-326 2 26
- Livingstone, J. A.1997. Metacognition: An overview. www.gse.buffalo.Edu.
- Marzano, R. et al.1998. Dimension of thinking a frame work for curriculum and instruction, ASCD, Alexandria.
- Murray, D. 1989. Expecting the unexpected: Teaching my-self and others to read and write. Portsmouth: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Ormod, Jeanne.1995. Education Psychology: Principles and Application, New Jersey: Prentice - Hall.
- Paris, S.G. and Winogard, D. 1990. Promoting metacognition and motivation of exceptional children. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(6): 15-17.
- Pearson, P.1993. Teaching and learning reading: A research perspective. *Language Arts*, 70, 502-511.
- Phakiti, Aek. 2003. A closer look at gender and strategy use in
- Barell, J. 1991. Grating our pathways: teaching students to think and become self-directed, in N. Colangelo and G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of Gifted Education* (PP.256-270), Needham Height, M. A., Allyn and Bacon.
- Borkwski, J., Carr, M. and Presley, M. 1987. Spontaneous strategy use: perspective from metacognitive theory. *Intelligence*, 11, 16-67.
- Brown, A. 1987. Metacognition, executive control, self - regulation and other more mysterious mechanisms.
- Cattell, Micki. 1999. A study of the effect of metacognition on reading comprehension. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 491177).
- Chamot, A. 1988. A study of learning strategies in foreign language. Instruction in the third year and final report. Roselyn: Interstate Research Associates, Inc.

- Vandergrift, L. 1997. The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listener: a descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 387-406.
- Yang, Y. 2002. Reassessing readers comprehension monitoring, *Reading in Foreign Language*, 14, 18-42.
- Young, D. and Oxford, R. 1997. A gender related analysis of strategies used to process written input in the native language and a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 43-73.
- Wilson, J. 1998. Reflecting on metacognition: is it possible to assess metacognition? Postgraduate conference, 190-213. Melbourne: Melbourne University.
- L2 reading. *Language Learning*, 53(4), 649-702.
- Scardamalia, M. and Bereiter, C. 1991. Higher level agency for children in knowledge building: challenge for the design of new knowledge media. *Journal of Learning Science*, 1, 37-68.
- Schunk, D. 1991. *Learning theories: An educational perspective*, New York: McMillan Publishing Company.
- Shied, K. 1993. *Helping students become strategic learners: Guidelines for teaching*, Cambridge: Broolcline Books.
- Sprinthall, N. et al. 1994. *Educational psychology: A developmental approach*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, New York: McGraw Hill.

## **The Degree of Using Metacognition Processes of Reading Comprehension of Foreign Texts among Zarqa Private University Students**

*Thaer Ghbari and Khaled Abu-Sheirah\**

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at detecting the extent to which the students of Zarqa Private University use metacognitive processes. It also aimed at exploring the difference in using these processes in terms of variables of gender, study year and college. The sample consisted of (242) students from different majors in the university, who responded to a metacognitive scale. After analyzing the data, the results showed that the students of the university use metacognitive processes weakly. The study also found that there were no statistically significant differences in using metacognition processes due to the gender and college variables, but there were statistically significant differences in using those processes due to the study year variable in favor of the fourth year students. They were using those processes more than the other students. In the light of the results, the researchers made some recommendations.

**Keywords:** Metacognition, Reading Comprehension.

---

\* College of Educational Sciences, Zarqa Private University, Zarqa, Jordan. Received on 12/2/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 7/10/2008.