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ABSTRACT
The present study intended to investigate the relationship between Global reading strategies and Support reading strategies on Iranian Intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension ability. In this respect the following research questions were under consideration: 1) what types and frequency of reading strategies (Global, Problem-solving and Support reading strategies) do the Intermediate students use in the reading process? 2) Which reading strategy (Global and Support reading strategies) lead to a better reading comprehension of Iranian Intermediate EFL learners? To carry out this research, 100 EFL learners studying in Nosrat language Institute participated in this study. Having being homogenized by PET test (Cambridge English: Preliminary English Test), 40 learners were selected at the intermediate level in two intact classes. The purpose of the present study based on a questionnaire (The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) (Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001) was adapted for use in this study. This Survey classifies reading strategies into three categories: global, problem solving, and support strategies.), assessed the students’ awareness of reading strategy use at the EFL intermediate level; (Glob M=3.41, Sup M =3.92, Prob M= 3.80). Second, based on the results of the first stage, learners are divided into two groups based on their reading strategies use. Then are given them same Reading Comprehension Test (TOIEC Reading test) to both groups to observe which of these two categories had a better understanding of reading (Sup M=12.62, Glob M=11.08).
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INTRODUCTION
Learners would like to be master when they ensure to be success in reading skills which is important. According to Anderson (2003), reading is the relationship among the reader, the text, the fluent reading, and strategic reading. Actually reading is an important means to literacy as well as language learning. Reader and reading material are some important elements in reading. It is impossible achieve to reading goals unless establishing an adequate match between these two elements. Actually, awareness and using of reading strategies and reading comprehension ability should be selected. According to (Birjandi et al., 2006) reading comprehension includes two types: the first is focus of this study and second is reading aloud without reader’s attention. In present study reading comprehension is reading a text to getting meaning or to reproduce the writer's meaning without saying what is being read. Comprehension of written passage is the final goal of reading (Birjandi et al., 2006).
Some the pilot studies were done at Iran, their results has been determined that many Iranian learners have problem in reading comprehension. Since the 1970s, more scholars researched on how students learn a second language has possessed great emphasis. Most of them have been researched to comprehending the features of language learners and the learning strategies they use to attain success in language learning. Reading serves as the basic source of new information about all kinds of topic in range of second language learning.
Many previous studies emphasized on the role of awareness on native language or a second language reading comprehension. Most researchers noticed that there are some important aspects of skilled reading such as strategic awareness and managing of the comprehension process. Some scholars like Alderson (1984), Clarke and Coady (1979) and Silberstein (1994) have presented different explanations of reading from different points of view. Li (2010), expressed reading is conceptualized as an interactive cognitive
process in which readers interact with the text using their prior knowledge, cultural background and use appropriate strategies. Reading is fundamentally a problem-solving task. Some activities instant problem solving, requires effort, planning, self-monitoring, strategy selection, and reflection are useful for reading comprehension. As students move through school, reading materials become more assembled, thus more laborious. Problem solving activity is an active and strategic approach to reading, so students who select this activity are metacognitively aware of how well they understand what they read (Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001), explored in their research that metacognitive awareness of reading strategies are specific and used to second or foreign reading ability. Students will enable to make meaning from texts they are reading by awareness of different cognitive and metacognitive strategies and employing those (Amer et al., 2010). Xianming (2007), analyzed the metacognitive awareness among 74 freshmen college students by using the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies (MARI) questionnaire (Mokhtari and Reichard, 2002), conducting interviews, and through passive participant observation. And finally he found a moderate use of these strategies.

**Definition of Reading**
There is some necessity which learners should be get them to reading comprehension such as: the reading skills of involuntary recognition, vocabulary and structural knowledge, formal discourse structure knowledge, content/world background knowledge, synthesis and evaluation, and metacognitive knowledge and skills, Anne (2005). Reading is mixture of attention, memory, perceptual processes and comprehension processes.

Many scholars believed that reading is one of the most important skills for educational and professional success. Rivers (1981) expressed about the nature of reading comprehension “reading is the most important activity in any language class, not only as a source of information and a pleasurable activity, but also as a means of consolidating and extending one’s which are knowledge of the language”. Krashen (1981) claims believed that all reading activities lead to assist communication fluency in each of the other language skills and other language skills are very depending to reading and emphasizing of reading for meaning. Also (Kim and Krashen, 1997) confirms that those who read more have larger vocabularies do better on test of grammar and write.

**Definition of Reading Comprehension Strategies**
Kouider Mokhtari and Ravi Sheorey stated that there are some strategies which help students to enhanced reading comprehension. Its name is (ELLS) English language learners. These are divided into three classes: global reading strategies, problem-solving strategies and support strategies. According to different criteria, reading researchers usually administrate reading strategies differently. In present study, Mokhtari and Sheorey’s Reading Strategy Model was utilized. Three main categories of reading strategies are the focus of this scale's evaluation.

(Barnett, 1989 and Cohen, 1998) confirmed that based on consciousness term ‘strategy’ has been used in the reading research from the term ‘skill’. They expressed that, skills operate at the semiconscious level while strategies are defined as conscious intentional behavior. With the increasing interest in the organizing of the reading process, as against to the product, researchers have been investigating tools for exploiting such processes to determine all thoughts which are raised in the readers’ minds when to carry out a reading task. Global Reading Strategies possess 13 items and are those purposeful, intently planned techniques by which learners are taught how to informant or manage their reading. It refers to pre reading activities such as having a purpose in mind before reading and thinking about what one already knows about the material before reading.

Global Reading Strategies (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2001)

-Read with a purpose in mind
-Think about what I know to help me understand what I read (pre-information)
-Over all view of the text to see what it’s about before reading
- Decide whether the content of the text fits the reading purpose
- Review the text first by noting characteristics including length and organization
Problem-Solving Strategies contain 8 items; it includes functions and manners that readers use when they meet difficulties in comprehending textual information. It refers to functions like as rereading hard to understand text and adapting one's reading rate to the difficulty level of what they're reading.

Problem Solving Strategies (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2001)
- Read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I'm reading
- Try to get back on track when distracted or lose concentration
- Adjust reading speed according to the reading material
- When text becomes difficult, pay closer attention to the material
- Stop from time to time and think about the reading
- Try to picture or visualize information to assist in remembering
- When text becomes difficult, re-read to increase understanding
- When reading, guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases

Support Reading Strategies comprises 9 items; ELLs need to know that there are other support materials available to them, further to the teacher and the text. It presents the use of producing outside reference materials from the text such as notes in the margins, summarizing, or simple underlining of important information.

Support Reading Strategies (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2001)
- Take notes while reading to assist in understanding
- When text becomes difficult, read aloud to assist in understanding
- Underline or mark-up information in the text to assist in remembering
- Use reference materials (dictionaries, etc.)
- Paraphrase/restate to better understand
- Go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas
- Ask self-questions to find answers in the text

Mokhtari and Reichard (2001) stated the inventory consists of 30 questions about student's effectiveness in the three classes and involved some ways for managing, scoring, and translating the results. The present study also has emphasis on the promotion of good reading attitudes for advancing EFL learners’ positive self-perception to monitor their own learning.

Statement of Problem
If learners want to be better readers and more important more effective language learners, they should expand their awareness of the process underlying their own learning strategies Nunan (1999). The present study notes different reading comprehension strategies. Some specific approaches such as: visualizing, re-reading and using dictionary or more appropriated methods like exploring inferences and summarizing have used by EFL students for reading comprehension. Most of the studies that considered the effect of reading strategies use on the reading comprehension were carried out in settings different from Iran such as India, China, and Hong Kong and among learners with different language proficiency. Thus, the current research intends to find out the relationship between reading strategies (Global and Support
reading strategies) on Iranian Intermediate EFL reading comprehension ability. Therefore, Iranian Intermediate EFL learners’ awareness of reading strategies can be recognized and assessed which of the two from third categories of reading strategies (Global and Support reading strategies) used by learners had led to better reading comprehension.

Review of Literature

A group of processes and strategies are necessity for reading as a complex cognitive activity. Grellet (1981) pointed, Reading is transformation of text into discourse and a communicative act by an individual, it is necessary to be taken in to account in any description of reading according to both performance by him. In the late 1970s and early 1980s research in L2 reading strategies were began by (Carrell, 1998). At during this period scholars (Knight et al., 1985) emphasized on the relationship between some cognitive strategies and both successful and less successful L2 readers.

Most researchers in domain of reading strategy were tested more on the development involved in reading than comprehension ability. Some researchers (Auerbach and Paxton, 1997; Carrell et al., 1989) stated in their research that Metacognitive awareness includes some proper procedures that learners or anybody take in order to attain a specific objective. When Metacognitive awareness applied to reading, it can be defined as “the knowledge of the readers’ cognition relative to the reading process and the self-control mechanisms they use to monitor and enhance comprehension” (Sheorey and Mokhtari, 2001).

Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies can help learners in two parts: a) what strategies they can use (declarative knowledge; that is knowledge that consists of consciously known fact, concepts that can be stored as propositions) or how they should use them (procedural knowledge; that is knowledge that concerning things we know how to do but which are not consciously known) b) when, and where they are supposed to use them at a particular stage, and how to evaluate their efficacy (conditional knowledge) (Anderson, 2002; Carrell, 1989). These approach and such like these lead students eventually become skilled readers. (O’Malley et al., 1985) recommended that “Students need to awareness about metacognitive approaches and without it they are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to review their progress, accomplishments, and future learning directions”. Cohen (1998) there are some ways for learners to be a successful learners such as: improving their use of class time, talking more responsibility for their own language learning, more knowing about their learning needs by learners’ awareness, and responsible for the selection, use, and evaluation of their learning strategies (Anderson, 1991; Karbalaei, 2010; Mokhtari and Reichard, 2004; Malcolm, 2009) declared that EFL students by emphasizing on the role of strategies in the second language are employed strategies in an active way to perform their learning aims.

In below there are some reviews of students of metacognitive awareness and reading comprehension and some common views about metacognitive awareness and its impact on language learning.

(Zhang and Wu, 2009) assessed metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use of Chinese senior high school students who are learning English as a foreign language (EFL). Their research participants were 249 learners answered to a 28-item survey of reading strategies (SORS). They were divided into three proficiency groups (high, intermediate, and low) according to their average scores of three English exams performed among the whole population. Their result showed the high-proficiency group outperformed the intermediate group and the low-proficiency group in 2 categories of reading strategies: global and problem-solving; but no statistically significant differences were found among the 3 proficiency groups in using support strategies. Phakiti (2003) investigated the impact of gender differences in cognitive and metacognitive strategy use on English language reading comprehension. Gender differences were analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance. Generally, males and females did not differ in their reading comprehension performance and their use of cognitive strategies. But he reported in his study that males use of metacognition strategies higher than females. According to research which by same achievement group (highly successful, moderately successful, and unsuccessful), there were gender differences in both reading performance and use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Carrell (1989) studied the relationship between learners’ awareness and their reading comprehension; he established metacognitive awareness of reading strategies by two groups of learners in their L1 and L2. One group
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Consisted of 45 native speakers of Spanish learning English as an L2 in an intensive program and the other group involved native speaker of English learning Spanish as a foreign language. Carrell designed a self-report questionnaire to estimate the subjects’ metacognitive awareness and two texts of English and Spanish to test their reading comprehension. The results showed that L2 learners of English at an advanced level tended to use more top-down strategies where learners of Spanish at a lower level tended to use more bottom-up strategies. And there were a correlation between bottom-up reading strategies and reading performance.

Poole (2005) found some insignificant differences between male and female about their strategies used while English and Spanish reading text. In this domain of research, it should be better if research generated to draw general consequences about strategy use and their relation with reading comprehension although the results of these studies have been clear gender differences and strategy use. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) stated that awareness of reading strategies and comprehension monitoring are the important characteristic of a successful reader. They believe that metacognitive knowledge of the readers includes an awareness of a domain of reading strategies. It is very useful if we want to enhance students’ reading mental process, it should be use of explicit teaching of reading skills and strategies to them (Susser and Robb, 1990). Wu (2002) tested the relationship between reading awareness and reading strategy use between L2 high proficiency students and L2 low proficiency students. Wu found that students with high proficiency have more awareness to metacognitive skills and students either low proficiency less awareness to metacognitive skills. According to result of Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) good readers are know the strategies and know how use to better understanding. Based on result of Chern (1994) in metacognitive awareness area, Chinese readers often use dictionary during reading English and most of them are accuracy-oriented readers. Chinese readers used reading strategies least while comprehending information or recollecting the text. Cheng (2000) reported that EFL students of Taiwanese College more use of local strategies for reading English comprehension. Vandergrift (2003) suggested to teachers can prepares students to become skilled readers by knowledge and help them to control their learning guiding by process of reading. Most studies has been done on the process of new information by learners, the strategies used by learners to understand, learn, or remember the new information, and the variables influencing learners’ choice of strategies. There have been few studies on the subject of gender and reading strategies. The results of these studies do not show greater strategy use for either males or females Cheng (1998) studied on ten Taiwanese readers and found that there are two types of Taiwanese readers which use of reading strategies while reading English. One group was integrators which selected general reading strategies or top-down and the other group was non-integrator which selected local strategies and bottom-up. Cheng believed that the other factors which influence on students reading goals is socio-cultural. There are differences among learners to their methods of reading strategy use depend on their reading purpose varies. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) noticed that if students have awareness of the reading strategies they can make meaning from the text, so these students could be responsive.

Research Questions

To do so this study is intended for investigating the following research question:

RQ 1: What type and frequency of reading strategies (Global, Problem-solving and Support reading strategies) do the Intermediate students use in the reading process?

RQ 2: Which reading strategy (Global and Support reading strategies) lead to a better reading comprehension of Iranian Intermediate EFL learners?

Research Hypothesis

In order to answer the research question, the following null hypothesis has been formulated:

H0 1: There is not a significant difference among Iranian intermediate EFL learners in terms of their preferred reading strategies.

H0 2: There is not a significant differences between types of reading strategies (Global and Support reading strategy) and scores of Iranian intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

-Introduction
This part introduces the method of the study. More specifically it details the design of the study, the subjects who participated in research, the instrumentation, procedures and statistical analysis. SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) 14.0 was employed to analyze the data.

-Design of the study
The design of study was mix methods of quantitative and qualitative and descriptive.

-Participants
A PET (Cambridge English: Preliminary English Test), test was administered to a population of 100 students which 40 participants were selected and homogenized at the intermediate level so all of the selected participants to be the same level of language proficiency that the students of this class belongs to two intact groups. In order to prevent gender effect all participants were female, and non-native English speakers and all were native speakers of Persian who had studied at Nosrat language institute in Lahijan. Participants’ age was from 20-34.

-Materials
This research scheme takes advantage of three types of tests for the sake of data collections. A Cambridge English: Preliminary English Test (PET) in order to measure the subjects’ current status of proficiency level. This test is in 4 parts. The parts are - reading, writing, listening and speaking. All four parts of the test have the same value 25% each. Total mark is made by adding all these results together. Learners need to get more than 70% to pass the exam. In present study participants were selected among learners who got scores between 80% - 97%.

In the present study, the researcher used a standard questionnaire (The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) (Sheorey and Mokhtari 2001). The adapted (SORS) consists of 30 items that measure awareness reading strategies. In this questionnaire each item is accompanied with a 5-point, Likert-type scale, 1 (never or almost never do this), 2 (only occasionally do this), 3 (sometimes do this), 4 (usually do this), 5 (always or almost always do this) in which scores of 2.4 or below demonstrate low strategy use, 2.5 to 3.4 show moderate strategy use, and 3.5 or above signifies high strategy use. It was designed to measure three categories: Global Reading Strategies (13 items) focus on how students monitor their reading, contains: S1, S3, S4, S7, S10, S14, S17, S19, S22, S23, S25, S26, and S29. Problem Solving Strategies (8 items) cover how learners resolve reading problems, contains: S8, S11, S13, S16, S18, S21, S27, S30 and Support Strategies (9 items) include possible techniques that can help readers, contains: S2, S5, S6, S9, S12, S15, S20, S24, and S28.

Other instrument to measuring the relationship between Global reading strategies and Support reading strategies on reading comprehension ability is a standard reading comprehension test (TOEIC Reading test) In this Reading test, participants read a variety of texts and answer several different types of reading comprehension questions it includes three parts: a) A word or phrase is missing in each of the sentences. Four answer choices are given to each sentence. Participants should select the best answer to complete the sentence. B) According to texts a word or phrase is missing in some of the sentences. Four answer choices are given to each of these sentences. Participants should select the best answer to complete the text. C) In this part participants read a selection of texts, such as magazine and newspaper articles, letters, and advertisements. Each text is followed by several questions. They should select the best answer for each question. The test taker’s score report also includes the percentage of questions the test taker answered correctly for reading ability measured. The percentage can be compared with the percentage score of test takers who have taken the same TOEIC test form. The ability measured is calculated by the “percentage of items answered correctly.”

-Procedure
100 EFL learners studying in a language Institute participated in this study. Having being homogenized by PET test (Cambridge English: Preliminary English Test), 40 learners were selected at the intermediate level. Of course, all these participants were in two intact classes. Then, the SORS instrument and TOEIC Reading Test were administered among 40 Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners at Nosrat language institute...
in Lahijan. In SORS the participants were asked to answer based on their authentic opinions for each statements. For TOEIC Reading Test subjects were assigned into two groups (Global Reading Strategies and Support Reading Strategies) based on their reading strategies use. On the other hand, researcher was study based on a SORS questionnaire, investigated the students’ awareness of reading strategy use at the EFL intermediate level and used same TOEIC Reading Test to estimate which of the two strategies they had a better understanding of reading. Based on data collection of questionnaire SORS: likert scale(1,2,3,4,5) learners divided into two groups according to their choice of answers; every participants who choose item 3 or 4 or 5 for Global reading strategies held in Global group and every learners who choose item 3 or 4 or 5 for support reading strategies held in Support group. Based on this, Global group involved 14 learners and Support group include 26 learners.

-Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 14.0). The following data analysis procedures were used to analyze the collected data:
- Calculated the reliability of the SORS with the data from the current study by using Cronbach’s Alpha.
- Descriptive Statistics among the three strategy Categories.
- Calculated the relationship of Global Reading Strategy and the Support Reading Strategy on reading comprehension ability by Descriptive Analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis and Results

The SORS has been tested with ESL college students and the internal consistency of the questionnaire obtained through Cronbach’s alpha was reported to be 0.88 (Mokhtari and Sheorey, 2002). The present study was carried out 40 participants and the reliability calculated for the main study was 0.79 using Cronbach’s Alpha.

| Table 1: Cronbach’s Alpha for each strategy and all strategy of the SORS (N=40) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Strategy        | Number of Items | Alpha           |
| Problem Solving | 8               | 0.56            |
| Reading Strategies |                |                |
| Global Reading Strategies | 13             | 0.69            |
| Support Reading Strategies | 9              | 0.52            |
| Overall Reading Strategies | 30             | 0.79            |

According to Table (1), although the alpha indices for the three strategy categories are moderate (0.52–0.69), the alpha index for the whole questionnaire is rather high, indicating internal consistency of the questionnaire with this study’s data. Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) provided a key to interpreting the mean for each item and overall item ratings of the SORS. They considered a mean ≤2.4 as low usage, 2.5–3.4 as medium usage, and ≥3.5 as high usage. We used the same rating to interpret item means in the present study.
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- Inferential Analysis of the Data

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics among the three reading strategy Categories (N=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Reading Strategies</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Reading Strategies</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>5.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Reading Strategies</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>7.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Reading Strategies</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M= Mean S.D. = Standard Deviation

According to Results of the SORS administered to EFL Intermediate learners reported medium to high use of reading strategies. The average use of reading strategies fell under medium level (M=3.02). The learners mostly preferred support reading strategies (M=3.92) during reading comprehension. Then the learners preferred using problem solving strategies (M=3.80). The least preferred strategy by the EFL Intermediate learners was global strategy (M=3.41).

Table 3: Preferences of Reading Strategy by EFL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>1. I have a purpose in mind when I read.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>2. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>3. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>4. I preview the text to see what it’s about before reading it.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>5. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>6. I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>7. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROB</td>
<td>8. I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I’m reading.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>9. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td>10. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROB</td>
<td>11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>12. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glob (Global Strategy), Prob (Problem Solving Strategy), Sup (Supporting Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline: Five most used strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italic: Five least used strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table (3) Intermediate EFL Learners’ preferences for Support reading strategies and Problem solving reading strategies, the most preferred strategy was item 5 “When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.” (M = 4.23, SD = 0.84). Also, strategies such as item 24 “24. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it” (M=3.94, SD=0.82) and item 20 “I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read” (M=3.88, SD=0.72). Based on these result these readers were, generally, aware of their reading process and capable of taking action while reading in order to overcome reading difficulties. In second part Intermediate learners’ preferences for problem-solving strategies suggests that these readers were, generally, aware of their reading process and capable of taking action while reading in order to overcome reading difficulties (Alhaqban and Riazi, 2010) Strategies such as item8 “I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand...
what I’m reading” (M=3.82, SD=0.98) and item 16 “When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I’m reading” (M=3.78, SD=0.80) and item 18 “I stop from time to time and think about what I’m reading” (M=3.58, SD=0.85). Table 3 shows that Intermediate EFL Learners’ least preferences for Global Reading Strategies. For instance: item 4 “I preview the text to see what it’s about before reading it” (M=3.22, SD=0.92) and item 17 “I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding” (M=3.50, SD=0.88) and item 25 “I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information” (M=3.69, SD=0.69). (Alhaqbani & Riazi, 2010) stated that the reason for these being among the least preferred strategies is probably due to the context itself, which does not, in reality, focus on these types of strategies, either in teaching methods or in curriculum and textbook design. Most of the textbooks and materials the students read are of an old-fashioned design, and rarely contain pictures or graphs. In addition, the reading materials assigned for reading in several subjects at the undergraduate level were presented as knowledge that needs to be learned rather than views or theories that the students could discuss or take a position about. This is not to suggest that the whole context does not support the students to be critical or to take another position, but it reveals that evaluation critical reading did not seem to be as common at the undergraduate level as it might be at the postgraduate level. In generally, the participants show high strategy use while reading (mean of Overall Reading Strategies = 3.02). Support Reading Strategies are the students’ favorite, followed by Problem Solving Reading Strategies and then Global Reading Strategies, irrespective of their reading ability. The prime preference for Support reading strategies (SUP), followed by Problem Solving (PROB) and support strategies (SUP), is consistent with previous studies that examined the perceptions’ of reading strategies via SORS Hungarian university students (Sheorey & Baboczky, 2008) and both ESL students and native English speaking U.S. college students (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001).

By contrary Li, 2010; Alsheikh, 2009; Alsheikh, 2011; Dhanapala, 2010;Mokhtari, 2008; Mónos, 2005; Zhang & Wu, 2009) who found that most use of reading strategies was problem solving reading strategies such as guess the meaning, read slowly but carefully, pay closer attention but on present study based on The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) (Sheorey & Mokhtari 2001) the Support Reading Strategies fall into the High Usage Group, and Global Reading Strategies are the least frequently used among the three strategies.

TOEIC Reading test is used for measuring the relationship between reading strategies (Global and Support) and reading comprehension ability.

Table 4: Descriptive analysis of relationship between Reading Strategy (Global and Support) and reading comprehension abililty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table (4) indicates, the mean of the Support Reading Strategy group is higher than that of the Global Reading Strategy group. Accordingly, the number of participants in Support Reading Strategy group was 27 and Global Reading Strategy group was 13; in addition, the amount of the standard deviation was lower in the Global Reading Strategy group as compared to the Support Reading Strategy group of the study which indicates that the Global Reading Strategy group scores are more homogenous than those of the Support Reading Strategy group. Therefore, based on result of Table (4) the mean score of both groups with learners’ population in each groups (Sup= 27, Glob= 13); there were very closely relationship between two groups but Support Reading Strategy Group (M=12.63) had better reading comprehension against Global Reading Strategy Group (M=11.8). The results in tables (2) and (3) and (4) indicated that
the null hypothesizes of the study were rejected. This rejection means that the data collection of the study was shown that Iranian Intermediate EFL learners use reading strategies (Global, Problem solving and Support) and they were aware about them; most used reading strategies by learners was Support reading strategies and then Problem solving and the least use was Global reading strategies. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference among Iranian intermediate EFL learners in terms of their preferred reading strategies. And based on research results learners who were in Support reading strategies group were successful than learners were in Global reading strategies group about reading comprehension ability. So the second research hypothesis was reject and there is a significant differences between types of reading strategies (Global and Support reading strategy) and scores of Iranian Intermediate EFL learners’ reading comprehension.

**Conclusion**

Great and successful readers use strategic skills to understanding meaning in a text and enjoy what you read. The findings of this study can be summarized as follows: a) type and frequency of reading strategies (Global, Problem-solving and Support reading strategies) do the Intermediate EFL learners use in the reading comprehension. Our results illustrate that learners in this level of English Proficiency have high awareness of reading strategy use and can be considered active readers due to their high usage of reading strategies. Among all the three strategy groups, Support Reading Strategies are the EFL learners’ favorite, followed by Problem Solving Reading Strategies and then Global Reading Strategies, irrespective of their reading ability. In contrast, use less global strategies and use more support and problem-solving strategies. Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) consider support and problem-solving strategies are advanced planning and comprehension monitoring techniques as metacognitive strategies, and are the deliberate actions readers take when comprehension problems develop as cognitive strategies. The Iranian Intermediate EFL learners show high strategy use while reading (mean of Overall Reading Strategies = 3.02). The results of the present study are against with the results of the few studies conducted on reading strategies using the same instrument (e.g. Anderson, 2003; Huang et al., 2009) or other instruments e.g. Coiro and Dobler, 2007; Huang et al., 2006. b) Measuring the relationship between Global reading strategies and Support reading strategies on reading comprehension ability by TOEIC Reading test. The mean score of Support Reading Strategy Group (M=12.63) shows that, Iranian Intermediate learners most often use this strategies than Global strategies (M=11.08) for better reading comprehension. Li (2010) in his study explored the high-proficiency students’ show more frequent use in all the three sub-categories.

**Implication**

For practical implications, generally, for a long time EFL students lead to use a fixed set of reading strategies to comprehension text. Consciously awareness of different kinds of metacognitive and cognitive reading strategies aware of reading strategies characteristic of skilled readers could be help students to more and better comprehending. More importantly, they should be consciously aware of the reading strategies characteristic of skilled readers. This study might provide better understanding of the pattern of reading strategy use by non-native Iranian Intermediate learners when reading text. The results of this study may be helpful for EFL learners in the shift of their approach from teacher-centered approach to learner-centered approach. Students who aware their reading strategies use will be self-direct and take more responsibility for meeting their own language reading dominant learning needs and less dependent on the classroom teacher. The aware teachers also will alter their teaching style somewhat to accommodate her students' reading strategies and employ instructional materials and strategies accordingly. These teachers can actively help students develop their reading strategies by trying out some strategies out or beyond their primary style preferences through strategy instruction approach. The results of the study reveal moderate relationship among reading strategies use (Global, Support and Problem Solving Reading Strategies). However, a major concern for all EFL teachers is how to help our students become better readers. Therefore, based on our discussion the following recommendations will be…
- Help EFL students become strategic readers and help them in the process of reading comprehension.
- Teach reading as problem identification.
- Useful for teachers of the universities, schools and language institutes.
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