Research Article

The Comparative Effect of Collaborative Strategic Reading and Metacognitive Reading Strategies on Extrovert and Introvert EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension

Pezhman Nourzad Haradasht [1], Mahnaz Saeidi [2*], Saeideh Ahangari [3]

[1, 2, 3] *Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*
*Corresponding author: m_saeidi@iaut.ac.ir

Abstract

This study investigated the comparative effect of collaborative strategic reading (CSR) and metacognitive reading strategy (MRS) on the reading comprehension of Iranian extrovert and introvert EFL learners. To achieve the purpose of this study, a sample IELTS was administered to 325 students studying at Marefat Language Academy in Tehran from whom 225 were selected based on their performance on that test. Next, the above students sat for Eysenck Personality Inventory questionnaire to determine their level of extroversion and introversion. As a result, a total of 150 learners (75 extroverts and 75 introverts) were selected as four experimental groups and two control groups. The four experimental groups, comprised of 1) 25 extroverts undergoing CSR, 2) 25 extroverts receiving MRS, 3) 25 introverts undergoing CSR, 4) 25 introverts undergoing MRS while the two control groups, with 25 extroverts and 25 introverts, the learners experienced the conventional procedure of teaching reading comprehension in the language school. Ancova and two-way Ancova were conducted which revealed introvert learners with MRS outperformed the extrovert with MRS, introvert and extrovert with CSR, and control groups, suggesting a decisive role for personality traits in reading comprehension classes with different reading strategies instruction.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Collaborative Strategic Reading, Extroverts, Introverts, Metacognitive Reading Strategy

Introduction

It is justified that reading is considered as the ultimate skill to be used in collaboration at school and all over life (Amin, 2019). Therefore, the basic of the language skills and the most important goal of reading process in second language is reading comprehension (Ortlieb, 2013), in which there are bridges between learners, learning activities, the learner's experience and the learner's prior knowledge to determine the meaning of a text (Mohaidat, 2018).

Despite numerous number of the research on the reading comprehension, gaining academic reading comprehension has always been considered as a big challenge in second language and foreign language contexts (Grabe, 2004; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Nation, 2000). For example, many ESL students often encounter the capacity to comprehend academic texts when they join university education. Thus, the lack of academic capacity leads to students' poor reading competence (Eshetie, 2010; Jeylan, 2010; Jha, 2014).

Dealing with reading texts, especially academic texts, requires some reading strategies that learners must be instructed. Hence, teaching reading strategy positively affects the reading comprehension of university learners. (Levine et al, 2000; Murphy et al, 2009), particularly in dealing with some of the comprehension questions on grasping the main idea and discovering the supporting details, and students, after strategy instruction practices, apply more top-down strategies, like finding the main ideas and summarizing (Bogale, 2018). Moreover, since readers use strategies to form organized mental representation and explanation of situation in the text, they help them comprehend the text (McNamara, 2007). Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) and Metacognitive Reading Strategy (MRS), implemented in this study, are the two reading comprehension strategies that are also regarded as deliberate and goal oriented processes used to construct meaning from the text (Afflerbach, Pearson & Paris, 2008). Therefore, the use of strategies is of significant importance for promoting good reading comprehension (Mc Namara, 2007; National Reading Panel, 2000; Presley & Harris, 2006).

CSR is a reading strategy that is research based strategy through which students are taught how to comprehend a text while being in small cooperative groups. (Riyawi, 2018). According to Klingner and Vaughn

(1996), CSR is set of students' strategies which include previewing the text; giving ongoing feedback by deciding "click" (I get it) or "clunk" (I don't get it) at the end of each paragraph; "getting the gist" is of the most important parts of the text; and "wrapping up" includes key ideas to find out how to help students of mixed achievement levels in which comprehension strategies are applied while reading content area text in small groups.

Reading comprehension and conceptual learning are improved via administering CSR in order to increase students' involvement. CSR, which has also led to positive outcomes for students of different proficiency levels, boosts skills of reading comprehension for learners with learning deficiencies and reading difficulties (Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 2002).

Huang (2004); Karimabadi, Khonamri, and Mahdavi (2015); Khori and Ahmad (2018); Klingner et al., (1998); Oladele and Oladele (2016); Standish (2005); Wang (2008) are the researchers whose works have found the positive effect of CSR on primary and secondary ESL and EFL learners' comprehension skills and motivation for learning.

Over the past years, the students' MRS have been extensively investigated (Dundar, 2016; Meniado, 2016; Temur & Bahar, 2011; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2012). According to Karbalaei (2010), "metacognition involves awareness and control of planning, monitoring, repairing, revising, summarizing, and evaluating" (p.166). Many studies have proved the correlation and efficacy of MRS training and its probable effect on reading comprehension (Ji, 2002; Liu, 2004; Yang & Zhang, 2002).

Mokhtari and Reichards (2002) have highlighted three different categories of cognitive reading strategies called global strategies, support strategies and problem solving strategies. Global strategies prepare the scene for reading act by looking at the title and contents, predicting about what the text conveys and diagnosing the purpose etc. Problem solving strategies means reading and understanding simultaneously by reading again for comprehending. Support strategies are some compensatory acts such as consulting dictionary, taking notes etc while reading a text. Therefore, teaching reading skill connected with metacognitive strategies not only creates efficient readers and boosts their critical thinking but also helps them to tackle the heavy task of reading (Azher & Awan, 2015).

Although the two strategies, CSR and MRS, may help the learners comprehend the text easily, one of the important factors is personality impacted by various factors ethnic background, culture, and environment, and it affects second language acquisition (Jacobson, 2007; Peregrine & John, 2009; Shanker, 2009). Extroversion and introversion are two personality types that have attracted the most attention in L2 research (Dornyei, 2005). According to Emerson, English, and McGoldrick (2016) the introverts' main characteristics are having interest in understanding concepts and ideas; relying on internal concepts more than on transitory external events; a the detachment of thoughtful contemplation; and solitude and privacy enjoyment while extroverts are defined as individuals with characteristics associated with extroversion: relying on the environment for both stimulation and guidance; having action orientation; being impulsive in meeting life; being frank; easing the communication; or having social skills" (p. 13).

Actions can be taken by extroverts and without them unending analysis and prototyping will remain infinite while without introverts important decisions depend largely on instinct and wordiness, with no critical reflection (Bennet & Quaal, 2018). As Noprianto (2017) states, identifying students' different characteristics might be helpful for English teachers to reach the objectives. Some scholars believe that extroversion is associated with better language learning performance (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000; Sidek, 2012), and some others consider introverted learners as the better learners (Gan, 2011). For example, Jafarpour, Roohani, and Hasanimanesh (2015) analyzed the impact on writing ability of extroversion and introversion personality types on EFL learners and it was found that introverts outperformed extroverts in writing courses. However, to the best knowledge of the researchers, there have been no studies, if any, on these personality types along with MRS and CSR reading strategies.

Hence, the findings of this study may contribute greatly to L2 research and pedagogy especially to improving Iranian EFL learners' academic reading comprehension skill by exercising CSR and MRS among two different types of personality traits, namely extrovert and introvert. In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1: Is there a significant difference between CSR and MRS in terms of extrovert EFL learners' reading comprehension?

RQ2: Is there a significant difference between CSR and MRS in terms of introvert EFL learners' reading comprehension?

Method

Participants

To fulfill the objectives of this study, 150 male EFL learners, studying English in advanced level, with the age range of 19-35, participated in this study. These participants were selected through the reading test of International English Language Testing System (IELTS) from 325 learners in the same language school. The participants whose scores fell one standard deviation above and below the mean were served as the target participants in this study. The participants were grouped in terms of personality types of extrovert and introvert, using Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). To avoid the confusion and have equal number of extrovert and introvert EFL learners in each class, firstly, EPI was run amongst 225 learners selected after answering the IELTS reading test out of 325 learners. After that, 150 learners were selected to have 75 extrovert and 75 introvert EFL learners of advanced level. The sample which comprised six intact classes, with the equal number of extroverts and introverts, were randomly assigned as four experimental and two control groups. Two of experimental groups underwent CSR strategy with 25 extroverts and 25 introverts, two other experimental groups experienced MRS strategy with 25 extroverts and 25 introverts, and the last two groups belonged to the control group with 25 extroverts and 25 introverts. In the control group, the teacher worked with the traditional approach to teaching reading comprehension. In the procedure section the details would be elaborated on.

Instruments

Putting into practice the theoretical aspects of the current study, the following instruments were utilized for data collection procedures.

Two samples of IELTS Reading Test as the Pretest and the Posttest of the Study

The test has four sections of listening, reading, writing, and speaking. The reading section, focus of the study, has three long passages of ascending-order questions and the learners have 60 minutes to answer 40 questions. To recognize the learners' levels in academic reading texts as the pretest of the study, an IELTS of academic module was administered. Furthermore, to discover the effectiveness of the treatment as the posttest of the study, another sample of IELTS reading test of academic module was conducted. The texts are about academic subjects and mostly with discursive genre.

Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI)

The Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 2004) is a questionnaire which intends to assess a person's personality. Initially, personality as two biologically-based categories of temperament which include extroversion/introversion and neuroticism/stability were conceptualized. The hugely validated test has 57 Yes/No questions. Those who filled out the EPI received four different kinds of scores: the E scale shows how much extrovert a person is, the N scale measures the neuroticism, the P scale is related to the psychoticism, and the L scale reveals Lie scale which measures how socially desirable a person has wanted to prove to be. Because the E score consists of 24 items, it is computed out of 24, the N score has 24 items, and the Lie score is out of 9. The researcher administered only E scale items which has 24 questions so that participants know the number of extroverts and introverts since this study focused on extroversion and introversion alone and it was not concerned with other psychological traits.

Course Book

The course books that were used in this study were Active Reading (book4) developed by Andersen (2008), Focus on IELTS written by Philip Gould and Michael Clutterbuck (2011), Oxford Word Skills (advanced) by Gairns and Redman (2008).

Procedure

The participants had 60 minutes to answer 40 questions of IELTS Academic reading test as the pretest of the study. The reading questions were of different types such as matching heading, matching information, true/false/not given, multiple choice questions, sentence completion, summary completion, note completion. After the pretest and analyzing the

learners' levels, the researcher put the learners in different groups. The first and the second experimental group of the study, 25 extroverts and 25 introverts, experienced CSR. In the preview step of the CSR, the students attempted in their own small cooperative groups to invent the best title for the reading passages. After that, they brainstormed their selected title for the reading passage with the teacher and the best title was chosen. Next, students predicted what types of information they might face according to the best title selected and they brainstormed this information in groups with the monitoring of the teacher.

In the second step of CSR, students did "click and clunk" in each section of the passage. Click and Clunk was about students' knowledge of the words and concepts. For example, if students comprehended the paragraph, click would happen. However, if they did not understand any words, ideas, information, etc the clunk would happen. The fix-up strategies on the clunk cards were as the following:

- ✓ Reread the sentence and the parts you know in order to get the parts you have problem with.
- ✓ Focus on the sentences before and after the clunks sentences
- ✓ Word formation such as prefix and suffix can guide you in the right direction to know the meaning of the word you have problem with
- ✓ Focus on the infix, meaning the smallest unit of the word, which has meaning in itself.

"Get the gist" was the third step of CSR according to which each individual shared his main idea with the other members of the group to come up with the most relevant main ideas for each paragraph. Therefore, the details of each paragraph (something that is not neglected in the summarization) were eliminated and the key information was conveyed by their own words.

"Wrap up" was the final step of the CSR through which students had shared their grasped details from the passage with the other members of the group and selected the best one to say to the whole class.

In the third and the fourth experimental group of the study, 25 extroverts and 25 introverts, the teacher tried to implement MRS with another 50

students. Following Preseely and Harris (2006), MRS in this group were classified into three steps of pre-reading (planning strategies), while reading (monitoring strategies), and post reading (evaluating strategies). According to Cubukcu (2007), in the "planning" step of MRS, students' background knowledge about the title, preview, picture, illustration, heading or subheading of the reading were activated in order to help them grasp the overview of the text. In this way some very general information about the text understood by the students. If students got the overall and general information about the text, their minds would be ready to start the text itself.

In the monitoring step of MRS, students did the monitoring during the reading. Monitoring contains the strategies such as comprehension of vocabulary, self-questioning, and summarizing (Phakiti, 2006). In other words, while students were reading the text they were trained to ask themselves if they comprehended what they were reading or not. However, this time questioning was not only about comprehending the text but they also had to even understand any vocabulary and grammar written in the paragraphs. Having done all these, they were asked to give summary of what they had been exposed to with every detail.

Evaluating strategies were used in the post reading stage when the task of reading was completed. For example, after the reading, students were trained to think in what cases they were able to apply what they had read to other situations. In other words, they were asked to simulate a situation in which they could exercise what they had learned in the passage in order to see whether they had grasped the key information in the passage or not.

In the fifth and sixth group of this study, control group, there were 25 introverts and 25 extroverts. In the control group the instruction in class was teacher-centered and the traditional teaching techniques were applied. Thus, naturally, students didn't do group activity. Primarily, the topic of the reading was introduced by the teacher and students' prior knowledge was activated by teacher's further explanation. After one of the students read the passage loudly, the teacher asked the meaning of the new vocabularies as well as synonyms and antonyms and also asked them if they had any comprehension problem. In this group the teacher and the students had the most of interaction.

After all these treatments, the six groups under their own reading strategy practices, CSR and MRS in experimental groups and traditional approaches in control group, underwent another reading test of IELTS as the posttest of the study in order to see if there was any significant difference among traditional approaches to reading comprehension, the CSR, and MRS across two personality traits of extrovert and introvert.

Results

The results obtained from the collected data are described with the related information. The research questions are examined and their results are explained. The normal distribution of the variables are ensured by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and in order to provide answer to the research questions, Ancova and 2-way Ancova tests are administered.

Reading comprehension pre-test results

The descriptive statistics was conducted on the pre-test scores of CSR, MRS, and control groups.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of the Reading Pre-test and Post-test in All Groups

Personality Traits		Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Extrovert	Collaborative	Pre-test	25	5.18	0.51
		Post-test	25	5.92	0.62
	Metacognitive	Pre-test	25	5.52	0.6
		Post-test	25	5.32	0.69
	Control	Pre-test	25	5.36	0.53
		Post-test	25	5.28	0.59
Introvert	Collaborative	Pre-test	25	5.26	0.61
		Post-test	25	5.38	0.65
	Metacognitive	Pre-test	25	5.24	0.5
		Post-test	25	6.38	0.41
	Control	Pre-test	25	5.36	0.72
		Post-test	25	5.28	0.59

As Table 1 indicates, in pre-test, among extrovert learners, the highest mean score of reading strategies belongs to MRS group with 5.52 and the standard deviation of 0.6. However, in posttest, the highest mean score of reading strategies is CSR group with 5.92 and the standard deviation of 0.62.In

addition, among introvert learners in pre-test, the highest mean score of reading strategies is in control group with the mean score of 5.36 with and the standard deviation of 0.72. However, in posttest, the highest mean score of reading strategies is in MRS group with the mean score of 6.38 and the standard deviation of 0.41.

Table 2

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normal Distribution of the Variables

Personality Traits		Groups	N	Kolmogrov-Smirnov	Sig
Extrovert	Collaborative	Pre-test	25	1.25	0.08
		Post-test	25	0.75	0.61
	Metacognitive	Pre-test	25	1.23	0.09
		Post-test	25	1.19	0.11
	Control	Pre-test	25	1.22	0.1
		Post-test	25	1.2	0.11
Introvert	Collaborative	Pre-test	25	1.32	0.06
		Post-test	25	1.2	0.11
	Metacognitive	Pre-test	25	1.08	0.18
		Post-test	25	1.46	0.052
	Control	Pre-test	25	0.84	0.47
		Post-test	25	1.2	0.11

 As Table 2 about the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov shows, the pre-assumption of normal distribution test of the variables ($p>0.05$) is confirmed. Thus, parametric tests will be used for answering the research questions.

Research Question 1

   The purpose of the first research question was to examine whether there is a significant difference between CSR and MRS on the reading comprehension of extrovert learners. For testing this question, Ancova test was administered.

Table 3
Levene's Test for Homogeneity of the Variances

.F	df1	df2	Sig
0.13	2	72	0.87

Initially, table 3 shows Levene's test was applied and the homogeneity of the variances is confirmed and the variances are the same (p>0.01).

Table 4 shows confirming the assumed pre-assumptions, the analysis of covariance (Ancova) on the scores of extrovert learners' comprehension in three groups. In this analysis, the pre-test scores are controlled statistically and the groups were compared based on the remained variance.

Table 4
The Results of Covariance Analysis related to the Difference between Collaborative and Metacognitive Models and Control Group on the Comprehension of Extrovert Learners

Variables	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig	Eta
Pre-test	0.43	1	0.43	1.05	0.3	0.01
Subcategories	5.47	2	2.73	6.73	0.002	0.15
Error	28.89	71	0.4			

The results of covariance analysis revealed that there is a significant difference between learners' comprehension score in three groups (p<0.05, F=6.73, Eta=0.15), and by collaborative model, we can improve extrovert learners' comprehension skills for 15%. In addition, table 5 indicates that the comprehension score of the learners in collaborative model with the mean score of 5.89 is significantly higher than other models and it is significantly effective in improving extrovert learners' comprehension skill.

Table 5

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Extrovert Learners' Comprehension Scores in Three Groups

Subcategories	Mean	Std Error	95% confidence interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Collaborative	5.89	0.13	5.63	6.15
Metacognitive	5.34	0.13	5.08	5.6
Control	5.28	0.12	5.02	5.53

Research Question 2

The second research question examined whether there is a significant difference between collaborative strategic reading and metacognitive reading strategy on the reading comprehension of introvert learners. For testing this question, Ancova test was administered.

Table 6

Levene's Test for Homogeneity of the Variances

F	df1	df2	Sig
3.49	2	72	0.03

Initially, table 6 shows Levene's test was applied and the homogeneity of the variances is confirmed and the variances are the same ($p>0.01$).

Table 7 indicates the analysis of covariance (Ancova) on the scores of introvert learners' reading comprehension in three groups. In this analysis, the effect of scores related to the similar variable is removed from the comprehension scores of the learners in three groups, and the groups were compared based on the remained variance.

Table 7
The Results of Covariance Analysis Related to the Difference between Collaborative and Metacognitive Models and Control Group on the Comprehension of Introvert Learners

Variables	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig	Eta
Pre-test	1.74	1	1.74	5.88	0.01	0.07
Subcategories	19.11	2	9.55	32.2	0.000	0.47
Error	21.07	71	0.29			

The results of covariance analysis revealed that there is no significant difference between learners' reading comprehension score in two groups (p<0.05, F=32.2, Eta=0.47), and by metacognitive model, we can improve learners' reading comprehension skill for 47%.

Table 8
Mean and Standard Deviation of the Introvert Learners' Comprehension Scores in Three Groups

Subcategories	Mean	Std Error	95% confidence interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Collaborative	5.38	0.1	5.16	5.6
Metacognitive	6.39	0.1	6.17	6.6
Control	5.26	0.1	5.04	5.47

Table 8 reveals that the comprehension score of the learners in metacognitive model with the mean score of 6.39 is significantly higher than other models and the metacognitive model is significantly effective in improving introvert learners' reading comprehension skill.

Discussion

Investigating the effect of two reading comprehension models (CRS & MRS) on Iranian EFL learners' academic reading comprehension across two personality types of extrovert and introvert was the overarching aim of this study. To address the objective of the research, a quasi-experimental study was set out. The results of data analysis revealed that the groups receiving MRS outperformed the CSR groups and control groups and CSR groups outperformed the control group as well. Moreover, personality traits had

effects on reading comprehension skill of the participants; that is, MRS introvert group outperformed MRS extrovert group and CSR in both introvert and extrovert groups.

Indicating the efficiency of MRS groups, a cogent body of research has already been carried out by Soodla, Jogi and Kikas (2016), Meniado (2016), Iwai (2016), Rassul (2018), Aghaie, and Zhang (2012), Xin, Ismail, and Ahmad (2018), Gomez Gonzalez (2017), Peñuela (2018), Liao and Chiang (2016) who have examined the impact of explicit instruction of MRS on reading comprehension. However, what is significant in the findings of the current study is the contribution of the personality trait, which causes lower performance in extroverts in comparison with introverts. That is, extrovert learners did not benefit being taught explicitly about MRS since in the three categories of the MRS, global strategies, support strategies, problem solving strategies which are believed to contribute to efficient reading (Zhang and Wu, 2009), learners are not supposed to be involved in any group work activity which is an outstanding feature of extroverted learners. However, introverts benefitted greatly from explicit instruction of MRS in comparison with extroverts which is in line with Kayaoglu (2013) conclusion that metacognitive and cognitive strategies are preferred more by introverts than extroverts. Therefore, the findings of this study revealed that personality type, extroverts and introverts, play a key role in the efficiency of the MRS strategy

Regarding the superiority of the CSR over control group, the findings of the current study are supported with the earlier findings by Oladele and Oladele (2016), Gani, Yusuf, and Susiani (2016), Khori and Ahmad (2018), Riyawi (2018), Rojabi (2018), Mursalina (2018), Jafre and Riswanto (2012), Riani (2013) who have investigated applying of CSR in improving students' reading comprehension at different levels. For example, the research findings of Fan (2010) revealed that CSR is more significant in improving the students' reading comprehension than the traditional teacher-led reading approach which focuses on vocabulary and grammar teaching. However, findings of the current study contradicted it as it revealed the introvert control group, teacher-led, was more successful in comparison with CSR group with the same personality trait. Thus, introverted learners did not benefit from the collaborative nature of the CSR. As Noprianto (2017)

mentioned, they seek their own individualistic perspective in learning. CSR with collaborative feature in nature, was more appropriate for the extroverted since they gained the second highest score in the current study. Therefore, as Brown (2007) mentioned, strategies applied by learners according to their personality and learning styles, so different language learning strategies are not exercised by themselves.

Although the current study lends credence to the significant impact of the reading strategies (MRS & CSR) on the reading comprehension of the learners mentioned in the study, it further highlights the role of personality traits, extroverts and introverts. Some researchers consider extroverted learners better language learners and some others believe counterevidence in favor of introverted learners (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000; Sidek, 2012; Gan, 2011). Moreover, Lightbown (2013) suggests that many classroom teachers are convinced that extrovert students are more successful in L2 learning than their introvert counterparts. However, this study substantiates metacognitive reading strategies with introverted learners proved to be more efficient than extroverted learners in CSR and MRS groups.

One of the implication of the study was about the MRS which enables teachers to fulfil the challenging task of English language teaching in EFL contexts which provides less exposure to language than ESL contexts. This study also elaborates on the significance of metacognitive strategy training by providing the further related evidence. Another pedagogical implication can be resulted from the effectiveness of CSR on the academic reading comprehension of the extrovert learners. CSR was an appropriate strategy that had a significant effect on students' reading comprehension achievement in extrovert group. Therefore, there is the need to prepare the students carefully for collaboration. However, one of the important features of collaboration is the shared goals and motivation among the students and the teachers cannot assume that students will gain it automatically, which warrants teachers' special attention to cultivating it.

Therefore, both practitioners and theoreticians in the field of language teaching can benefit from the findings of this research. Accordingly, required measures can be taken to improve EFL learners' reading

comprehension in general and academic reading comprehension in particular.

Declaration of interest: none

References

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 364-373. doi: 10.1598/RT.61.5.1.

Ahmadi, M., Ismail, H. & Abdulla (2013). The Importance of Meta-cognitive Reading Strategy

Awareness in Reading Comprehension. *English Language Teaching, 6* (10), 235-244.

Amin, M. R. (2019). Developing Reading Skills through Effective Reading Approaches. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 4*(1), 35_40.

Azher, M., & Awan, R. U. N. (2015). Meta-cognitive Reading Strategies. *Journal of Education and Research, 2*(1), 19_32. http://uos.edu.pk/.

Bennett, C., & Quaal, A. (2018). I need a minute: Teaching and learning as introverts in an extroverted culture. *Kaleidoscope: Educator Voices and Perspectives, 4*(2), 7–10.

Bogale, Y. N. (2018). Conceptualizing Reading to Learn: Strategy Instruction and EFL Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 10*(2), 93_117.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman.

Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 56, 453–484.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 355-365. http://doi.org/c6tffk

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner. Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dundar, S. (2016). Determining EFL students' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies. *ELT Reasearch Journal, 5*(1), 47–59.

Emerson, T. L. N., English, L., & McGoldrick, K. M. (2016).Cooperative learning and personality types. *International Review of Economics Education, 46*(1), 21- 29.

Eshetie, A. (2010). *Language Policies and the Role of English in Ethiopia*. Unpublished Thesis. Retrieved from http://www.besig.org/ braries/Bielefeld-Docs.

Eskey, D. E. (2005). Reading in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 563-580). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum `   Associates.

Eysenk, M. W. (2004). *Psychology an international perspective*. NY: Psychology Press Ltd.

Fan, Y.C. (2010). *Implementing Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) in an EFL context in Taiwan.* Unpublished Thesis. Retrieved on September 3rd 2010, from http://Ira.le.ac.uk/handle/2381/434.

Gan, Z. (2011). An investigation of personality and L2 oral performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*, 1259-1267. http://doi.org/fntndn

Gani, S. A., Y. Q. Yusuf, and R. Susiani. (2016). "Progressive Outcomes of Collaborative Strategic Reading to EFL Learners." *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences 37* (3): 144–149. doi:10.1016/j.kjss.2016.08.004.

Gorsuch, G., & Taguchi, E. (2010). Developing reading fluency and comprehension using repeated reading: Evidence from longitudinal student reports. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(1), 27-59.

Grabe, W. (2004). Second language reading. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed,), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F.L. (2002).*Teaching and Researching Reading.* Harlow: Longman.

Huang, C. Y. (2004). *Think to win: An inquiry-based approach via Collaborative Strategic Reading technique to teach English reading in a senior high EFL classroom.* National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Jafarpour, A., Roohni, A., & Hasanimanwsh, A. (2015). The impact of extroversion and introversion personality types on EFL learners' writing ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(1), 212-218.

Jafre, M. & Riswanto.(2012).Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) within cognitive and metacognitive strategies perspectives. *European Journal of Business and Management,1*(4), 61-69. Retrieved from http://www.iiste.org.

Jeylan, W. (2010). English supremacy in Ethiopia– autoethnographic reflections. In Kathleen, & Tove (Eds.), *Multilingual Education Works*. New Delhi. Orient Black Swan.

Jha, S. (2014) Shall we teach English as a subject or as a language? *Education Practice and Innovation, 1*(1), 17-24.

Ji Kangli. (2002). Metacognitive Strategy Training in Foreign Language Learning. *Foreign Language World, 3*, 20-26 (in Chinese).

Karbalaei, A. R. (2010). A comparison of the metacognitive reading strategies used by EFL and ESL Readers, *The Reading Matrix 10*, (2) pp. 165-180.

Karimabadi, M., F. Khonamri, and O. Mahdavi. (2015). "Investigating Iranian Students' Attitude Toward Using Collaborative Strategic Reading in Their Reading Course." *WALIA Journal 31* (3): 260–265. http://waliaj.com/wp-content/2015/ Special20Issue203,202015/46202015-31-S3-pp.260-265.pdf.

Kayaoglu, M.N. (2013). Impact of extroversion and introversion on language learning behaviors. *Social Behavior and Personality, 41*(5), 819-826. http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.5.819.

Khori, Mhd & Ahmad, A. (2018). Enhancing Students' Reading Comprehension through the Collaboration between Reciprocal Teaching and Cooperative Learning. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. 1st International Conference of Innovation in Education,178,* 574-577 Retrieved fromhttp://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Klinger, J.K and Vaughn, S. (1998). *Using CSR*. Retrieved June 22nd 2010, from http://www.idonline.org/id in depth/teaching technique/collab reading.html.

Koulianou, M. & Samartzi, S. (2018). Greek teachers' metacognitive awareness on reading strategies. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences.* [Online]. *5*(1), pp. 68–74. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Levine, A., Ferenz, O., Reves, T. (2000). EFL academic reading and modern technology. How can we turn our students into independent critical readers? *TESL-EJ 4*(4) Available: http://www-writing.berkley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej16/al.html. Retrieved on October 12 2011.

Lightbown, P. S. N., Margaret. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liu Huijun. (2004). Relationship Between Metacognitive Strategy and English Reading. *Foreign Language and Foreign Language Learning, 12*, 24-26(in Chinese).

McNamara, D. S. (2007). *Reading comprehension Strategies: Theories, Intervention, and*

Technologies, Mahwah, NJ:Erlbaum.

Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive reading strategies, motivation, and reading comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. *English Language Teaching, 9*(3), 117–129.

Mohaidat, M, T. (2018). The Impact of Electronic Mind Maps on Students' Reading Comprehension. *English Language Teaching, 11*(4), 1-32.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94* (2), 249-259

Murphy, P.K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soler, A. O., Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effect of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 740-764.

Mursalina, S. (2018). The Use of Collaborative Strategic Reading to Teach Reading. *Research in English and Education (READ), 3*(2), 160-167

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: an evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implication for reading instructions.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Noprianto, E. (2017). Extrovert versus Introvert Students: What EFL Learning Strategy do They Use? *Asian TEFL, 2*(2), 119_135.

Oladele,A.O., & Oladele. I.T. (2016). "Effectiveness of Collaborative Strategic Reading and Whole Language Approach on Reading Comprehension Performance of Children with Learning Disabilities in Oyo State Nigeria Adetoun." *International Journal on Language, Literature and Culture in Education 3* (1): 1–24. doi:10.1515/llce-2016-0001.

Ortlieb, E. (2013). Using Anticipatory Reading Guides to Improve Elementary Students' Comprehension. *International Journal of Instruction, 6*(2), 145-162

Pressley, M., & Harris, K. R. (2006). Cognitive strategies instruction: from basic research to classroom instruction. In Andreassen, R., & Braten, I. 2011. Implementation and effects of explicit reading comprehension instruction in fifth-grade classrooms. *Internet journal. Available: http//www.elseviers.com/locate/learninstruc.* Retrieved on October 7 2011.

Riani, D. O. (2013). Collaborative strategic reading implementation to improve students' reading comprehension. *English Review: Journal of English Education,1*(2),231-239

Riyawi, R. M. (2018). The Effect of Applying Collaborative Strategy Reading toward Students' Reading Comprehension at the Eight Grade of MTs Hubbul Wathan Duri. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan, 10* (1), 2087-9490.

Rojabi, A. R. (2018). Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) in Improving the English Department Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement. *Journal of English Teaching Adi Buana, 3*(2), 127-139.

Shabani, K., Samarghandi, S., Bakhshi, E. (2016). The Effect of Content Feedback on Extroverted and Introverted English Learners' Reading Comprehension Ability. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 3*(2), 1579-1599. Retrieved from http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index

Shanker W. (2009). Reading comprehension development.Cockrum, *edition,* p. 161-162.

Sidek, H. M. (2012). EFL language learning personality traits and instruction. *The International Journal of Learning*, *18*, 255-272.

Standish, L. G. (2005). *The effects of Collaborative Strategic Reading and direct Instruction in persuasion on sixth-grade students' persuasive writing and attitudes.* Maryland: University of Maryland, College Park.

Sultana, F. (2014). *Efficacy of Outside.* Classroom English Language Learning: A Study of Intermediate Bengali Medium Students Studying English at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh.

Tavakoli , H. (2014). The Effectiveness of Metacognitive Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension: The Case of Iranian University EFL Students. *The Reading Matrix, 14* (2), 314-336.

Temur, T. & Bahar, O. (2011). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of Turkish learners who learn English as a Foreign Language. *European Journal of Educational Studies, 3*(2), 421–427.

Wang, T.H. (2008). *The Effect of modified Collaborative Strategic Reading on EFL learners' Reading Comprehension.* Unpublished MA dissertation, National Changhua University of Education, Changhua, Taiwan.

Yang Xiaohu & Zhang Wenpeng. (2002). Correlation Studies on Chinese College Students' Metacognitionand English Reading Comprehension. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 3*, 213-218.

Yuksel, I. & Yuksel, I. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. Procedia—*Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 894–898.

Biodata

Pezhman Nourzad Haradasht is a PhD candidate at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch, and has been teaching English for 15 years in different language schools in Tehran. He has also been teaching English for BA students of Islamic Azad University, Shahre Ghods branch for 7 years. His interests include theories in SLA, Psychology of language learning and teaching, and teacher training. He has published articles both nationally and internationally in different areas of language education.

Mahnaz Saeidi, an associate professor of Applied Linguistics at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, is the editor-in-chief of the journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice and the director of Academic Translation center. She has published many books and articles and presented papers at national and international conferences. Her research interests are multiple intelligences, feedback, and intercultural competence.

Saeideh Ahangari is an assistant professor in TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran. Her main interests are Task-based language, Teaching, awareness studies, and their interface with the issues in language testing. She has published many articles and participated in many national and international conferences.