

An investigation into Reading Strategies used by English Major Students at the Faculty of Arts in Al Qubba Campus, university of Derna

Tahar Fadhil *

Department of English Language, Faculty of Arts Al Qubba, University of Derna, Al Qubba, Libya

تحقيق في استراتيجيات القراءة التي يستخدمها طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية في كلية الآداب /القبّة، جامعة درنة

طاهر محمد فضيل *

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب/ القبّة، جامعة درنة، مدينة القبّة، دولة ليبيا

*Corresponding author: t.fadhil@uod.edu.ly

Received: February 27, 2026

Accepted: April 25, 2026

Published: April 26, 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract:

This study examined cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies employed by Libyan English major students at university of Derna, faculty of arts in Al Qubba Campus. This study is guided by a question: what are the most frequently used reading strategies cognitive or metacognitive among Libyan English major students in the faculty of Arts in Al Qubba Campus at the university of Derna? The participants in this study were 72 students (26 males and 46 females). A 36-item self-report questionnaire developed by (Phakiti, 2006) was used to collect the data. The findings indicate that participants employed metacognitive reading strategies more frequently than cognitive strategies. Specifically, within metacognitive strategies, planning and monitoring strategies were more prevalent than evaluating strategies. Among cognitive reading strategies, retrieval and memory strategies were found to be more commonly employed than comprehending strategies. The findings have significant recommendations and pedagogical implications for EFL teaching practices, emphasizing the importance of employing both cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: Reading Strategies, Cognitive, Metacognitive, EFL Libyan, English Major Students.

المخلص

تناولت هذه الدراسة تحقيقاً في استراتيجيات القراءة المعرفية وما وراء المعرفية التي يستخدمها الطلاب الليبيين المتخصصون في اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة درنة، كلية الآداب بفرع القبّة. وتسترشد هذه الدراسة بتساؤل رئيسي: ما هي استراتيجيات القراءة (المعرفية أو ما وراء المعرفية) الأكثر استخداماً بين الطلاب الليبيين المتخصصين في اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية الآداب فرع القبّة في جامعة درنة؟ بلغ عدد المشاركين في هذه الدراسة 72 طالباً وطالبة (26 من الذكور و46 من الإناث). ولجمع البيانات، تم استخدام استبانة مكونة من 36 فقرة، والتي طورها (Phakiti, 2006). وتشير النتائج إلى أن المشاركين استخدموا استراتيجيات القراءة ما وراء المعرفية بشكل أكثر تكراراً مقارنة بالاستراتيجيات المعرفية. وعلى وجه التحديد، ضمن الاستراتيجيات ما وراء المعرفية، كانت استراتيجيات التخطيط والمراقبة أكثر انتشاراً من استراتيجيات التقييم. أما بالنسبة لاستراتيجيات القراءة المعرفية، فقد وُجد أن استراتيجيات الاسترجاع والذاكرة تُستخدم بشكل أكثر شيوعاً من استراتيجيات الفهم والاستيعاب. وتقدم هذه النتائج توصيات وآثاراً تربوية مهمة لممارسات تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL)، مؤكدةً على أهمية توظيف كل من استراتيجيات القراءة المعرفية وما وراء المعرفية في الفصول الدراسية.

Introduction

Reading is one of the four basic language skills which is important for EFL (English as a foreign Language) and ESL (English as a second Language) learners. It is the ability to recognize written words. Reading strategies play a crucial role in enabling students to acquire the skills necessary for learning a second or foreign language. Reading is a significant basic skill in any language. It is the most important skill for learners who learn English as a foreign language or as a second language (Grabe, 1991). Several scholars (Nation, 2009; Oxford, 2017) emphasize that reading strategies play significant contribution to improving reading comprehension among second and foreign language learners. Therefore, it is imperative to clearly understand what reading strategies entail. Reading strategies can be defined as the techniques and approaches that readers consciously employ to enhance their comprehension (Baker & Boonkit, 2004). Moreover, developing a solid understanding of English reading strategies, along with an awareness of how to apply them effectively, is essential for learners seeking to strengthen their reading proficiency (Zheng, 2023). Reading strategies are categorized into cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Consequently, the present study aims to address this research gap by investigating cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies utilized by Libyan English major in the eastern region of Libya specifically among students at the University of Derna. This study might provide valuable insights into improving English language instruction tailored to students' specific needs, thereby fostering more effective and engaging learning environments. In doing so, this study attempts to answer the following question:

What are the most frequently used reading strategies cognitive or metacognitive among Libyan English major students in the faculty of Arts in Al Qubba Campus at the university of Derna?

Literature Review

Reading is commonly thought to be the ability of recognizing the written words. According to Nunan (1999) reading is a receptive language skill and it is the process of receiving information from a text.

Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are the techniques and actions used by readers during working with the text (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001, 436). Cognitive strategies are "the actions and procedures readers use while working directly with the text" (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). Cognitive strategies contain procedures like making predictions, translating, summarizing, linking with prior knowledge, applying grammar rules, and guessing meaning from contexts (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990). Rubin (1987) defines cognitive strategies as the actions used directly by readers to process information from a text. Cognitive strategies are divided into three types: comprehending strategies, memory strategies, and retrieval strategies.

Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive strategies are identified as high level of strategies. These strategies are based on the concept of metacognition which is, Phakiti (2003) describes these strategies as "thinking about thinking". It is "a conscious awareness of our thinking and learning process" (Lems, Miller, & Soro, 2010, p. 181). Metacognitive strategies help readers prepare for a reading task, monitor the task as they continue the task, and finally evaluate the task after completion (Grabe & Stroller, 2002). Therefore, metacognitive strategies are divided into three types of strategies: planning strategies, monitoring strategies, and evaluating strategies.

Previous Studies

Several previous studies have investigated reading strategies used by learners in various contexts. Nazurty et. al. (2019) found that cognitive strategies were the most utilized reading strategies by Indonesian learners. Ahmed (2020) revealed that cognitive strategies were the most utilized reading strategies by Omani EFL learners, with support strategies and metacognitive strategies following in preference. However, Hasibuan et. al. (2022) discovered that the dominant reading strategy was metacognitive strategy among Indonesian students. However, only one study has investigated metacognitive reading strategies of EFL Libyan University Learners (Ghwela, et al., 2017). This study focused only on metacognitive reading strategies used by female first-year university students enrolled at Al-Asmariya Islamic University in the western region of Libya. This limitation is attributed not only to the lack of investigation of metacognitive reading strategies but also to the restricted geographical scope of the survey within Libya.

Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive quantitative approach in the form of a survey design. As stated by Cresswell (2013), quantitative research involves gathering data to quantify information and analyze it statistically to either support or challenge different knowledge claims. The researcher selected this method due to the use of a Likert-scale questionnaire for data collection.

Participants

A total of 72 undergraduate students involved in this study from English Language department, faculty of Arts/ Al Qubba at University of Derna. Their ages range from 18 to 23. The participants were 26 male (36.1%) and 46 were female (63.9%). All participants are Libyan students learning English as a foreign language, with Arabic being their native language and they have been learning English language since grad five in primary school.

Instrument

This study was used in a self-report questionnaire developed by (Phakiti, 2006). This questionnaire contains 36 items about two strategies: cognitive and metacognitive. The questionnaire items were designed on a five-point Likert Scale, and the students were asked to indicate the frequency with which they used the reading strategy implied in the statement by using the five-point Likert Scale ranging from always to never given after each statement. The responses were rated as always=5, usually=4, sometimes=3, occasionally=2, and never=1. Of the thirty-six reading strategy items, equal number (eighteen) of cognitive and metacognitive strategies were used. Under cognitive strategies seven strategy items (5, 8, 12, 14, 23, 31, and 34) belonged to comprehending strategies; six strategy items (9, 13, 15, 19, 22, and 25) belonged to memory strategies while the rest (2, 7, 17, 29, and 33) were used for retrieval strategies. Under the metacognitive strategies seven strategy items (1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 16, and 26) belonged to planning strategies; six strategy items (11, 18, 21, 24, 28, and 32) belonged to monitoring strategies while the rest (20, 27, 30, 35, and 36) were used for evaluating strategies. In this study the reading strategies questionnaire confirmed a reliability coefficient of 0.87, which is commonly accepted standard for internal consistency.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The questionnaire was administered in class to 72 students under the supervision of the researcher during the academic year 2025-2026. The aim of the study and the instructions were explicitly explained to the participants, and they were informed that there were no right or wrong answers to any questions. The process of distribution and collection of the questionnaire took about 20 minutes. The data that has been obtained from the survey conducted through questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 27.0). Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were computed for each variable's responses to identify the most employed reading strategies by the participants. To represent the utilization of reading strategies as reported in the survey, three levels (High, Moderate, and Low) of reading strategy usage (as depicted in Table 2) were established following Oxford and Burry-Stock's (1995) recommendations for language learning strategy use. The average scores of students' responses to specific reading strategy items were utilized to indicate the frequency of perceived adoption of academic reading strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002).

Results and Discussion

Before showing the results of the study, a demographic description of the participants of the study is important to be analyzed. The data used in the analysis was collected from 72 EFL Libyan undergraduate students from the Faculty of Arts at Al Qubba Campus of the University of Derna, Libya. The details of the participants' demographics are presented in the following:

Table 1 Participants' Demographics

Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	26	36.1%
Female	46	63.9%
Age		
18-20	39	54.2%
21-23	33	45.8%
University Stage		
First year	24	33.3%
Second year	22	30.6%
Third year	13	18.1%
Fourth year	13	18.1%

Table 1 provides a demographics description of the participants in the study. showing gender, age distribution, and their progression in university. Most of the participants were female 46 which equal 63.9%, with a small proportion of male participants 26, which equal 36.1%. The distribution of the participants' age indicates that group ages 18 to 20 were higher with 54.2% than group age 21 to 23 with 45.8%. The distribution of the participants was across all four years of university study, with the largest number of respondents was from the first-year students 24, which equal 33.3% while the smallest was only 13 from third -year students 18.1% similarly to fourth -year students.

To describe the classification of reading strategy utilization, Oxford & Burry-Stock's (1995) stated three levels of reading strategy usage: high, moderate, and low whereas the mean score of 3.5 and above are considered as high level, mean score from 2.5 to 3.49 moderate level, while mean score of 2.49 and below is viewed as low level.

Table 2 Range of Means and Level of Strategy Use

Range of Mean scores	Level of use
Mean of 3.5 or higher	High
Means of 2.5 to 3.49	Moderate
Mean of 2.49 or lower	Low

This study aims to examine the reading strategies employed by university students enrolled in one government institution in eastern Libya. Table 3 demonstrates overall and categories of reading strategies utilized by EFL Libyan undergraduate students majoring English language from the Faculty of Arts at Al Qubba Campus of the University of Derna.

Table 3 Overall and Categories of Reading Strategy Use

Reading strategy	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level of use
Cognitive strategies	3.85	0.55	High
Metacognitive strategies	3.83	0.73	High
Overall strategies	3.84	0.59	High

The findings in Table 3 presented that the level of use of both categories of reading strategies was high with the mean for cognitive reading strategies (M = 3.85) was slightly greater than that for metacognitive strategies (M = 3.83). These findings indicate that students tend to employ cognitive reading strategies more frequently than metacognitive. The findings are coordinated with that of prior studies (Nazurty et. al. 2019; Ahmed, 2020). One possible reason for this consistency might be due to learning objective similarities of English as a foreign language irrespective of geographical context. The causes behind Libyan English major students preferred cognitive reading strategies could be related to doing the learning tasks rather than thinking and reflecting on what they are doing and to teaching that is viewed as teacher-centered in the Libyan context where the students are basically directed and controlled by teachers for doing tasks in the class. Nevertheless, the result is inconsistent with Hasibuan et. al. (2022)'s study who found that metacognitive strategies were the most employed reading strategies by Indonesian students. Such contradictory findings might be due to different cultural backgrounds which could have an impact on the usage of reading strategies.

Table 4 Subcategories of Reading Strategy Use

Reading strategy categories	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level of use
Evaluating strategies	3.65	0.83	High
Comprehending strategies	3.75	0.61	High
Memory strategies	3.88	0.70	High
Retrieval strategies	3.92	0.64	High
Planning strategies	3.93	0.83	High
Monitoring strategies	3.93	0.83	High

The results in Table 4 show that the highest means (M=3.93) was for monitoring strategies, while the lowest means (M=3.65) was for Evaluating strategies of all subcategories of reading strategies. The findings also indicate that the students used comprehending strategies at a high level but still lower than other strategies. Monitoring strategies, which come under metacognitive strategies, allow students to interact with the text actively during the reading process. This indicates that students used monitoring strategies most frequently, at a high level, while their use of evaluating strategies was at a high level but the lowest level of use among all strategies. The findings exposed that while students employed evaluating and comprehending strategies at a moderate level, their use of other strategies such as monitoring, planning, retrieval and memory was at a high level. This suggests that students are more actively engaged in pre- and while-reading activities such as monitoring, summarizing, planning, scanning, activating background knowledge and recalling information than in while-reading activities such as note-taking, analyzing. Monitoring and planning strategies, a key component of metacognitive reading strategies, are vital for setting clear reading goals, knowledge activation, and monitoring with planning both before and during reading tasks. Another possible explanation is students' proficiency level; lower English proficiency students may rely more heavily on literal and decoding comprehension rather than engaging in higher-order planning or monitoring strategies while reading.

Cognitive Reading Strategies

The table provides details of cognitive reading strategies with subcategories items employed by EFL Libyan students majoring English language from University of Derna, faculty of arts at the Al Qubbah Campus. The data uses a Likert scale (1–5) to categorize the level of use for eighteen items across three main cognitive reading strategies: Comprehending, Memory, and Retrieval strategies. Also it shows a descriptive statistic including frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation, while 5=always, 4= usually, 3= sometimes, 2= occasionally, 1= never, M= mean, and SD= standard deviation.

Table 5 Use of Individual Reading Strategies under Cognitive Category

SN	Cognitive strategies	5	4	3	2	1	M	SD	Level of Use
Comprehending strategies									
5	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	58.3%	16.7%	12.5%	8.3%	2.4%	4.16	1.18	High
8	Translating to native language.	40.3%	22.2%	13.9%	11.1%	12.5%	3.66	1.42	High
12	Using reference materials (e.g. dictionaries).	38.9%	16.7%	15.3%	16.7%	12.5%	3.52	1.46	High
14	Thinking about information both in English and native language.	43.1%	23.6%	13.9%	9.7%	9.7%	3.80	1.34	High
23	Using skimming and scanning to find main ideas and specific information.	34.7%	19.4%	29.2%	6.9%	9.7%	3.62	1.29	High
31	Paying more attention to the meanings of individual words.	31.9%	27.8%	13.9%	15.3%	11.1%	3.54	1.37	High
34	Summarizing the main ideas for better understanding	51.4%	15.3%	13.9%	16.7%	2.8%	3.95	1.26	High
Memory Strategies									
9	Using text features (e.g. tables, figures).	29.2%	18.1%	18.1%	16.7%	18.1%	3.23	1.48	Moderate
13	Taking notes while reading.	47.2%	20.8%	19.4%	5.6%	6.9%	3.95	1.23	High
15	Highlighting or under lining key words in the text.	52.8%	22.2%	11.1%	8.3%	5.6%	4.08	1.21	High
Memory Strategies									

SN	Cognitive strategies	5	4	3	2	1	M	SD	Level of Use
19	Reading aloud to help remember information.	41.7%	16.7%	12.5%	11.1%	18.1%	3.52	1.55	High
22	Rereading the text for better understanding.	65.3%	15.3%	12.5%	4.2%	2.8%	4.36	1.03	High
25	Paraphrasing for better understanding.	51.4%	22.2%	18.1%	5.6%	2.8%	4.13	1.07	High
Retrieval strategies									
2	Using background knowledge and relevant experiences.	44.4%	40.3%	6.9%	8.3%	0.0%	4.20	0.90	High
7	Using knowledge of English language.	54.2%	26.4%	12.5%	1.4%	5.6%	4.22	1.09	High
17	Using knowledge of word structure, prefixes and suffixes.	43.1%	19.4%	20.8%	9.7%	6.9%	3.81	1.28	High
29	Remembering the purposes while reading.	41.7%	22.2%	23.6%	12.5%	0.0%	3.93	1.07	High
33	Looking back and forth in the text to find	23.6%	27.8%	30.6%	6.9%	11.1%	3.45	1.24	Moderate

Note: 5=always, 4= usually, 3= sometimes, 2= occasionally, 1= never, M= mean, SD= standard deviation

The result in Table 5 showed that all subcategories of cognitive reading strategies were used with high level of frequencies and mean scores, for comprehending strategies item 5 "*Guessing the meaning of unknown words*" was the most used strategy, received the highest mean score in this category (M=4.16, SD=1.18) with over 58% of students reporting they always use it. Other strategies such as "*Summarizing main ideas*" got high mean (M=3.95, SD=1.26) signify a high level of active interactions with reading text. However, strategies relying on the native language like "*Thinking in English and native language*" (M=3.80, SD=1.34) and "*Translating to native language*" (M=3.66, SD=1.42) received a slightly high levels of usage. Memory strategies contain the item with the highest overall frequency in the study with 65.3% of students said that they always use "*Rereading the text for better understanding*", this item also got highest mean score (M=4.36, SD=1.03). This indicates reading repetition habits among the students. Other students regarding Students favor active strategies achieved high utilize like highlighting (M=4.08, SD=1.21) and paraphrasing (M=4.13, SD=1.07). However, strategy like "*Using text features (tables, figures)*" got a moderate level of use with the lowest mean score (M=3.23, SD=1.48), indicating that students may overlook non-prose items throughout reading tasks. Retrieval Strategies which show how students call upon prior information to simplify new knowledge, clearly showed in items like "*Using Background knowledge*" (M=4.20, SD=0.90) and "*Using Knowledge of English language*" (M=4.22, SD=1.09). This reflects that approximately all students applying their prior knowledge to facilitate reading tasks. Nevertheless, strategy such as "*Looking back and forth in the text to find*" got the lowest mean score in this category with (M=3.45, SD=1.24), which indicates a more linear reading approach rather than a flexible, non-linear retrieval style.

Metacognitive Reading Strategies

The data uses a Likert scale (1–5) to categorize the level of practice and usage for eighteen items across three main metacognitive reading strategies: Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating strategies, moreover it shows a descriptive statistic including frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation.

Table 6 Use of Individual Reading Strategies under Metacognitive Category

SN	Metacognitive Strategies	5	4	3	2	1	M	SD	Level of Use
Planning Strategies									
1	Looking at the title and guessing the text content.	65.3%	9.7%	11.1%	9.7%	4.2%	4.22	1.22	High
3	Setting reading goals and purposes for reading.	23.6%	18.1%	26.4%	16.7%	15.3%	3.18	1.37	Moderate
4	Planning how to complete the text and do the reading tasks.	29.2%	18.1%	18.1%	16.7%	18.1%	3.23	1.48	Moderate
6	Deciding what to read closely and what to Ignore.	36.1%	19.4%	15.3%	8.3%	20.8%	3.41	1.55	Moderate
10	Checking the genre and organization of the text.	26.4%	34.7%	18.1%	12.5%	8.3%	3.58	1.24	High
16	Identifying reading problems and planning actions to solve them	34.7%	23.6%	22.2%	15.3%	4.2%	3.69	1.21	High
26	Previewing the reading tasks before reading the text.	33.3%	23.6%	19.4%	12.5%	11.1%	3.55	1.36	High
Monitoring strategies									
11	Verifying guesses of word meanings.	38.9%	22.2%	26.4%	5.6%	6.9%	3.80	1.21	High
18	Double checking understanding of confusing information.	50.0%	16.7%	20.8%	4.2%	8.3%	3.95	1.28	High
21	Pausing and thinking about what is read.	51.4%	20.8%	16.7%	4.2%	6.9%	4.05	1.22	High
24	Checking understanding of new information.	41.7%	22.2%	20.8%	9.7%	5.6%	3.84	1.22	High
28	Checking concentration and paying closer attention to reading.	40.3%	26.4%	20.8%	8.3%	4.2%	3.90	1.15	High
32	Paying more attention to the overall meaning of the text.	52.8%	15.3%	18.1%	8.3%	5.6%	4.01	1.25	High
Evaluating strategies									
20	Asking oneself questions to be answered in the text.	51.4%	12.5%	13.9%	13.9%	8.3%	3.84	1.40	High
27	Evaluating difficulty level of the text and adjusting reading speed accordingly.	34.7%	23.6%	18.1%	13.9%	9.7%	3.59	1.34	High
30	Evaluating overall understanding of the text.	37.5%	26.4%	26.4%	4.2%	5.6%	3.86	1.14	High
35	Evaluating the effectiveness of strategies used while reading.	22.2%	31.9%	29.2%	4.2%	12.5%	3.47	1.24	Moderate
36	Evaluating overall performances of the reading tasks.	33.3%	20.8%	16.7%	18.1%	11.1%	3.47	1.40	Moderate

Note: 5=always, 4= usually, 3= sometimes, 2= occasionally, 1= never, M= mean, SD= standard deviation

Table 6 shows descriptive statistics including frequency and level of use of metacognitive reading strategies namely planning strategies, monitoring strategies among participants, and Evaluating Strategies. Planning strategies which prepare the reader to undertake before engaging with the reading text. The findings of this category showed the lowest overall utilization among the respondents except one item 1, "Looking at the title and guessing the text content" with mean score of (M=4.22, SD=1.22). 65.3% of respondents stated that they are always doing this which indicates a significant reliance on surface-level visual signs to guess meaning. Students demonstrate below moderate level of using preparation strategies, such as checking the genre and organization of the text (M=3.58, SD=1.21), previewing reading tasks before reading (M=3.55, SD=1.36), and Identifying reading problems and planning actions to solve them (M=3.69, SD=1.21). Other strategies received the lowest utilization compared to other strategies such as Setting reading goals and purposes (M=3.18, SD=1.37), planning how to complete the reading tasks (M=3.23, SD=1.48), and deciding what to read closely and what to ignore (M=3.41, SD=1.55). These findings indicate that while readers engage in immediate, superficial predictive behaviors, they largely omitted strategic, goal-sittings planning before beginning a reading task. Monitoring strategies that occur during reading show how readers organize their comprehension while engaging and interacting with the text. The results show that every item in this category is classified as having a very high level of use, with means scores ranging between 3.80 and 4.05. The most used strategy in monitoring strategies is "Pausing and thinking about what is read" (M=4.05, SD=1.22), with 51.4% of respondents confessed they always do this. Other strategies got high usage include paying closer attention to the overall meaning (M=4.01, SD=1.25), double-checking confusing information (M=3.95, SD=1.28), checking concentration (M=3.90, SD=1.15), checking understanding of new information (M=3.84, SD=1.22), and verifying guesses of word meanings (M=3.80, SD=1.21) indicating overwhelming usage strategies among participants. Post reading strategies particularly evaluating strategies that occur during and after reading to judge comprehension of the reading tasks. The findings show that participants are frequently emphasis on comprehension results. The data demonstrate high use of asking questions to be answered in the text (M=3.84, SD=1.40) and evaluating their general understanding of the text (M=3.86, SD=1.14). Strategy item shows a moderate level of usage like evaluating difficulty level of the text and adjusting reading speed (M=3.59, SD=1.34). Other strategy considered as a moderate utilizing is the valuating the overall performance of the reading tasks and evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies used while reading both classified in moderate usage for both mean scores (M=3.47), indicating that readers are qualified at checking if they understood the text but they unable to evaluate how well they achieve the task.

Conclusion

This study has investigated cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies used by Libyan English major students at university of Derna, the faculty of arts in Al Qubba Campus. This study used quantitative "survey" design questionnaire that was developed by Phakiti (2006). The main objective of this study was to extract which of the two strategies is most used by students. The results of the study showed that the metacognitive strategies, including planning, monitoring, and retrieval strategies, were employed more frequently than the cognitive strategies, which are memory, comprehending, and evaluating strategies, among the students of the faculty of arts at university of Derna. Based on such findings, it is recommended that English instructors should be aware of teaching their students cognitive reading strategies as such strategies have played a key role in helping students strategies predicting, translating, summarizing, connecting new information with prior knowledge or experience, applying grammatical rules, and inferring meaning from context (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

This study was limited by its sample size, and the findings cannot be generalized across all English major students from all Libyan universities because it covered only one Libyan public university campus. For further research it could expand on these findings through a large-scale quantitative study across various educational institutions. Additionally, a with larger numbers of participants from a broad range of universities and colleges, Adopting mixed methods research designs in which qualitative sources of data collection are combined with quantitative data seems to yield more dependable results (Dörnyei, 2007).

References

- [1] Ahmed, R. M. (2020). Investigating EFL Learners' Awareness of Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Students in Different Disciplines. *Arab World English Journal*, 11 (3) 294 -304 . DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.18>
- [2] Baker, W., & Boonkit, K. (2004). Learning strategies in reading and writing: EAP contexts. *RELC Journal*, 35(3), 299-328.
- [3] Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL quarterly*, 25(3), 375-406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586977>

- [4] Cresswel, J. (2013). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [5] Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [6] Ghwela, M., Rosniah, M., & Noorizah, M. N. (2017). Metacognitive reading strategies of EFL Libyan university learners. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 5, 332–339.
- [7] Grabe, W., & Stroller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- [8] Hasibuan, S., Puspita, H., & Arasuli, A. (2022). An Analysis of Reading Strategies Used by The Fourth Semester Students of English Education Study Program in Muhammadiyah University. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 6(1), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.6.1.73-88>
- [9] Lems, K., Miller, L. D., & Soro, T. M. (2009). *Teaching reading to English language learners: Insights from linguistics*. Guilford Press.
- [10] Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(3), 2–10.
- [11] Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- [12] Nazurty, R., Priyanto, N., Anggia Pratiwi, S., & Mukminin, A. (2019). Learning strategies in reading: The case of Indonesian language education student teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(11), 2536-2543.
- [13] Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042-2978.
- [14] O'Malley J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Toronto: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [16] Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- [17] Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(94\)00047-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(94)00047-A)
- [18] Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language testing*, 20(1), 26-56. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt243oa>
- [19] Phakiti, A. (2006). Modeling cognitive and metacognitive strategies and their relationships to EFL reading test performance. *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 1, 53-95.
- [20] Pratiwi, I., Regina, R., Wardah, W., Susilawati, E., & Sumarni, S. (2024). Reading Strategies Used By the Students of English Language Education Study Program. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 6(1), 113-132.
- [21] Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-30). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [22] Sheorey, R. & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 29(4), 431-449. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00039-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00039-2)
- [23] Zheng, R. (2023). The Chinese University Students' English Reading Strategies: An Analysis of the Current Situation and A Proposal for Enhancement. *Pacific International Journal*, 6(2), 226-231. <https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v6i2.390>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of **JSHD** and/or the editor(s). **JSHD** and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.