

THE USE OF EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT INSTRUCTIONS IN TEACHING READING STRATEGIES AND THEIR IMPACTS ON EFL LEARNERS' READING COMPREHENSION

Marjan Mehrpour¹, Dr. Mostafa Zamaniyan^{2*}, Dr. Firooz Sadighi³, Dr. Ehsan Hadipourfard⁴

*1-PhD candidate in TEFL, Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
Email: mehrmarjan@yahoo.com*

*2-Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
Corresponding author: Email: Iranmostafazamaniaan@yahoo.com*

*3-Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
Email: firoozsadighi@yahoo.com*

4-Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English Language, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

Abstract

This study attempted to scrutinize the use of explicit and implicit instructions in teaching reading strategies and their impacts on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension. To this end, 117 Iranian college freshmen, both females and males at the age of 20-35, studying at the Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht Branch were chosen. To collect the necessary data, the researcher administered Key English Test (KET) to ascertain initial homogeneity of the groups at the onset of the study. The classes were assigned as the experimental groups initially and they received implicit and explicit instructions. After analyzing the data using an independent samples t-test and paired samples t-test to see if the groups perform significantly differently on the reading comprehension pre-test or not, it was determined that both explicit and implicit instructions of reading strategies had effects on the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension, and based on obtained data on mean scores from pretest to posttest, after the treatment, the explicit group outperformed.

Keywords: explicit instruction, implicit instruction, Iranian EFL learners, reading comprehension, reading strategies

Introduction

According to Herrera, Perez, and Escamilla (2010), unfortunately reading is a skill which is ignored in most of the classes following communicative approaches. They also mentioned that being autonomous readers, language learners must increase their capabilities in this skill as with other skills; this need makes teachers develop a method to teach reading

which will help readers become independent strategic ones. Individuals are not only speakers, but also receivers, consumers, readers and interpreters of language. Herrera et. al. (2010) claimed that the extent to which one knows and uses a foreign Language may be crucial to one's existence, education, relationships, and careers and as soon as the world entered the new era, the ability and the need to understand and

communicate with others became increasingly important, at times even urgent.

Reading is considered as a multifaceted process and the major objective of reading is comprehension. One of the many problems that students face nowadays is lack of interest. Studies based on reading habits have particularly focused on the importance of the promotion of specific strategies to promote their interests, make reading materials available, build an appropriate environment, allow time to read in school, provide significant adult models and use motivational techniques (Clary, 1991). A dozen of studies (e.g., Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989; Cotterall, 1990) have proved that reading strategies are effective in promoting comprehension. Besides, there are considerable researches that show good readers are strategic readers who use more strategies than poor readers as they read. Therefore, teaching reading strategies should be the crucial concern in the reading classrooms. Some of studies have found that the most successful individuals understand and use a variety of active study strategies to control and monitor their learning (Yaworski, 1998). These students can also explain the strategies they use and can describe whether or not particular strategies prove to be useful in different situations (Ruzic, 2001).

The present study focused on the effect of two different instructions on learners' reading comprehension ability by implementing metacognitive strategies and to find the gap between this recent research and the recent studies in some other fields, some findings are presented here. The findings of several studies (Shokrpour & Fotovatian, 2009; Alhaqbani and Riazi, 2012; Jafari & Shokrpour, 2012; Madhumathi and Ghosh, 2012; Soleimani & Hajghani, 2013) showed that while strategy training appeared to raise students' awareness of reading strategies and could encourage strategy use by some students, the reading strategy instruction was not able to enhance statistically

the students' reading performance. Research has found that improvement in reading skill has a positive effect on other language skills - reading, writing and speaking.

The findings of the present study may be remarkably beneficial to language learners in that they may attribute their lack of effective reading comprehension ability to their faulty lexical competence. Language teachers may also take advantage of the possible finding of the current study through getting more aware of the role of reading strategies in promoting their language learners' mastery over reading comprehension challenges they may face when using a foreign language. By taking these concerns into account, the present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Does the use of explicit instruction in teaching reading strategies have any effects on the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension?
2. Does the use of implicit instruction in teaching reading strategies have any effects on the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension?
3. Is there any difference between the use of explicit and implicit instructions in teaching reading strategies to the Iranian EFL learners?

Rationale

The findings of the present study may be remarkably beneficial to language learners in that they may attribute their lack of effective reading comprehension ability to their faulty lexical competence. Language teachers may also take advantage of the possible finding of the current study through getting more aware of the role of reading strategies in promoting their language learners' mastery over reading comprehension challenges they may face when using a foreign language.

Theoretical and Empirical Bases

Reading is an important language skill, and a comprehensive understanding of EFL reading comprehension growth is needed for successful reading comprehension support in language learning (Tümen Akyıldız & Çelik, 2021; Yakut & Aydın, 2017; Anggraini, Afriani, & Riswanto, 2020). Reading comprehension can be thought of as multifaceted and dynamic relationships among meanings, behavior, readers, and texts in several ways. It is a process by which readers interact with written language to extract and infer meanings (Habók et al., 2019; HellersteinYehezkel, 2017). Since the reading comprehension process is so complex, many EFL readers assume that being fluent in the target language is a challenging task (Shang, 2016; Saputri, Rizal, & Afriani, 2021). Cognitive views of reading comprehension indicate that reading is an interactive and comprehension is a constructive process and that expert readers are distinguished from weak readers by their flexible use of a set of activities to make sense of the text and to monitor and regulate their comprehension (Baker & Brown, 1984; Dole et al., 1991). A cognitive view of reading submits that comprehension instruction should emphasize teaching students a set of strategies to use to comprehend a text with the goal of empowering students with a sense of conscious control, or metacognitive awareness, over a group of strategies so that they can use and adapt the strategies with any text they read (Pressley, Johnson, Symons, McGoldrick, & Kurita, 1989). As noted by Pressley (2006) and Grabe (2009), comprehension instruction now includes teaching students a set of strategies to use while they are trying to comprehend the main idea of the text, and combining these two goals through scaffolded discussions as the students are reading the text. This needs the identification of effective strategies that support comprehension. Strategic processing entails learners' awareness and what may in fact make strategies distinct from skills and other processes is this

component of awareness and conscious reflection rather than the nature of processes per se (Afflerbach, Pearson, & Paris, 2008; Anderson, 2005; Carrell, Gajdusek, & Wise, 1998).

The provision of the most detailed description of the language's rules and norms by the instructor is referred to as explicit teaching (Asiyaban, Yamini, Bagheri, & Yarmohammadi, 2020; Basturkmen, 2018; Potgieter & Conradie, 2013; Sanz, 2018; Zarei et al., 2020). As a consequence, students who receive specific instructions can acquire grammatical knowledge directly (Criado, 2016; Tsai, 2019). Implicit instruction, on the other hand, encourages students to think about the language and create their own generalization of rules. Implicit teaching is exemplified by experiential approaches that focus the learners' attention by allowing them to respond to grammatical rules (Asiyaban et al., 2020). The use of overt methods to teach learners by raising their consciousness is referred to as explicit teaching. Trial-and-error, explanation, monitoring, and observation are all examples of an explicit instruction (García-Fuentes & McDonough, 2018). Explicit instruction causes further noticing, which is critical for matching feedback to intake. Implicit instruction, on the other hand, is a unique type of language instruction in which learners learn by exploration. Subsequently, implicit learning represents an information acquisition without being led by deliberate elaborations, thus students make use of their active cognition to generate their own concepts (Brown, 2001; Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2018).

There are a large number of studies on the effects of explicit and implicit instructions on implicit and explicit knowledge of L2/FL learners. The following review mainly includes the most related studies where learners were exposed to either explicit or implicit instruction in L2/FL contexts.

Aghaie and Zhang (2012) investigated the influence of explicit teaching of reading strategies on EFL university students' reading ability in Iran. A questionnaire adapted from Chamot and O'Malley's (1994) cognitive and metacognitive strategies framework was used to collect the required data in this study. A quasi-experimental design involving a control group and an experimental group was used to test the effects of explicit teaching of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies on students' reading performance and strategy transfer. After four months of strategy instruction, the experimental group achieved significantly better results than the control group. Results of paired-samples and independent-samples t-tests, effect sizes, and a Split-plot ANOVA showed that strategy instruction could lead to enhance reading comprehension and reading strategy transfer and use. Moreover, strategy instruction could result in autonomous reading behaviors.

In another study, Salemi, Rabiee & Ketabi (2012) found that explicit instruction had the advantage over implicit instruction. They concluded that participants in explicit groups outperformed implicit groups, by saying that it was due to the fact that students' attention was directed to specific features during explicit instruction. One other factor that influenced the result was the learners' learning preference and habits: students from certain cultures prefer to receive explicit feedback in regards to their performance. Thus, after a delayed post-test given after four weeks, they found that the effect of instruction almost fades away due to a lack of proper input during that time span and due to the students' habit of needing to be told what to do. Salemi et al. reported that L2 pragmatic instruction is necessary even for learners with high-level proficiency.

A study done by Nazari (2013) found that the group that received explicit instruction outperformed the group with implicit instruction on the use of the present perfect. This was

measured with a writing and a grammar task. Nazari (2013) therefore supports the claim that explicit instruction results in more proficiency gain than implicit instruction.

In a recent study, Umeda, Snape, Yusa, and Wiltshier (2017) examined the long-term effects of explicit instruction on learners' knowledge on English articles. Three groups including the treatment group, a control group and a native English speaker control group participated in the study. The two instruction groups were taught the target structures across nine weeks. The results from delayed post-tests showed that the explicit group improved, but after one-year little knowledge was remembered. Similar to Tode's (2007) finding, they also gave more weight to explicit teaching, but its durability was under question.

In a more recent study, Chan (2018) examined the effects of explicit instruction versus implicit instruction on the acquisition of English simple past at a primary school in Hong Kong at the second phase of her study, the students were being taught using three different forms of intervention: (1) processing instruction, (2) traditional or explicit instruction, and (3) implicit instruction. Results indicated that the processing instruction group had significant improvement in the interpretation task. Results also revealed that explicit instruction was found to be more effective than implicit instruction in second language acquisition of English simple past.

About the acquisition of adjective ordering in English, a recent study was conducted by Hirakawa, Shibuya, and Endo (2018) to compare the effectiveness of explicit instruction, input flood and study abroad in EFL context of Japan. The explicit instruction group received 90-min instruction across three weeks while the input flood group received positive evidence with multiple adjectives over 15 weeks. The natural exposure groups participated in three or five-week intensive study-abroad

programs in North America. Results indicated that only the explicit instruction group improved in their acquisition of adjective ordering and input flood and study abroad groups did not reveal any knowledge gain of adjective order restrictions in their posttests

Method

Research design

The study used a quantitative methodology and a quasi-experimental pretest, posttest group research design was used for this study to determine the effects of explicit and implicit instructions of reading skills on the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension based on convenient sampling procedure. Since, the number of students in each class was not large enough, initially two intact classes were assigned as the experimental groups, which they received implicit and explicit instructions, to have enough number of participants for the study.

Participants

The research data were obtained from a sample of 117 Iranian college freshmen, both females and males at the age of 20-35, studying at the Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht Branch. They were majoring in Mechanical engineering, Computer engineering, and Management and are also taking the three-credit General English Course (GEC) as a pre-requisite for a content-based two-credit English for Specific Purpose (ESP) Course. Yet, to overcome this limitation, the researcher administered a proficiency test, Key English Test (KET), to ascertain initial homogeneity of the groups at the onset of the study. Then, there were two General English Course (GEC) classes with a total population of 117 males and females in each group.

Instruments

A Modified Version of the Key English Test (KET, 2005)

It is a standardized first level Cambridge English exam for speakers of other languages (ESOL) at the elementary level, will be piloted and administered as homogeneity test of the participants of the present study. The modified test includes six different sections: A sentence comprehension section with five matching items, a grammar section with ten three-option items, three vocabulary subsections: a vocabulary test with five three option questions, a "guessing the word" section based on its description with five three-option questions, and a cloze text with eight blanks and three-option choices; The test also included a reading text entitled "A New Young Player" which contained 195 words followed by seven statements.

A Reading Proficiency Test

The test was administered as the pre-test and posttest. A reading proficiency test with the number of 22 items was selected from The Longman TOEFL book and administered to all the participants in both the experimental and the control groups twice, once as a reading comprehension pre-test before embarking the study and another time as a post-test at the end of the study. The topics of the test were related to the topics of the students' textbook taught in the class. The reliability of the reading comprehension test was computed through KR-21 method of estimating reliability after it was administered as a pretest to both groups. The reliability index obtained was 0.76 which revealed that the test was a reliable measure of reading ability. Also, validity was assessed with the confirmation of face validity and content validity by some professors on the necessity, relevance, clarity, and simplicity of each item related to reading comprehension.

Data Collection Procedure

Key English Test was administered and the scores were analyzed to represent the homogeneity of the groups before the treatment. Two groups consisting of 100 students served as the experimental groups (50 participants in each group). Prior to the experiment and in order to make sure that no significant difference in terms of reading comprehension ability existed between the two groups, the reading comprehension pre-test was administered to the two experimental groups. The significant difference between the explicit and implicit group was a thorough explanation was given to explicit instruction, while no explanation was given to implicit instruction. Additionally, the difference in the treatments between the explicit and implicit instruction groups was that the implicit version, of course, had no clear and direct explanation of the use of strategies in reading comprehension. In other words, both explicit and implicit groups were exposed to the same materials; only the instruction was delivered in a different method. The explicit instruction group was teacher-centered, and the implicit instruction was student-centered. The purpose of designing an implicit instruction group in this study was to determine whether

progress in the use of strategies occurs in the absence of explicit instruction. After implementing the 12-session training program, all the participants in the two groups were given the reading comprehension post-test, the same test which were administered as the pre-test before starting the training.

Data Analysis Procedure

First, an independent samples t-test was run to see if the groups perform significantly differently on the reading comprehension pre-test or not. Also, in order to investigate whether the treatment, explicit and implicit instructions, given to the experimental groups caused any significant change within these groups and to see if the students in these groups performed significantly different on the post-test compared with the pre-test, the reading comprehension pre-and post-test scores of the experimental groups were compared using a paired t-test.

Results

As the homogeneity of the groups was the most critical issue to consider before the treatment, the Key English Test was administered, and the scores were analyzed, presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Whole Participants (N=117)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Homogeneity Test	117	60.00	78.00	68.5500	5.37178
Valid N (listwise)	117				

Table 1 illustrated the number of students and means of the scores of Key English Test. Based on the standard deviation in Table 1, students who got scores between 62 and 74 were chosen as the main participants (N=100). Group statistics of the main participants of the present study are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 2. Group Statistics of Main Participants (N=100)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Implicit	50	50	68.3200	5.21552
Explicit	50	50	68.7800	5.56699

According to Table 2, two groups consisting of 100 students served as the experimental groups (50 participants in each group). The first group was assigned as an implicit group with a mean score of 68.32 and the second one was chosen as explicit group (68.78). Independent samples t-test was conducted to show the homogeneity between implicit and explicit groups before the treatment. Table 3 reports independent samples t-test of test scores in implicit and explicit groups.

Table 3. Independent Samples T-test of Homogeneity Test Scores in Implicit and Explicit Groups (N=100)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-Test for Equality of Means						
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Variables	Equal Variances Assumed	.919	.340	-.426	98	.671	-.46000	1.07882	-2.60089	1.68089
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			-.426	97.586	.671	-.46000	1.07882	-2.60100	1.68100

As shown in Table 3, the sig. level (Sig=.671) indicates that the groups were homogeneous and the sig. level is higher than the p-value ($p > .05$). Moreover, before the experiment and in order to make sure that no significant difference in reading comprehension ability existed between the two experimental groups, implicit and explicit, the reading comprehension pre-test was administered. Overall descriptive statistics of means of reading comprehension pretest is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Means of Reading Comprehension Pretest (N=100)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Implicit pretest	50	44.00	66.00	55.1200	6.08323
Explicit pretest	50	46.00	66.00	55.9200	5.58365
Valid N (listwise)	50				

As illustrated in Table 4, the mean scores of both experimental groups, implicit and explicit, were 55.12 and 55.92, respectively, before implementing of the treatment. Overall descriptive statistics of means of reading comprehension posttest are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Means of Reading Comprehension Posttest (N=100)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
--	---	---------	---------	------	----------------

Implicit posttest	50	60.00	94.00	75.0600	8.61752
Explicit posttest	50	63.00	95.00	78.5800	9.34179
Valid N (listwise)	50				

As shown in Table 5, the mean scores of both experimental groups, implicit and explicit, were 75.06 and 78.58, respectively, after implementing of the treatment. Paired Samples t-test of reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in explicit group (N=50) is presented in Table 6.

Table 6.

Paired Samples T-test of Reading Comprehension Pretest and Posttest Scores in Explicit Group (N=50)

Paired Differences							
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)
			Lower	Upper			
-22.66000	11.47777	1.62320	-25.92195	-19.39805	-13.960	49	.000

According to Table 6, the p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) was less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). So, it is concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in explicit group (N=50). Paired Samples t-test of reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in implicit group (N=50) is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Paired Samples T-test of Reading Comprehension Pretest and Posttest Scores in Implicit Group (N=50)

Paired Differences							
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)
			Lower	Upper			
-19.94000	11.13078	1.57413	-23.10333	-16.77667	-12.667	49	.000

As the SPSS output showed in Table 7, the p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) was less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). So, it is concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in implicit group (N=50). Independent Samples t-test of reading comprehension pretest scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100) is illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8. Independent Samples T-test of Reading Comprehension Pretest Scores in Explicit and Implicit Groups (N=100)

Variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-Test for Equality of Means						
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Variables	Equal Variances Assumed	.326	.569	-.685	98	.495	-.80000	1.16776	-3.11738	1.51738
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			-.685	97.289	.495	-.80000	1.16776	-3.11759	1.51759

Based on Table 8, the sig. level (Sig=.495) indicated that the groups were homogeneous reading comprehension pretest, before the treatment, and the sig. level was higher than the p value ($p > .05$). Independent Samples t-test of reading comprehension posttest scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100) is reported in Table 9.

Table 9. Independent Samples T-test of Reading Comprehension Posttest Scores in Explicit and Implicit Groups (N=100)

Variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-Test for Equality of Means						
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Variables	Equal Variances Assumed	1.109	.295	2.231	98	.028	4.00000	1.79292	.44202	7.55798
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			2.231	97.438	.028	4.00000	1.79292	.44176	7.55824

Considering Table 9, the sig. level (Sig=.028) was less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). So, it is concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension posttest scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100).

Discussion

In order to investigate whether the treatment, explicit and implicit instructions, given to the experimental groups caused any significant changes within the groups and to see if the students in these groups performed significantly differently on the post-test compared with the pre-test, the reading comprehension pre-and post-test scores of the experimental groups were compared using a paired t-test. Before the treatment, the homogeneity test was carried out, and the SPSS output showed that the groups were homogeneous before running the reading comprehension pretest. Moreover, after running the reading comprehension pretest and as illustrated in Table 4, the mean scores of both experimental groups, implicit and explicit, were 55.12 and 55.92, respectively, before implementing of the treatment. As shown in Table 5, mean scores of both experimental groups, implicit and explicit, were 75.06 and 78.58, respectively, after the implementation of the treatment, the explicit group has higher mean scores in posttest. Paired Samples t-test of reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in explicit group (N=50) was presented in Table 6, it was shown that the p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) is less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). It was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in explicit group (N=50). Paired Samples t-test of reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in implicit group (N=50) was shown in Table 7 and the p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) was less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). Thus, it is concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension pretest and posttest scores in implicit group (N=50). It is worth noting that

Independent Samples t-test of reading comprehension posttest scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100) was reported in Table 9 (p. 82), and the sig. level (Sig=.028) was less than the alpha level ($p < .05$). Thus, it was concluded that there was statistically significant difference in the participants' reading comprehension posttest scores in explicit and implicit groups (N=100).

The findings of the present research were conversing with some previous studies (Aghaie & Zhang, 2012; Andringa, Gloppe & Hacquebord, 2011; Macaro & Masterman, 2006; Nazari, 2013; Nguyen, Pham, Pham, 2012; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Salemi, Rabiee & Ketabi, 2012; Spada & Lightbown, 2008; Spada & Tomita, 2010). Spada and Tomita (2010) on the difference in language acquisition between implicit and explicit instruction argued in favor of explicit instruction. They found that the effect sizes of explicit instruction were more extensive than those of implicit instruction. On top of that, Spada and Lightbown (2008) gave an overview of studies that reinforce the claim that explicit instruction results in higher language learning outcomes.

However, the findings of the present research are inconsistent with some previous findings (Afshari & Oroujlou, 2012; Siyyari, 2005). Afshari and Oroujlou (2012) found implicit instruction to be more conducive to learners' overall accuracy in all aspects and their oral accuracy in particular. Moreover, they found that though both foci on form techniques develop students' linguistic accuracy, implicit technique through the combination of clarification request plus recast turned out to be more effective than explicit post-task technique. Moreover, Siyyari (2005) has done research about the effectiveness of implicit focus on form

in communicative tasks. In his research, he has reported implicit focus on form to be more effective than the explicit one. He has stated that: 'Since one of the responsibilities of materials developers is to provide and sequence the content of teaching materials, especially the tasks, designing communicative tasks to provide opportunities for focus on form in one of the recommended ways, especially implicitly, seems very much advisable' (Siyari, 2005).

Conclusion

Given the results of the current research, it is worthy to draw a conclusion that implementing explicit instruction outperformed implicit instruction in improving learners' reading comprehension strategies, and there are some studies such as Spada and Lightbown (2008), Andringa, Glopper and Hacquebord (2011), Nguyen, Pham, Pham (2012), Salemi, Rabiee and Ketabi (2012), and Nazari (2013) that approve the results of the present study. They concluded that participants in explicit groups outperformed implicit groups, by saying that it was due to the fact that students' attention was directed to specific features during explicit instruction. Apart from all the criticisms on the positive effect of implicit instruction, the general result of the studies so far, have confirmed the fact that explicit instruction resulted in higher language learning outcomes when learners received the same amount of input, and moreover, explicit instruction could be more effective than implicit instruction. This study confirmed emphasis on the beneficial results in using metacognitive and affective strategies in the explicit instruction group. In general, the results of most studies point to the notion that explicit teaching instruction has had a better effect on the improving of EFL learners' reading comprehension. As the final words, to be on the safe side from the critics' eyes, it should be considered over and over that the obtained data revealed that there was a significant difference

between the two types of instruction of reading strategies. Regarding pedagogical implications of the present study for learners, using different approaches in teaching helps them develop their awareness and competence in reading comprehension abilities.

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.
- Afshari, S. & Oroujlou, N. (2012). Reexamining the role of implicit and explicit focus on form: Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4 (2), 306-322.
- Aghaie, R., & Zhang, L. J. (2012). Effects of explicit instruction in cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies on Iranian EFL students' reading performance and strategy transfer. *Instructional Science*, 40(6), 1063-1081.
- Alhaqbani, A., & Riazi, M. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use in Arabic as a second language. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 24(2). Al-Khateeb, O. S. M. (2011). The impact of using metacognitive learning strategies on Al-Hussain Bin Talal university students' achievement in and attitudes towards health concepts in 'Tenet of Worship' course. *Asian Social Science*, 7(3), 165–186.
- Andringa, S., de Glopper, K., & Hacquebord, H. (2011). Effect of explicit and implicit instruction on free written response task performance. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 868- 903.
- Anggraini, M., Afriani, Z.L., & Riswanto. (2020). The effect of Question Answer Relationship (QAR) Strategy in enhancing students' reading comprehension. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 4(4), 548-558.

- Asiyaban, A. R., Yamini, M., Bagheri, M. S., & Yarmohammadi, L. (2020). Implicit/explicit knowledge and its contribution towards tense consistency employment across EFL learners' proficiency levels. *Cogent Education*, 7(1)
- Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Cognitive monitoring in reading. *Understanding reading comprehension*, 21-44.
- Basturkmen, H. (2018). Explicit Versus Implicit Grammar Knowledge. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Carrell, P. L., Gajdusek, L., & Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading. *Instructional Science*, 26(1-2), 97-112.
- Chamot, A. U. & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). Language learner and learning strategies. In N. C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 371-392). London: Academic Press.
- Chan, M. (2018). Processing instruction in helping map forms and meaning in second language acquisition of English simple past. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 1–13.
- Clary, L. (1991). Getting adolescents to read. *Journal of Reading, cognitive developmental inquiry American Psychologist*, 34, 906 - 911.
- Criado, R. (2016). Insights from Skill Acquisition Theory for grammar activity sequencing and design in Foreign Language Teaching. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(2), 121–132.
- Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 239-264.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Jafari, S. M., & Shokrpour, N. (2012). The reading strategies used by Iranian ESP students to comprehend authentic expository texts in English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(4).
- García-Fuentes, C., & McDonough, K. (2018). The effect of explicit instruction and task repetition on Colombian EFL students' use of politeness strategies during disagreements. *Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 470–482.
- Habók, A., Magyar, A., & Hui, S. K. F. (2019). The effects of EFL reading comprehension and certain learning-related factors on EFL learners' reading strategy use. *Cogent Education*, 6(1).
- Hellerstein-Yehzekel, D. (2017). The path to reading comprehension through intercultural competence in the multicultural EFL classroom*. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17(3), 323–343.
- Herrera, S. G., Perez, D. R., & Escamilla, K. (2010). *Teaching reading to English language learners: Differentiated literacies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hirakawa, M., Shibuya, M., & Endo, M. (2018). Explicit instruction, input flood or study abroad: Which helps Japanese learners of English acquire adjective ordering? *Language Teaching Research*.
- Macaro, E. & Masterman, L. (2006). Does intensive explicit grammar instruction make all the difference? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(3), 297-327.
- Madhumathi, P., & Ghosh, A. (2012). Awareness of reading strategy use of Indian ESL students and the relationship with reading comprehension achievement. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12).

- Nazari, N. (2013). The effect of explicit and implicit grammar instruction on learners' achievements in receptive and productive modes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 156-162.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(4), 416-434.
- Potgieter, A. P., & Conradie, S. (2013). Explicit grammar teaching in EAL classrooms: Suggestions from isiXhosa speakers' L2 data. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 31(1), 111-127.
- Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., Johnson, C. J., Symons, S., McGoldrick, J. A., & Kurita, J. A. (1989). Strategies that improve children's memory and comprehension of text. *The Elementary School Journal*, 90(1), 3-32.
- Ruzic, R. (2001). Lessons for everyone: how students with reading-related learning disabilities survive and excel in college courses with heavy reading requirements, Paper presented at the, Seattle, Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Washington <http://www.cast.org/udl/LessonsforEveryone1540.cfm>. Retrieved August 29, 2011 from URL.
- Salemi, A., Rabiee, M., & Ketabi, S. (2012). The Effects of Explicit/Implicit Instruction and Feedback on the Development of Persian EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence in Suggestion Structures. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 188-199.
- Sanz, C. (2018). Implicit Versus Explicit Grammar Feedback. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Saputri, Y. A., Rizal, S., & Afriani, Z. L. (2021). An Analysis on English Teacher Strategies in Teaching Reading Comprehension. *Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, 1(3), 353-361.
- Shang, H. F. (2016). Exploring demographic and motivational factors associated with hypertext reading by English as a foreign language (EFL) students. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 35(7), 559-571.
- Shokrpour, N. & Fotovatian, S. (2009). Effects of consciousness raising of metacognitive strategies on EFL students' reading comprehension. *ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 157, 75-92.
- Siyari, M. (2005). A Comparative study of implicit and delayed, explicit focus on form on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy of oral production. M.A. dissertation, Sharif University of Technology.
- Soleimani, H., & Hajghani, S. (2013). The effect of teaching reading comprehension strategies on Iranian EFL pre-university students' reading comprehension ability. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 5 (5), 594-600.
- Tsai, K. J. (2019). Corpora and dictionaries as learning aids: inductive versus deductive approaches to constructing vocabulary knowledge. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(8), 805-826.
- Tümen Akyıldız, S., & Çelik, V. (2021). Using WhatsApp to support EFL reading comprehension skills with Turkish early secondary learners. *Language Learning Journal*.
- Umeda, M., Snape, N., Yusa, N., & Wiltshier, J. (2017). The long-term effect of explicit instruction on learners' knowledge on English articles. *Language Teaching Research*.

- Yakut, A. D., & Aydın, S. (2017). An experimental study on the effects of the use of blogs on EFL reading comprehension. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 1–16.
- Yaworski, J. (1998). Why do students succeed or fail? A case study comparison. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 29, (1), 57-72.
- Zarei, M., Ahour, T., & Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of implicit, explicit, and emergent feedback strategies on EFL learners' motivation, attitude and perception. *Cogent Education*, 7(1).