



## The Effect of Metacognitive Strategy Instruction on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Metacognitive Awareness in Listening

**Amir Mohammadian**

Assistant Professor, Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

**Hooshang Khoshima**

Associate Professor, Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

**Niloofar Dehghani \***

MA in TEFL, Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

### Abstract

The major purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening. Hence, 31 male and female learners majoring in English Translation at Chabahar Maritime University were selected. The participants were randomly divided into two control and experimental groups. Their proficiency level was established via administering TOEFL general proficiency test. Moreover, their listening homogeneity was ensured using another TOEFL listening pre-test as the screening pre-test. After that, MALQ questionnaire relating to listeners' metacognitive awareness was administered as a pre-treatment questionnaire. Then, the treatment was implemented and the experimental group enjoyed MSI by implementing authentic materials for about ten 45-minute sessions. The control group used the same materials except for being instructed metacognitive strategies. At the end of the study, students of both groups were administered MALQ questionnaire again to examine the status of participants' listening metacognitive awareness. The results of the study revealed that MSI boosted the experimental students' listening metacognitive awareness significantly in comparison to the control group's learners.

**Keywords:** listening comprehension, strategy, listening strategy, metacognitive strategy

### INTRODUCTION

Listening is an essential part of foreign language learning procedure, and it has as well been described as a dynamic procedure throughout which students build meaning from oral input (Bentley & Bacon, 1996). Those who investigated on first language acquisition agree that listening is the basis for language learning. There are many ways that we can promote listening comprehension amongst which is using learning strategies. One of these strategies is listening comprehension strategies which are universal actions,

behaviors, approaches, procedures, and plans listeners utilize to be able to comprehend oral tasks more easily (Chen, 2008). By employing these strategies, students can be more successful in the procedure of second language learning. Instructing listening strategies to the learners is very beneficial. With regard to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), there are three basic listening comprehension strategies which are: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and socio-affective strategies. One of the essential strategies in developing learners' skills is metacognitive strategies (Anderson, 1991). Metacognitive strategies are methods which help students learn how to learn. In other words, it means processes designed for students to think about thinking. These strategies can be divided into three categories: planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies (Israel, 2007; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995).

Due to the importance of listening in teaching and learning a foreign (L1) or a second language (L2), and also its contribution to the mastery of other skills, this study was conducted. The current research was designed to answer the following question regarding teaching listening to intermediate EFL learners:

RQ: Does explicit instruction of metacognitive strategies have a significant effect on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening?

The following null hypothesis has been made from the research question in order to fulfill the study:

H0: Explicit instruction of metacognitive strategies has no significant effect on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **Metacognition**

The term *metacognition* is most frequently related with John Flavell, (1979). In terms of Flavell (1976) metacognition is a procedure in which someone is effectively monitoring, controlling and organizing the cognitive procedure in order to achieve cognitive objectives. Flavell (1979) specified metacognition as to be conscious of one's own cognitive procedures and products or everything else which is applicable like those features of data connected to the learning procedure. O'Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 44) assume that metacognitive strategies are "higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of activity". Harris (2003) described metacognition as a managing procedure to learning in which a student is utilizing strategies to plan, monitor and evaluate language learning.

It has been claimed that metacognition can have positive impact on second language acquisition (Byrnes, 1996; Wenden, 1998). Metacognitive capabilities are psychological feature shared by successful students (Vandergrift, 2006). Metacognition assists students comprehend their learning style and capability, adjust and administer their learning procedure in a dynamic way; hence, they can discover more efficient learning methods. Development of metacognition can as well assist students become conscious of their

learning procedure and requirements of learning activities so that they will recognize how to select suitable learning strategies in diverse contexts. As a result, students can practice and reestablish new data better (Vandergrift, 2006).

Language learners can develop their independence by applying cognitive, metacognitive and socio-affective strategies whereby they can get control of their own learning. Actually, teachers can educate students to become what Marcia Lovett (2008) names *expert learners*. She believes that educating metacognition entails three particular processes:

- Instructing students that their ability to learn not only alters, but that they can influence how that skill extends,
- Instructing them how to sketch for achievement and set aims, and
- Providing them with many situations to monitor their learning and adjust their own learning strategies

### **The Relationship between Metacognitive Awareness and Listening Comprehension**

Metacognitive awareness in listening alludes to the acceptance of suitable strategies and perfect allotment of resources (Lin, 2002). Metacognition has a significant role in each stage of listening comprehension. Before approaching the listening activity, students forecast, choose suitable strategies (e.g. listening for the main idea) required for carrying it out, and allocate concentration consequently. Whereas they are doing the listening activity, students retain or alter learning strategies by monitoring their learning procedure. When they discover these strategies are unsuccessful and guide to disappointment, they look for solutions for assisting comprehension. When they complete the listening procedure, they evaluate efficiency of listening strategies and abilities in listening comprehension. Thus, if the metacognitive theories can be utilized in second language listening, students can turn out to be more dynamic in the learning procedure. Therefore, learning results and self-adjusted learning skill can be enhanced. Their learning advantages and motivation can also be produced (Wei, 2008).

### **Previous Studies on Listening Comprehension and Metacognition**

The fundamental opinion underlying metacognitive awareness is motivating learners monitoring, evaluating and planning listening procedures, which has been included in the organization of class tasks. This is basic in increasing self-adjusted learning. Wenden (1998) states that students are no more inactive receivers of training. Students are predicted to effectively build their own comprehension of knowledge. In listening situation, learners can plan a listening, monitor their comprehension and evaluate listening proficiency. Through this procedures, listeners attain progress in listening tasks and the responsibility is altered from the instructors to the students. A lot of work and investigation is still required to examine the success of metacognitive teaching in younger learners, to investigate how the procedure of psychological improvement impact

metacognitive improvement in L2 listening (Goh, 2008), and how the metacognitive training for young learners is diverse from adult students (Goh, 2008).

The research on metacognition is complex because of its psychological nature, as has been stated by Goh (1997), like all psychological procedures, learners' consciousness about listening cannot be seen straightforwardly. Metacognition has ever been alluded to as *seventh sense* (Goh, 2008) and more research are required in this field. Some scholars examined the effect of metacognitive instruction on the listening skill and metaognitive awareness of EFL students. Among them, Movahed (2014) examined the effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on the listening performance, metacognitive awareness, and listening anxiety of EFL beginner learners. The strategy instruction to the experimental group was based on Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010). This study showed that the experimental group considerably performed better than the control group on the post-tests and so the positive impact of the metacognitive strategy instruction on learners listening performance, metacognitive awareness and listening anxiety were confirmed.

In many educational settings, metacognitive strategy instruction is not an inner part of many listening course books and instructors do not focus on these strategies when they design their lessons. Listening does not obtain its due significance and learners do not look as if to be effectively taught about the listening strategies (Seferoglu and Uzakgoren, 2004). Even though there have been a number of researches like these studies in diverse contexts, Goh (2008) highlights that more study is required to examine the role of metacognitive teaching in listening performance in diverse contexts. The more the students know how to learn, the better they learn. Hence, this study aims to investigate the impact of metacognitive strategy instruction on EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening to reduce the complexity of listening comprehension.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants**

The participants of the study were thirty-one intermediate students majoring in English Translation at Chabahar Maritime University of both genders. Two groups of students were selected randomly: control group and experimental group. The control group consisted of 16 learners and the experimental group included 15 students. Moreover, they were at the intermediate level of English proficiency.

### **Instruments**

The following testing instruments were used in this study for the purpose of data collection:

#### ***TOEFL Proficiency Test***

The first instrument was TOEFL (The Test of English as a Foreign Language) proficiency test in order to make sure the participants are intermediate EFL learners, prior to the

treatment. Based on TOEFL (the Paper Based Test) scoring scale, all students established as intermediate learners.

### ***Listening Pre-Test***

As the main focus of this research is on listening ability of the students, a TOEFL listening test as a pre-test was distributed to ensure the homogeneity of the participants' listening comprehension ability in both groups (the control and the experimental groups) as intermediate learners. The pre-test consisted of 50 multiple-choice items.

### ***The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)***

The third instrument was metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) to assess the participants' metacognitive awareness. The questionnaire was adjusted from the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) by Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, and Tafaghodtari (2006). Each item is rated on a six-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) without a neutral point so that respondents cannot hedge to show students' preferences. MALQ includes five factors comprising problem-solving (6 items), planning-evaluation (5 items), directed attention (4 items), personal knowledge (3 items) and mental translation (3 items). The participants were required to choose one option from each Likert-scale. In order to compute the scores of the participants, a value as follow was assigned to each scale: Strongly disagree = 1, disagree =2, slightly disagree=3, agree =3, partly agree=4, agree=5, strongly agree =6. Finally, each participant's score was calculated by adding the numerical value of the options for each scale.

### **Procedure**

This study conducted during 13 sessions, 3 for testing and 10 for treatment. Each session lasted 45 minutes, two times a week. First of all, the TOEFL proficiency test was used to ensure the homogeneity of the students in both groups. Next, the second pre-test was used to determine their listening proficiency level. It was determined that they are homogenous in listening skill. After that, MALQ questionnaire concerning listeners' metacognitive awareness was administered to both groups before the treatment. At the second phase, the treatment was started. The model which applied in this treatment for instruction was proposed by Vandergrift and Taghodrati (2010) and the instructional material was topnotch book by Joan Saslow and Allen Ascher (2011). Both classes enjoyed the same amount of exposure to language. The main difference was that the experimental group was taught metacognitive strategies explicitly but the control group only received the listening instruction without being instructed metacognitive strategies. After choosing the instructional model, some audio texts were selected and students were asked to apply metacognitive strategies. At the end of each session, the kind of strategy that they used was introduced. This course was taught through using three different teaching approaches i.e. pre-listening stage, listening stage and post-listening stage. At the last stage, MALQ questionnaire was administered between two groups again as a post-treatment questionnaire to see changes (if there was any) in learners' metacognitive

awareness. A summary of these three stages applied in this study is presented in the following paragraphs:

### ***Pre-Listening Phase***

Before listening to the oral text, the topic of the oral text was written on the board. Then the students were asked to write any word or information on a paper that they had in their minds about that topic. The prediction phase was done in pairs. The metacognitive strategies involved in this phase were planning and directed attention.

### ***Listening Phase***

1. In this phase, the students listened to the task for three times. In the first listening, they were asked to check their predictions, put a check mark beside the information they had predicted previously if they were true, and correct them if it was necessary. Then they were asked to write new information that they heard and understood. The metacognitive strategies involved in this stage were selective attention, monitoring and evaluation.

2. After that, students compared their predictions and the information they perceived in pairs. They focused on areas that needed more attention in the second stage of listening. The metacognitive strategies involved in this stage were monitoring, evaluation, planning and selective attention.

3. They listened to the task for the second time. They attempted to focus on areas that had been difficult for them in the first listening. They corrected the information that they had predicted wrongly and also added the new points they perceived. The metacognitive strategies involved in this stage were monitoring, evaluation, problem solving and selective attention.

4. All of the participants participated in class discussion. They explained how they were successful in the process of understanding. They shared the main points they've perceived and how they reached those inferences. The metacognitive strategies involved in this stage were monitoring, evaluation and problem solving.

5. In the third listening, the focus was on the parts that have been mentioned in class discussion. They listened more carefully to understand those points revealed in class discussion which they could not get in the previous listening. The metacognitive strategies involved in this stage were monitoring, problem solving, and selective attention.

### ***Post-Listening Stage***

Finally, students answered comprehension questions based on the task they listened to. Based on the information they had learned about strategies at that session, they said what strategies they would use at the next session.

All of this process was done in each session of treatment.

### ***Post-Treatment MALQ Questionnaire***

At the end of the treatment, the MALQ questionnaire was given to students again in order to examine the research question of the study, whether EFL learners' metacognitive awareness changed after finishing instruction or not.

### **Data analysis**

SPSS (version 18) was utilized to calculate the analysis of the collected data. The statistical procedures used for the question were descriptive statistics and also several independent samples t-tests and paired samples t-tests.

## **RESULTS**

### **Performance of the Participants on the TOEFL General Proficiency Test**

First of all, a TOEFL proficiency test was administered to both of the control and experimental groups in order to make sure the homogeneity of the participants. The collected data was analyzed by means of an independent-samples t-test. . The results are shown in the following table.

**Table 1.** Results for the TOEFL General Proficiency Test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control	16	424.18	8.479	2.11
Experimental	15	435.46	13.99	3.61

As Table 1 displays, the total TOEFL mean scores of all participants' in the control and experimental groups amounted to 424.18 and 435.46 respectively. Therefore, according to the TOEFL paper-based scoring scale, it was determined that all participants are intermediate EFL learners. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that these two groups enjoyed homogeneity at the outset of the research, so they could participate in the experiment.

### **Performance of the Experimental and Control Groups on the Listening Pre-Test**

Since we are supposed to work on listening skill, after establishing the participants as intermediate EFL learners, the homogeneity of the participants in listening skill was measured. To this end, a TOEFL listening test was administered to both groups as the main pre-test. The results are analyzed using independent samples t-test which are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental and Control groups on Listening Pre-Test

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre-Test	Control	16	32.3750	2.57876	.64469
	Experimental	15	32.9333	3.32666	.85894

As illustrated in Table 2, the mean score and standard deviation of the control group were 32.38 and 2.58 respectively. The mean score and standard deviation of the experimental group amounted to 32.93 and 3.33 respectively. The results displayed that there was no significant difference between two groups in terms of listening skill. It means that the participants were at the same level of listening skill.

**Table 3.** Independent-Samples T-Test for the Performance of the Experimental and Groups on the Listening Pre-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.36	.249	-.524	29	.604	-.55833	1.06507	-2.73664	1.61997
Equal variances not assumed			-.520	26.398	.607	-.55833	1.07397	-2.76428	1.64762

The independent-samples t-test was used to compare the performance of the control and experimental groups on listening pre-test. Since the p-value of the mean is more than 0.05 (Sig. (2-tailed) = p-value = .604 > 0.05), the null hypothesis of the independent samples t-test is not rejected. As a result, there is no significance difference between the control and the experimental groups in listening pre-test. Now, we can conclude that the experimental and control groups had equal level on listening skill; so, they were homogeneous.

### Data Analysis for the Research Question

In order to analyze the data, MALQ questionnaire was handed out among the students of both groups as the pre-treatment questionnaire before the treatment. Then, after the treatment, MALQ questionnaire was distributed again as the post-treatment questionnaire. The results obtained from the second administration of questionnaire were compared to the results of the first administration. The findings were shown using the descriptive method including mean scores, standard deviation and paired-samples t-tests.

#### *Control Group*

Table 4 represents descriptive statistics of the control group in the pre- and post-treatment MALQ questionnaire. As can be seen in this table, the mean values for each strategy has increased during this period in the control group but this increase is not significant.



**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics of the Control Group on Pre- and Post-Treatment MALQ Questionnaire

Pre-Treatment	Problem-Solving	Planning Evaluation	Directed-Attention	Personal Knowledge	Mental Translation
Mean	24.6875	19.8125	16.2500	11.8750	10.6875
Std. Deviation	5.82774	3.54436	3.04412	3.00832	3.19831
Variance	33.963	12.563	9.267	9.050	10.229
Minimum	6.00	11.00	10.00	6.00	4.00
Maximum	30.00	24.00	21.00	17.00	15.00
Post-Treatment	PS	PE	DA	PK	MT
Mean	28.3125	21.6250	17.6875	12.6250	11.8750
Std. Deviation	6.07419	4.64579	2.98259	2.70493	3.59398
Variance	36.896	21.583	8.896	7.317	12.917
Minimum	12.00	12.00	12.00	8.00	4.00
Maximum	36.00	29.00	23.00	17.00	16.00

**Experimental Group**

Table 5 represents descriptive statistics of the experimental group in the pre- and post-treatment MALQ questionnaire.

**Table 5.** Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental Group on the Pre- and Post-Treatment MALQ Questionnaire

Pre-Treatment	Problem-Solving	Planning Evaluation	Directed-Attention	Personal Knowledge	Mental Translation
Mean	24.4667	20.4667	14.8667	10.7333	9.4667
Std. Deviation	6.16287	3.88893	3.60291	3.65409	3.13657
Variance	37.981	15.124	12.981	13.352	9.838
Minimum	10.00	10.00	8.00	5.00	4.00
Maximum	34.00	26.00	21.00	18.00	14.00
Post-Treatment	PS	PE	DA	PK	MT
Mean	32.3333	26.5333	20.2000	14.6667	12.0000
Std. Deviation	2.79455	2.03072	1.56753	2.02367	2.32993
Variance	7.810	4.124	2.457	4.095	5.429
Minimum	27.00	24.00	18.00	11.00	8.00
Maximum	36.00	30.00	23.00	17.00	16.00

As displayed in this table, the mean values for each strategy boost significantly after the treatment compared to those of before the treatment. The increase of mean scores in the experimental group is much more than that of the control group. For better manifestation, the general mean of listening metacognitive awareness of the control and experimental groups are indicated side by side in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Descriptive Statistics of General Listening Metacognitive Awareness of Both Groups

Strategy	Experimental Group on Pre-Treatment	Experimental Group on Post-Treatment	Control Group on Pre-Treatment	Control Group on Post-Treatment
Problem Solving	24.4667	32.3333	24.6875	28.3125
Planning-Evaluation	20.4667	26.5333	19.8125	21.6250
Directed-Attention	14.8667	20.2000	16.2500	17.6875
Personal Knowledge	10.7333	14.6667	11.8750	12.62250
Mental Translation	9.4668	12.0000	10.6875	11.8720
MALQ	16.00002	21.146	16.6625	18.425

Based on the results of Table 6, the order of the strategies in both groups on both pre- and post-tests are the same. As can be seen, both groups have the same level of metacognitive strategies awareness to some extent before the treatment. After the treatment, the listening metacognitive awareness of the control group progressed from 16.66-18.42, but in comparison to that of the experimental group which their metacognitive awareness boosted from 16.00-21.14, the increase in control group is not significant.

Consequently, there is a significant difference between the participant's performances in the control and experimental groups after treatment. So, it can be concluded that explicit teaching of metacognitive strategies could have a positive impact on learners' metacognitive awareness of listening.

The hypothesis cannot be examined just by descriptive statistics. So, in order to precisely check the impact of MSI on understanding of metacognitive strategies, paired samples t-test method was used. As a result, the performance of the control group in pre-and post-treatment were compared with each other. The results are exhibited in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Paired Samples T-Test of Control Group's Pre-and Post-Treatment Data

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PS1-PS2	-3.62500	9.36572	2.34143	-8.61564	1.36564	-1.548	15	.142
Pair 2	PE-PE2	-1.81250	5.40640	1.35160	-4.69337	1.06837	-1.341	15	.200
Pair 3	D-DA2	-1.43750	4.60389	1.15097	-3.89074	1.01574	-1.249	15	.231
Pair 4	PK-PK2	-.75000	3.92428	.98107	-2.84110	1.34110	-.764	15	.456
Pair 5	MT-MT2	-1.18750	3.81608	.95402	-3.22095	.84595	-1.245	15	.232

In this table, PS1, PE1, DA1, PK1 and MT show performance of the control group's participants in the pre-treatment questionnaire and PS2, PE2, DA2, PK2 and MT2 illustrate their performance in the post-treatment questionnaire. As can be seen in Table 7, the amount of sig. value for all strategies is more than the cut-off score (0.05). In other words, there is no significance difference between scores of the control group in pre- and post-treatment administration. Accordingly, it can be concluded that listening metacognitive strategies awareness might not significantly differ without explicit strategy instruction in the context of study.

To confirm the significance of impact resulted from the treatment, the paired samples t-test was calculated for the experimental group, too. The results are demonstrated in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Paired Samples t-Test of Experimental Group's Pre-and Post-Treatment Data

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. 2-tailed
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PS1-PS2	-7.86667	6.36808	1.64423	-11.39319	-4.34014	-4.784	14	.000
Pair 2	PE1-PE2	-6.06667	4.69752	1.21289	-8.66806	-3.46527	-5.002	14	.000
Pair 3	DA-DA2	-5.33333	4.74593	1.22539	-7.96154	-2.70513	-4.352	14	.001
Pair 4	PK1-PK2	-3.93333	4.54292	1.17298	-6.44912	-1.41755	-3.353	14	.005
Pair 5	MT-MT2	-2.53333	4.17247	1.07733	-4.84397	-.22270	-2.351	14	.034

In this table, PS1, PE1, DA1, PK1 and MT1 represent performance of the experimental group's participants in pre-treatment MALQ questionnaire and PS2, PE2, DA2, PK2 and MT2 demonstrate performance of them in post-treatment questionnaire. As can be seen in this table, *problem-solving* (PS) has the highest mean difference among other strategies; so, MSI had the greatest impact on understanding *problem-solving* strategies while its effect was the least on *mental translation* (MT). By comparing these two sets of values, it can be seen that the mean difference of these two scores in the *mean column* for all strategies is negative, besides. The amount of p-value for all strategies is smaller than 0.05; therefore, it can be declared that the experimental group's participants performed significantly different on the post-treatment MALQ questionnaire.

According to the results of Tables 4 to 4, we can claim that there could be a positive relationship between explicit instruction of MS and intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness of listening. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

## DISCUSSION

This study investigated the relationship between MSI and Iranian intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening. Considering the findings of this research

(Tables 8), the amount of p-value for all strategies is smaller than 0.05; so, the null hypothesis assumed for the research question is rejected. This research proved that explicit instruction of listening metacognitive strategies has a significant impact on increasing intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive awareness in listening. The findings of this study are in line with the findings of other studies in this area such as Movahed's research which proved the positive effect of the metacognitive strategy instruction on students' metacognitive awareness of listening.

## **CONCLUSION**

Generally, metacognitive instruction has a significant role in second language learning. Malley and Chamot (1985) has described learners without metacognitive approaches as basically students without aim or chance to review their improvement, achievements, and future learning orientations. Consequently, the major concern of the current study was to determine the effect of MSI on EFL learners' metacognitive awareness. Based on the findings of this research, it can be strongly concluded that MSI improves the learners' metacognitive awareness in listening.

## **PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS**

The findings of this research may have some implications. The first implication is for teachers who have difficulties in teaching listening skill to EFL learners. To help students plan for listening, teachers should provide a purpose for listening so that students will become aware of the specific information they need before listening. The second implication would be for students and learners. Using metacognitive strategies will accelerate the listening comprehension process of learners. It is in this case that they become accountable for their own learning and move toward meaningful learning. The last crucial implication is for material designers. It is recommended that they incorporate this type of teaching method in their course books and design activities which value the importance of language learning strategies especially metacognitive strategies.

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES**

Like any other study, this research suffered from some limitations which make it conducive to further investigation. Firstly, this research focused on teaching metacognitive strategies. Hence, rather than limiting the study's scope to metacognitive strategies, it is recommended that future studies will examine the effect of other language learning strategies such as cognitive or socio-affective listening strategies. Secondly, the participants of this study were intermediate EFL learners. However, it can be replicated with other levels of language proficiency. Thirdly, this research was conducted with both male and female students regardless of gender differences. Thereupon, other researchers can take into account the difference between male and female's performance.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. R. (2009). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Byrnes, J. P. (1996). *Cognitive development and learning in instructional contexts*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chen, Y. (2008). Barriers to acquiring listening strategies for EFL students learners and their pedagogical implications. *TESL-EJ*. Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej32/a2.html>.
- Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.). *The nature of intelligence* (pp.231-236). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34, 906-911. Retrieved from [Http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X).
- Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive awareness and second language Listener. *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 361- 369.
- Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal*, 39 (2), 188-213.
- Harris, V. (2003). Adapting classroom-based strategy instruction to a distance learning context. *TESOL Internet Journal*, 7(20).
- Israel, S. E. (2007). Using metacognitive assessments to create individualized reading instruction. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. *Language annals*, 30 (3), 387-409.
- Lin, Q. (2002). A metacognitive study on unsuccessful listeners. *Foreign Language World* , 88/2: 40-44.
- Lovett, M. (2008). Teaching metacognition: Presentation to the educause learning initiative annual meeting, 29 January 2008.
- Movahed, R. (2014). The effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on listening performance, metacognitive awareness and listening anxiety of beginner Iranian EFL students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 88-99.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(3), 557-584.
- O'Malley, M., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, M. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Erlbaum Group.
- Saslow, J., & Ascher, A. (2011). *Top notch student's book*. London: Pearson Longman Press.
- Seferoglu, G., & Uzakgören, S. (2004). Equipping learners with listening strategies in English language classes. *Hacettepe University of Education Journal*, 27, 223-231.
- Vandegrift, L., & Goh, C. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: development and validation. *Language Learning*, 56(3), 431-462.
- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C. M., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ): Development and

- Validation. *Language Learning*, 56(3), 431-462. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.0037.x>
- Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*, 60, 467-470. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00559.x>
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 515-537.
- Wei, X. (2008). Study on the relationship between metacognition and self-access listening. *Journal of North China Institute of Water Conservancy and Hydroelectric Power (Social Science)*, 24/2: 131 -133.