**T.C.**

**ULUDAG UNIVERSITY**

**THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

**THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**THE DIVISION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

# THE ROLE OF METACOGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE AND STRATEGIES IN TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

**MASTER'S THESIS**

**Esra ÇAM**

**BURSA**

**2019**

# ÜSTBİLİŞSEL BİLGİ VE STRATEJİLERİN İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN YAZMA BAŞARILARINDAKİ ROLÜ

## YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**Esra ÇAM**

**Danışman**

**Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem KARATEPE**

**BURSA**

**2019**

## BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK

Bu sayfadaki tüm bilgilerin akademik ve etik kurallara uygun bir şekilde elde edildiğini beyan ederim.

**Esra ÇAM**

**25/07/2019**

## YÖNERGEYE UYGUNLUK ONAYI

"Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü" adlı Yüksek Lisans tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.


Tezi Hazırlayan                                              Danışman

Esra ÇAM                                        Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem KARATEPE


Yabancı Diller Eğitimi ABD Başkanı

Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

T.C.

ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE,

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı' nda 801010005 numara ile kayıtlı Esra ÇAM' ın hazırladığı "Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü" konulu Yüksek Lisans çalışması ile ilgili tez savunma sınavı, 25/07/2019 günü 14:00 – 15:00 saatleri arasında yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin **başarılı** olduğuna **oybirliği** ile karar verilmiştir.

Tez Danışmanı ve Sınav Komisyonu

Başkanı

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem KARATEPE

Uludağ Üniversitesi

Üye

Doç. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

Uludağ Üniversitesi

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bengü AKSU ATAÇ

Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi

iv

# ÖZET

Yazar : Esra ÇAM

Üniversite : Uludağ Üniversitesi

Ana Bilim Dalı : Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı

Bilim Dalı : İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

Tezin Niteliği : Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Sayfa Sayısı : XIX+199

Mezuniyet Tarihi : 25.07.2019

Tez : Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk

Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü

Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem KARATEPE

## ÜSTBİLİŞSEL BİLGİ VE STRATEJİLERİN İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCİ DİL OLARAK

## ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN YAZMA BAŞARILARINDAKİ ROLÜ

Yazma İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenler için önemli fakat zor bir beceridir. Çağdaş modellerde, bilişsel ve üstbilişsel süreçleri içeren özyinemeli, stratejik ve çok boyutlu bir süreç olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Geçtiğimiz yıllarda, İngilizce yazmada üstbilişin rolü üzerine artan sayıda araştırmalar olmuştur; ancak üstbilişin Türkiye'de İngilizce yazma alanında yeterince ilgi çekmediği görülmektedir.

Türkiye'deki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin üstbilişsel bilgi ve stratejileri kullanımlarının kapsamını ve bunların yazma başarısındaki rolünü inceleyen bu çalışma bu eksikliği gidermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Katılımcılar İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen B2 düzeyindeki 120 öğrencidir. Karma araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların üstbilişsel bilgi ve stratejileri kullanımlarını ölçmek için anketler uygulanmış ve bulguları güçlendirmek ve detaylandırmak için görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Üstbilişsel bilgi ve stratejilerin kullanımına dair benzerlikler ve farklılıkları tespit etmek için katılımcılar ayrıca yazma puanlarına göre yüksek, orta ve düşük performans gösterenler olarak gruplandırılmışlardır.

Üstbilişsel bilgi ile ilgili olarak, katılımcıların ortalama düzeyde bir kişi ve strateji bilgisine, ancak yüksek düzeyde bir ödev bilgisine sahip oldukları bulunmuştur. Üstbilişsel stratejilerin kullanımına yönelik nicel verilerin analizi, orta düzeyde bir öz-düzenleme seviyesine

işaret etmiştir. Öğrencilerin yazma başarısı ve üstbiliş arasındaki ilişkiyi göz önünde bulunduran korelasyon analizi, öğrencilerin yazma başarısı ile kişi ve strateji bilgileri ile planlama, izleme ve değerlendirme stratejilerinin kullanımı arasında zayıf pozitif bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ödev bilgisi ile yazma başarısı arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. İçerik analizlerinin bulguları nicel veri sonuçlarını desteklemiş ve gruplar arasında üstbilişsel bilgi ve üstbilişsel stratejilerin uygulanması noktalarında önemli farklılıkları ortaya çıkarmıştır. Yazma performanslarına paralel olarak, yüksek performanslı yazarlar tüm alt ölçeklerde daha iyi performans göstermiştir.

Bu sonuçlara bağlı olarak, söz konusu çalışma öğrencilerin üstbilişsel bilgilerinin ve öz düzenlemelerinin geliştirilmesine odaklanan bir yazma öğretiminin önemini vurgulamaktadır.

*Anahtar Sözcükler:* Üstbiliş, üstbilişsel bilgi, üstbilişsel stratejiler, İngilizce yazma, yazma becerisi

# ABSTRACT

Author         : Esra ÇAM

University     : Uludag University

Field           : The Department of Foreign Language Education

Branch       : The Division of English Language Teaching

Degree Awarded : Master's Degree

Page Number  : XIX+199

Degree Date    : 25.07.2019

Thesis       : The Role of Metacognitive Knowledge and Strategies in Turkish EFL

                Learners' Writing Achievement

Advisor      : Asst. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem KARATEPE

## THE ROLE OF METACOGNITIVE KNOWLEDGE AND STRATEGIES IN TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Writing is a significant but challenging skill for EFL writers. In contemporary models, it is defined as a recursive, strategic and multi-dimensional process involving both cognitive and metacognitive processes. There has been a growing body of research on the critical role of metacognition in EFL writing in recent decades. However, metacognition seems to receive insufficient attention in the field of EFL writing in Turkey.

Investigating the extent of Turkish EFL students' metacognitive knowledge and strategy use and their role in their writing achievement, this study addresses this gap. Participants were 120 B2 level Turkish EFL students. A mixed type research method was used. Questionnaires were employed to measure participants' metacognitive knowledge and strategy use, and interviews were conducted to triangulate and elaborate on their findings. Besides, to identify the similarities and differences in their metacognitive knowledge and strategy use, participants were grouped as high-performing (HP), average-performing (AP) and low-performing (LP) according to their writing scores.

Regarding their metacognitive knowledge, participants were found to have an average level of person and strategy knowledge but a high level of task knowledge. Analysis of the

quantitative data for their use of metacognitive strategies indicated an average level of self-regulation. A correlation analysis, which took into account the relationship between students' writing achievement and metacognition, revealed a weak positive relationship between students' writing achievement and person and strategy knowledge as well as their use of planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies. There was no statistically significant relationship between task knowledge and writing achievement. The findings of the content analysis supported the quantitative data results and revealed significant differences among groups in their metacognitive knowledge and the application of metacognitive strategies. Parallel to their writing performances, HP writers performed better in all subscales.

Depending on these results, the present study highlights the importance of writing instruction that focuses on the development of students' metacognitive knowledge and self-regulation.

*Keywords:* Metacognition*,* metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive strategies, EFL writing, writing skill

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Dedicated to my son, Umut Ege*

*I hope I always make you proud!*

**Table of Contents**

## List of Tables

# List of Abbreviations

1. AP: Average-performing

2. APS: Average-performing Student

3. EFL: English as a Foreign Language

4. ESL: English as a Second Language

5. FL: Foreign Language

6. HP: High-performing

7. HPS: High-performing Student

8. LLOS: Language Learning Orientations Scale

9. LP: Low-performing

10. LPS: Low- performing Student

11. L1: Native Language

12. L2: Second/Foreign Language

13. MAI: Metacognitive Awareness Inventory

14. MALQ: Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire

15. MARSI: The Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

16. MKWS: Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey

17. MSWS: Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey

18. SL: Second Language

19. SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

20. TESOL: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

21. TOEFL: Test of English as a Foreign Language

22. TSES: Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale

**CHAPTER ONE**

**Introduction**

This chapter mainly presents the background of the study, the statement of the problem, and the purpose, significance and limitations of the study. First of all, the influence of cognitive and constructivist learning models on the emergence of metacognition and the role of metacognition on English as a foreign language (EFL) learning process in general and EFL writing process in specific are addressed. Problems related to EFL learning and teaching, EFL writing and metacognition in Turkey are briefly explained. Research questions are introduced and the notable contributions of the present study to the literature in this field are noted. At the end of the chapter, several limitations of the present study are mentioned, and some key terms are introduced to the reader.

**1.1. The Background of the Study**

As an inevitable result of living in the information age, today we are exposed to more information than ever on a usual day. This era has brought about a period in which individuals can access information faster and more easily. All these have enforced us to review and change our approaches to teaching and learning and to acquire some skills in order to cope up with so much information at our fingertips. As a reaction to behaviouristic models of learning where reception of the new knowledge was highly valued, and learning was perceived as conditioning of behaviour, cognitive revolution emerged in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Unlike behaviouristic view, in cognitive models of learning, the key was the construction of knowledge by the individuals rather than its reception (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1962).

The cognitive revolution led to the emergence of several important learning theories such as cognitive information-processing theory (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968), cognitive-constructivism (Bruner, 1960; 1966; Piaget, 1970, 1976) and social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1962; 1978).

These theoretical approaches to learning and development not only provided us with valuable insight into how individuals construct information but also shaped our understanding of education today. The global trend from teacher-centred towards student-centred education motivated scholars to reconsider students and teachers' roles in the learning process and the purpose of instruction. Learners are no longer viewed as blank slates waiting to be filled with extensive knowledge. They are expected to develop new understandings based on their prior knowledge or past experiences, verify and investigate them through various sources, and modify or change them to accommodate new learning situations (Piaget, 1969; 1976). Teachers, on the other hand, have turned into the guides on the side rather than the sage on the stage (Piaget, 1973; Vygotsky, 1978). Finally, instruction has changed into an intervention in the ongoing process of knowledge construction (Resnick, 1989) from a passive transmission of information from more knowledgeable to the less knowledgeable. Its primary purpose is to encourage learners to think over their thinking, take responsibility of their own learning and use appropriate strategies to learn more autonomously (Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Piaget, 1973).

This new understanding of education has paved the way for the emergence of new notions in the educational field over the past few decades. One of the most significant of them is metacognition. The term, metacognition, was proposed by American developmental psychologist John Flavell in the late 1970s (Flavell, 1976, 1979). Flavell's pioneering work on children's knowledge and control of memory processes played a key role in initiating a series of important research on metacognition. However, even before Flavell, some basic terms that we use today to define and describe metacognitive processes (i.e. monitoring and control, self-regulation) had already appeared in the literature. The theory of metacognition is loosely based on the theoretical foundation of Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, Lev Vygotsky's sociocultural

theory of cognitive development and the writings of William James (see James, 1890/91, 1992) (Fox & Riconscente, 2008).

According to Flavell (1976), metacognition involves individuals' knowledge or thinking about their own cognitive processes and the strategies they use to regulate these processes. To put it more explicitly, metacognition refers to one's knowledge or awareness about his/her thinking or learning, and it involves active control over the cognitive processes engaged in learning (Brown 1978; Flavell, 1979). Flavell (1979) specifies the major role of metacognition in academic instruction as "teaching children and adults to make wise and thoughtful life decisions as well as to comprehend and learn better in formal educational settings" (p.910). Metacognition is not only a major component for competent thinking (Pressley & Gaskins, 2006), but it is also considered to be one of the most influential predictors of learning (Veenman, Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 2006).

A brief overview of language teaching history reveals that cognitive and constructivist models of learning also have a significant influence on the second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) teaching methodology (see Chomsky 1986; Krashen, 1977; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). We have been witnessing a paradigm shift from traditional language teaching approaches that mainly focused on grammar teaching, translation and accuracy (i.e. grammar-translation method and the direct method) towards a new understanding of SL/FL instruction that attaches importance on communicative competence, functional and authentic use of the language for meaningful purposes (i.e. communicative method). Since then, FL curriculums, which put learner autonomy and self-regulation into the centre and give more freedom, but responsibility to the learner in the language learning process, have been designed (Reinfried, 2000).

Wenden (1987) is the one who first applied the concept of metacognition into language learning. According to her, the fundamental role of metacognition in language learning is

enhancing learner autonomy and differentiating cognitive processes among language learners. Since her pioneering work, the role of metacognition in the development of language skills has been widely examined by many researchers and scholars, and eventually metacognition gets the attention that it has already deserved in the field of language learning. Furthermore, Anderson (2002) suggests that, "strong metacognitive skills empower second language learners", and by metacognitive instruction, language learners can think about what happens while learning and develop autonomy and, hence, stronger learning skills. He further claims, "The teaching of metacognitive skills is a valuable use of instructional time for a second language teacher" (p.4). (Anderson, 2002; 2012). These findings have encouraged researchers to investigate the probable influence of metacognitive instruction on the academic success of language learners for the last few decades.

Looking back at the literature on the teaching of EFL writing over the last 40 years, as a natural consequence of its difficulty for students and inefficiency of previous approaches to upskill EFL writers and expand their capabilities, we have been witnessing a dramatic change on the emphasis and focus of writing instruction. The instructional practices heavily influenced by the Behaviourist Theory (i.e. product approach to the teaching of writing) have been replaced with the ones that focuses on constructing or communicating meaning through writing (i.e. process and genre approaches). With developments in linguistics and cognitive psychology, the role of strategy training and learner metacognition on writing skills has attracted the attention of many scholars including the researcher of present study.

## 1.2. The Statement of the Problem

English is the most commonly spoken language in the world, and it is regarded as the language of science, diplomacy, tourism, technology and media in today's rapidly globalising world (Genc & Bada, 2010). High English proficiency provides individuals with various

opportunities such as employment and career, travelling, higher education, access to latest technological and scientific resources, cultural exchange, and better life conditions (Akbari, 2015; Crystal, 1997). Therefore, English is given a high priority in the curriculum as a foreign language in Turkey, and learning and teaching of English have always been on the front burner (Buyukkantarcioglu, 2004). For over 95 years, following the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, various reforms regarding FL teaching and learning have been introduced. Opening English medium high schools which offered instruction both in English and Turkish, establishing English-medium state universities, opening English-medium programmes in certain disciplines (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011), and introducing English instruction as early as the $2^{nd}$ grade were the most significant ones. Besides, English Language Teaching Program was revised, and a new curriculum based on the constructivist approach was put into practice in 2005 by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) (MoNE Website, 2018).

Despite all the efforts and investments devoted to developing English proficiency among Turkish learners, the eventual outcome is, however, not desirable. The curriculum, which is claimed to take all aspects of communicative competence into consideration, address functions and four skills of language in an integrated way, foster learner autonomy and include authentic assessment tools, looks pretty good on paper. However, how successful it is in meeting the needs and expectations of Turkish EFL learners and teachers is still debatable (Dogancay-Aktuna & Kiziltepe, 2005). The new curriculum has been criticised because classroom practices, teaching methods and materials, school and classroom structures, school administrators and teachers are still traditional, and they are not compatible with the principles of constructivism (Aykac, 2007a; 2007b; Aykac & Ulubey, 2012).   Furthermore, statistics show that Turkey ranks very low on various measures of English language proficiency in the global arena. For example, the 2017 English Proficiency Index (EPI), which ranks countries by their English skills, puts Turkey $62^{nd}$

out of 80 countries (26th out of 27 countries in Europe) with a score of 47,79 (very low proficiency).

In EFL contexts like Turkey, students' limited exposure to English outside the classroom, their lack of conscious effort, motivation and effective strategies to master a FL, their preconceived beliefs about the nature of learning English and their inefficiency in achieving autonomy are perceived to be the common reasons for the poor achievement of most EFL students. Some external factors regarding teachers and their teaching methods, textbooks, language assessment and evaluation procedures, and curriculum also have a significant impact on their failure in the task of foreign language learning (Akbari, 2015).

In 2013, the British Council conducted a comprehensive study in partnership with TEPAV (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey) to analyse the current state of English language teaching and learning in state schools in Turkey. 19.380 students, 1.394 parents and 78 teachers participated in the study. The study revealed several important findings, but one was quite remarkable: "the competence level in English of most (90+ %) students across Turkey was evidenced as rudimentary even after 1000+ hours (estimated at the end of the Grade 12) of English classes" (British Council & TEPAV, 2013, p.15, 16). Five significant shortcomings of the formal EFL programs at schools were also noted to be leading to the poor English proficiency of Turkish students: emphasis on grammar teaching, teacher-centred/textbook-centred learning and grammar based testing, class management, lack of differentiation regarding needs/interests/levels of students, and teachers' little voice in the process and practice of teaching English.

When Turkish students' competence in productive English skills, namely speaking and writing, is considered, the situation may be even worse. Productive skills are greatly ignored in EFL instruction and assessment in public schools in Turkey (Bozdogan & Karlidag, 2013).

Students are exposed to a teacher-centred/textbook-centred, rote memorisation-based and exam-oriented FL instruction that neglects their actual needs for years (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011; British Council & TEPAV, 2013; Oktay, 2015). As a result, most of them regard foreign language learning as memorising a list of words and grammar rules and comprehending reading texts. They expect to be the recipients of information even when they reach the tertiary level (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011). Even though they manage to deal with receptive skills such as reading and listening to some degree, they feel deeply concerned and even frustrated about coping up with tasks that require production and communication in the target language.

A good writing ability, on the other hand, has become a vital requirement for students, academicians and various professionals worldwide in the last three decades (Leki, 2001). Many Turkish tertiary-level EFL learners feel a strong need to develop their academic writing skills to complete their education in their English-medium departments and to succeed in the dynamic and competitive global society afterwards. However, writing is possibly the most difficult skill that SL/FL learners engage in (Richards & Renandya, 2003). Various external and internal factors (i.e. having an education that does not support creativity and autonomy, failure in appreciating a good read in childhood, insufficient linguistic proficiency, lack of writing practice, writing anxiety, low motivation, and lack of ideas) complicate the EFL writing process for most Turkish EFL students. They have little or no access to academic writing in English in the surrounding environment. Very few of them have sufficient training or practice even in the native language (L1) writing. In addition to these problems related to the students themselves, some external factors such as crowded classroom environments, time constraints, examination system, and un-qualified English teachers have also a great influence on this challenging process (Fareed, Ashraf, & Bilal, 2016; Leki, 2001).

Writing, as a productive skill, not only requires the availability of certain linguistic knowledge such as orthography, vocabulary and syntax of the target language but also the successful implementation of this knowledge (Ruan, 2005). Effective writing in the target language demands even more as it is an extremely complicated cognitive activity that requires the writer to have control over many variables simultaneously (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Nunan, 1989). To produce a good piece of writing, EFL writers need to generate ideas and organise them coherently, use appropriate level of formality for the audience, master writing conventions, meet the requirements of the specific genre, adhere to the rhetorical conventions of the target language, revise to communicate the intended meaning more accurately, and edit to correct the written errors (Leki, 2001; Nunan; 1989). That is why ensuring the mastery of all these skills and knowledge on the part of the students within a formal scheme of instruction does not seem to be a realistic and attainable goal for teachers and institutions that provide writing instruction.

All these problems related to EFL teaching and learning in general and EFL writing in particular in Turkey may seem to paint a hopeless picture. However, attempts to foster learner autonomy, self-regulation and metacognition in EFL writing process may be a remedy to the ills of EFL writing.

**1.3. The Purpose of the Study**

Writing was chosen as a research area in the current study for several reasons. First of all, more EFL students feel a strong need to improve their academic writing skills in Turkey today. However, they do not find themselves competent in writing; they have little or no experience in L1 and L2 writing; and they are not motivated to engage in writing tasks. Second, most of the teachers who are assigned to teach writing classes find themselves unqualified, and they experience difficulties as to how to teach students about this skill that requires learners to control a number of variables simultaneously. Finally, although prior reseyarch points at various

benefits of metacognition to the writing performance of EFL learners, there is not a single study on the metacognition and EFL writing skill in Turkey so far.

Considering these, the current study basically aims to explain the theoretical rationale behind metacognition and clarify the relationship between metacognition and EFL writing achievement. To achieve this purpose, first of all, it explores the current state of Turkish EFL students' metacognitive knowledge about and regulation of writing.  In a further attempt, it identifies whether there is a link between their metacognition and writing achievement, and if there exists, which certain aspects of metacognitive knowledge and regulation are more significant than others in accounting for success. Finally, it investigates what components or subcomponents these students' metacognition involve. In the light of its findings, the study also aims to provide EFL teachers with an insight about some possible ways to revise their teaching methodologies and approaches to writing instruction.

## 1.4. Research Questions

The present study addresses the following six research questions:

1. What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables?

2. While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating?

3. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

4. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing?

5. What do Turkish EFL learners think about their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

6.  What do Turkish EFL learners think about the metacognitive strategies they used in a given writing task?

## 1.5. The Significance of the Study

Research on metacognition in the area of education is quite new in the Turkish context, and the first study carried out dates only back to early 2000s (see Cetinkaya & Ertekin, 2002). Bas and Sagirli (2017)'s meta-analysis study revealed that educational surveys on metacognition in Turkey increased in number for the past several years. However, nearly half of these studies examined their participants' awareness about metacognitive knowledge or strategy use independently of a specific domain. Turkish, Mathematics and Science were the most common domains, respectively to draw Turkish researchers' attention.

The surveys examining metacognition in relation to EFL learning and teaching, on the other hand, constitute only 4 % of the whole research carried out in this field (Bas & Sagirli, 2017), and the majority of these limited number of studies were conducted on receptive skills focusing mainly on reading skill. EFL writing has been a significant academic field recently, especially for tertiary-level students. Though there exists a large population of EFL learners for whom writing is of great importance but a tough challenge, to the extent of the researcher's knowledge, there is not a single study examining the relationship between metacognition and EFL writing in Turkey. Accordingly, the present study aims to fill this gap and to add to the body of literature about EFL writing and metacognition in Turkey. Besides, it serves a starting point for further educational studies that will examine metacognition in relation to EFL writing skill.

## 1.6. The Limitations of the Study

The findings of the current study should be considered in light of its several limitations that may have unintentionally influenced its findingd. First, the study was carried out only with B2 level students studying at the School of Foreign Languages of Yalova University. There was

only one L1 (Turkish) within the study group. This imposes limitations on the degree to which generalization is possible to EFL groups with many different first languages.

Secondly, data collection tools were limited to two questionnaires measuring the participants' writing metacognitive knowledge (MKWS) and strategy use (MSWS), retrospective interviews, and argumentative essays. As both questionnaires and interviews serve as self-reports, measuring metacognitive knowledge and self-regulation through them might be insufficient to provide us with full access to the participants' complete metacognitive knowledge and behaviours during a writing task.

Third, students who participated in the surveys had four hours of classes in the morning and a writing task in the afternoon (which most of them described as challenging) immediately before they responded to the questionnaire items. Getting tired and demoralized may have affected their performances on the surveys negatively. However, it is important to note that this weakness stemmed from the fact that writing tasks were pop-up, and they had to be carried out at the same time (i.e. at an hour when all students had writing classes).

Fourth, students' writing performances were measured only through their argumentative writings and a strict time-limit (an hour) was administered for students' compositions. Relying on the view that difficult tasks may work better to trigger the writers to use metacognitive strategies in the writing process actively, the argumentative essay was chosen as the main task to measure students' writing achievement. Mainly because students were less familiar with it, they were expected to perform it more metacognitively. However, as interview data revealed, a discrepancy existed between students' current and actual writing performances when they were assigned such a challenging task (i.e. written argumentative).

Selection bias in the sample is also a possibility, especially for the students that participated in the interviews.  Interviewees were selected randomly among the volunteers, and it

was clearly seen that these students' were more motivated and interested than those students who were not eager to take part in the interview sessions.

Lastly, participants of the study used a specific textbook, followed a specific syllabus and were tested at the same exams. However, due to scheduling difficulties, each writing class was taught by a different instructor, undoubtedly having unique teaching styles, expectations and priorities, and presenting several different extra materials and classroom activities.

## 1.7. Definitions of Key Terms

**Cognition:** It refers to a variety of mental actions or processes relating to the acquiring, perceiving, thinking, understanding, and remembering.

**Metacognition:** It involves the knowledge, skills and strategies about mental states and processes. It acts like a "higher order agent overlooking and governing the cognitive system, while simultaneously being part of it" (Veenman, Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 2006).

**Metacognitive Knowledge:** It is one's knowledge or beliefs about his/her own mental processes (Brown, 1987; Flavell, 1979).

**Metacognitive Strategies:** These are the "higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring or evaluating the success of a learning activity" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p.44).

**Metacognitive Monitoring:** It is one's on-line self-observation and self-assessment of his/her thought processes, existing state of knowledge or actual performance.

**Metacognitive Control:** It is voluntary direction of one's metacognitive monitoring processes to achieve strategic control over cognitive processes (Nelson & Narens, 1994).

**CHAPTER TWO**

**The Review of Literature**

This chapter is divided into four main sections. In the first section, writing skill, more particularly second and foreign language (L2) writing skill, is addressed in detail. Similarities and differences between L1 and L2 writing are explained. Research directions concerning L2 writing are presented, and conventional approaches to writing instruction are summarised.  In the second part, the theoretical background of the study, including detailed information about metacognition, and several models for metacognition are explained. In the third section, readers are provided with a brief insight into the role of metacognitive knowledge and self-regulatory strategies in L2 learning. Also, a summary of the related literature on metacognition and EFL/ESL learning is given.  Next, the researcher focuses on metacognition and EFL/ESL writing urging upon metacognitive writing knowledge and self-regulatory writing strategies. At the end of the chapter, a brief overview of research on metacognition and EFL writing is presented.

**2.1. Writing Skill**

In line with the vastly expanding writing research in recent years, writing is no more viewed "as a linear and somewhat simplistic activity" but rather "a recursive, strategic, and multi-dimensional process central to (1) planning what to say and how to say it; (2) translating ideas into written text; and (3) revising what has been written" (Harris, Santangelo, & Graham, 2010, p.226). Writing requires absolute coordination and successful implementation of various factors such as writing rules and mechanics, writing purpose, target audience, organisation, communicative intent and several linguistic skills including semantics, syntax and spelling. Therefore, in contemporary models, it has been described as "cognitive, linguistic, affective, behavioural, and physical in nature and set within a larger socio-cultural context" (Harris et al., 2010, p.132). That is the very reason for the common assumption that writing is the most

challenging and problematic skill for most FL/SL learners, and meeting this challenge is very significant to ensure the academic progress of these learners (Kasper, 1997).

      **2.1.1. Writing in the mother tongue and writing in an L2.** Roca De Larios, Murphy, and Marin (2002) divide studies that focus on similarities and differences between L1 and L2 writing into two groups: intra-subject studies and inter-subject studies. Intra-subject studies examine the writing processes of the same individuals in both languages, whereas inter-subject studies compare the data they collect from L2 writers with those of native speakers. A considerable number of these studies indicate significant similarities and differences between L1 and L2 writing in the ways writers compose, in the processes they go through and in the skills they need (Akyel & Kamisli, 1997; Cumming, 2001; Cumming, Rebuffot, & Ledwell, 1989).

      To begin with, the writing skills students use or the writing behaviours they show while writing in L2 are claimed to be related to the ones they adopt while writing in L1 (Akyel, 1994; Cumming, 1990; 2001; Myles, 2002; Victori & Lockhart, 1995). Students' overall writing patterns, certain high-level writing processes (i.e. planning, monitoring and revising), and their efficient and inefficient use of these have been reported to be similar across languages (Roca De Larios et al., 2002). Thus, when students acquire these processes and become more skilled in their L1, they do not need to reacquire them in L2 (Myles, 2002). They can transfer these writing skills and strategies, which are already available, to L2 writing situations (Ransdell & Barbier, 2002; Roca De Larios et al., 2002).

      However, the tendency to regard L1 and L2 composing as the same processes and grounding on L1 composition models (i.e. Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981) to teach L2 writing may cause us to overlook the factors that are unique to L2 writing situations. According to Myles (2002), writing in L2 imposes a number of constraints upon students, and there are a number of educational, social and contextual factors that complicate L2

writing process for language learners or operate to hinder effective writing. Roca de Larios et al. (2002) further mention that "the L2 writing population cannot be regarded as homogeneous at all" (p.15). Although the acronym L2 has been commonly used to refer to both SL and FL in the literature, these two writing contexts provide students with "qualitatively different kinds of interaction, input and affective relations, as well as quantitatively different proportions of them" (Roca de Larios et al., 2002, p.15). Therefore, the skills or knowledge that writers need or the challenges they face in their writing process differ depending on the language they write in.

Silva (1993) further states, "L2 writing is strategically, rhetorically, and linguistically different in important ways from L1 writing" (p. 669). One potential challenge to effective L2 writing is students' lack of language proficiency. Writing requires generating and coordinating complex ideas, but the expression of these is closely related to lexical and syntactic knowledge. Therefore, many scholars consider linguistic competence as a significant factor which predicts learners' writing performance (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). If L2 writers cannot reach a certain level of proficiency in the target language, they also cannot transfer their L1 literacy skills, overall writing patterns, certain high-level writing strategies into L2 writing situations (Roca De Larios et al., 2002). Even if they can generate enough number of ideas to write about or goals to achieve, because of the constraints imposed by writing in an L2, they may have to reduce them in accordance with their linguistic competence.

Secondly, although L1 and L2 writers show some similarities in certain planning behaviours such as text length, genre choice or audience awareness, L2 writers seem to set fewer goals (Roca de Larios et al., 2002). Significant differences have also been found about revising behaviours of L1 and L2 writers; however, regarding research presents contradictory findings. While some studies reveal that L2 writers revise their work more frequently (Roca De Larios et al., 2002), others suggest that due to their limited proficiency in the target language, L2 writers

reread, revise and edit less when compared to their L1 counterparts (Raimes, 1985; Silva, 1993).

Even when they revise, they devote more attention to micro-level elements of writing (i.e. lexical

resources and grammatical accuracy) at the cost of macro-level elements (i.e. text structure,

coherence and cohesion, planning, revising) (Cumming, 2001), and their revisions are superficial

and mainly focus on mechanical errors.

Another challenge that disrupts formulation processes of L2 writers is their tendency to

translate the writing goals they generate in their native language into L2. As they need to both

retain these goals in working memory and concentrate on appropriate language use concurrently,

it is harder for them to sustain the formulation process fluently.  As a result, interruptions are

more common, and pauses are longer in L2 writing (Roca De Larios et al., 2002).

Last but not the least, "the quantity and quality of previous literacy experiences" and "the

hidden L1 literacy assumptions that writers carry over the acquisition of L2 literacy" play a

significant role in L2 writing performance (Roca De Larios et al., 2002, p.34). Students'

perceptions about writing change depending on whether they write in L1 or L2. What is more, L2

writers regard composing in the target language as more form-focused, laborious and time-

consuming (Silva, 1992).

In light of these studies, one can conclude that students' overall writing patterns, certain

high-level writing processes and strategies are similar across languages. Once they are acquired

in L1 writing, they can be activated and used in L2 writing. However, writing in L2 is has its own

challenges and differs strategically, rhetorically, and linguistically from L1 writing. Learners'

prior schooling experiences regarding their literacy both in their native language and the target

language ( Mohan & Lo, 1985),  the cultural contexts they grow up (Matalene, 1985) and the

perceptions and attitudes they bring in their writing classes (Rose, 1985) should also be

considered to draw conclusions about how to teach writing.

**2.1.2.  Research on L2 writing acquisition.** Research on learning to write in L2 has centred upon three fundamental dimensions: features of the texts that learners produce, the processes that underlie learners' writing performance, and the socio-cultural contexts that they write in (Cumming, 2001).  More importantly, it establishes foundations for the three main approaches to the teaching of writing: the product approach, the process approach and the genre approach (which will be explained in the next sections in detail).

First of all, when examining the writing improvement of L2 learners, considerable research has focused on the quality and features of the text they produce. While L2 learners write in the target language, they are expected not only to develop their overall language proficiency, expand their vocabulary knowledge and sophisticate their grammar but also to master the skill of writing in terms of organisation, coherence, cohesion, rhetorical styles, and strategies for writing (Cumming, 2001; Myles, 2002). Thanks to the research on text features, we have a greater insight about the micro and macro elements of a well-written text such as syntax, morphology, lexis, cohesive devices, and text structure today.   However, text analysis research alone fails to address to the individual writer (i.e. his/her characteristics, intentions and perceptions, prior educational experiences and knowledge base, and writing processes) and the discourse community s/he belongs to (Zamel, 1987).

Another currently investigated dimension in the relevant research concerns the processes that learners go through while composing in a target language. Studies that examine the learners' writing processes are significant in that they provide us with a better understanding of the complex nature of the writing skill, students' common writing behaviours, the challenges they face and the strategies they use while composing. They also urge us, teachers, to think over our role in their writing process and examine our teaching practices. As Roca De Larios et al. (2002) suggest, the more we know about what writers do while they are composing, the more effective

our teaching procedures will be. The problem with process studies, on the other hand, is that they are heavily influenced by L1 writing models that examine the writing processes of monolingual learners (i.e. Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981), and the studies conducted to investigate L2 writing process is limited in number (Ransdell & Barbier, 2002). In addition, despite their previously stated advantages, process studies are less likely to take into consideration the contextual factors affecting L2 writing such as "the quantity and quality of previous literacy experiences, the role played by genre, and the hidden L1 literacy assumptions that writers carry over to the acquisition of L2 literacy" (Roca De Larios et al., 2002, p. 34). Therefore, they are heavily criticised for failing to inform and transform L2 writing pedagogy.

Finally, because "writing is produced not merely *in* context, but *through* it" (Zamel, 1987, p.704), the educational or social contexts that L2 writing occurs are worth investigating for many scholars. Cumming (2001) describes the learning of L2 writing "as a process of individual development in particular social contexts" as well as "acculturation into particular discourse communities" (p.7). Although the contextual factors including "the conditions under which students write; the methods and styles of teachers; the personalities, attitudes and learning processes of students and the many interactions among these variables" have a great influence on learners' writing achievement, writing research fails to address them adequately (Kantor, 1984, p. 72). Therefore, studies examining the diverse situations and challenges that a group of individuals in a certain context face provide us with some insights into their common coping and learning strategies and how they change their identities to address the target language community (Zamel, 1987). Classroom and context-based research helps us understand the relationship between learners' writing behaviours and L2 writing pedagogy, and bring about the desired changes in L2 writing instruction.

To conclude, such analyses of the text features, composing process and the contexts of writing do not just help us to conceptualise what the learning and teaching of L2 writing entail but also provide us with useful implications for the teaching of L2 writing.

**2.1.3. Teaching writing.** The teaching of writing as a discipline dates only back to 1970s (Raimes, 1991). Although writing research provides us with important insights into learners' writing processes, the features of the text they produce and the role of context they write in, recent studies of the teaching of L2 writing reveal that research findings usually do not correspond to the classroom practices. In most writing classes, writing instruction is still based on traditional and mechanistic models and teacher-dominated routines. Students engage in various mechanical activities and drills or are assigned low-level writing tasks which are not meaningful for them and in which they have very few opportunities actually to write. According to Zamel (1987), this is either because it is difficult for teachers to incorporate changes in their classrooms or because relevant studies fail to examine writing in its naturalistic contexts. Teachers, who are not competent about the requirements of the teaching of writing skill but are assigned to teach it, find it easier to reduce writing into discrete steps and prescribe some basic rules and principles to their students. Constraints of educational systems, curricular or administrative goals and the inefficiency of writing textbooks are the other reasons for this tendency (Zamel, 1987).

Writing behaviours and processes are unique to each learner and vary with each individual. Traditional approaches to writing instruction centre mostly on the teacher's expectations and priories (i.e. proper use of mechanical aspects, adhesion to conventions of target language discourse), but fail to address learners' needs (i.e. communicating ideas with target audience through writing) and the contextual factors that affect their writing behaviours. About the teaching of writing, how teachers respond to students' written texts is another critical issue. Studies that investigate responding behaviours of teachers demonstrate that teachers cling to the

traditional approaches while they respond to student writings. They tend to evaluate students'

final products based on their "preconceived and fixed notions about good writing". What is more,

their feedbacks centre mostly upon "rhetorical forms and uniform standards" and local, language

related-problems at the sentence or clause level rather than meaning-related problems regarding

the whole text. (Zamel, 1987, p.700).

In writing classes where the form and accuracy take priority over meaning and

communication of ideas, students are restricted with rules and limitations that the teacher sets

about how to write or how not to write. They write in response to exams or assignments to be

evaluated by teachers (Applebee, 1984; Zamel, 1987). As a result, they feel upset, anxious,

frustrated and even in danger. They have negative perceptions about and attitudes towards

writing and writing instruction. Instead of struggling, they get lost in their self-defeating

thoughts. In her case study with an apprehensive writer, Selfe (1985) argues that anxiety, which

most students suffer from in writing classes, stems from students' limited writing experiences at

school and the particular importance that teachers attach to the perfectionism in writing. Besides,

negative attitudes and perceptions that L2 writers bring to the writing classes are strengthened or

reinforced when their efforts result in failure (McGroarty, 1996).

Considering the critical role of affective factors on students' writing performance, a

writing pedagogy which puts the students at the centre, provides them with a supportive

environment, makes them feel successful and encourages them to take responsibility of their

learning serve a useful purpose (McGroarty, 1996; Zamel, 1987). Diaz (1985) reveals that when

L2 learners are provided with a student-centred, nonevaluative and encouraging classroom

environment and plenty of opportunities for meaningful writing practices, they write better, feel

more competent but less anxious about writing in L2. On the other hand, if the writing

environment "is perceived to be stressful or threatening...., learners' affective states can influence

cognition..., so emotional influences along with cognitive factors can account for achievement and performance in L2, to a certain extent" (Myles, 2002).

Numerous studies were carried out to find an ideal approach to writing instruction until now. However, as Zamel (1987) states:

> These past efforts to establish the best method were based on the faulty assumptions that there was a best method and one just had to find it, that teaching writing was a matter of prescribing a logically ordered set of written tasks and exercises, and that good writing conformed to a predetermined and ideal model. (p.697)

Obviously, there is not a sure recipe for the teachers or instructors to follow to make this continuous and complicated process more straightforward. The characteristics, expectations, and educational, social and cultural experiences of the target learner group and priorities, cultural beliefs, ideologies, pedagogical content knowledge and goals of the writing teachers shape the focus of writing instruction and compel the class dynamics to function in certain ways. One thing is sure that writing is not a skill acquired naturally, so writing instruction should provide L2 writers with a considerable amount of input and experience in formal instructional settings (Myles, 2002). The more writers practice in the task of L2 writing, the greater control they have over the "abilities to plan, revise and edit their texts, to search for appropriate words or phrases…, and to attend more often or intently to their ideas in respect to the forms of the second language" (Cumming, 2001, p.6).

An increasing amount of research on writing has delineated a variety of approaches to writing instruction, but three stands out from the rest: the product approach, the process approach and the genre approach. These approaches will be explained in the next section in detail.

*2.1.3.1. Product approach*.  In line with the popularity of audio-lingual method and form-focused instruction in L2 classrooms where learners' attention is drawn on the lexical, grammatical and pragmalinguistic features of the target language, product-based writing approach emerged and enjoyed a vogue from 1950s to 1970s. Product approach is commonly referred as "a traditional approach in which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, usually is presented and analysed at an early stage" (Gabrielatos, 2002, p.5).  They are expected to follow the standard to construct their texts considering the language items in the model text and copying, imitating, or transforming them. Writing activities and tasks are usually controlled and guided, and constructing an error-free composition as the final product is highly valued. Whether a composition is high-quality or not depends both on the accuracy of mechanical aspects such as grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation and on the extent that it corresponds to the model text studied previously.

According to Steele (2004), the product approach consists of four stages. In the first stage, a standard sample of a text that belongs to a specific genre is presented to students. They analyse the model text and study the language and the highlighted features of that genre. In the second stage, students practice the important features in the model text through controlled activities and usually in isolation. In stage three, students organise their ideas mimicking the model text they have studied previously. In this approach, the control of the language and organisation of the ideas are more important than the ideas themselves. In the last stage, students are expected to generate a final written product using the skills, structures and vocabulary they have learnt.

In the product approach, teachers act as an authority in the classroom, transmitting the lexical and grammatical knowledge that students need to write accurately. They are responsible for supplying good model texts, teaching the language items specific to the genres, organising the

environment and giving feedback based particularly on grammatical and lexical errors rather than meaning-oriented exploration. An ideal student, on the other hand, is the one who adheres to and duplicates the models and uses the target language fluently, correctly and competently.

Although it is still a common approach to teach L2 writing, product-based writing instruction is heavily criticised for two main reasons: it ignores the role of audience and context, and it overvalues the error-free final piece of writing rather than the skills and processes that students use to produce it.

*2.1.3.2. Process approach.* With the dominance of cognitive theory in the 1970s in the psychology of learning, the focus of writing instruction shifted from the teaching of language itself to the cognitive processes of language learners. Not surprisingly, this shift sparked a change in approaches to writing instruction.  Mental and cognitive processes of learners and the cognitive and metacognitive strategies they use to handle the writing tasks attracted L2 researchers' attention. Process approach emerged in the mid-1970s. Unlike the product approach where using language accurately to develop a written-product is the major priority, the process approach puts the writer and the processes that he or she goes through to compose in the centre of writing instruction. In the process approach, language is a means to write skillfully and create meaning rather than being the main priority in writing instruction.

Scholars that put the writers and their cognitive processes to the centre of writing instruction offer some stages to be followed to write more skillfully. Graves (1983) mentions five stages, including pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing.  Similarly, Steele (2004)'s categorisation consists of eight basic stages which are brainstorming, planning/structuring, mind mapping, writing the first draft,  peer feedback, editing, final draft, and evaluation and teachers' feedback.

Among the several cognitive writing models in the literature that view writing as a unique process of development, the writing model of Flower and Hayes (1981) is quite popular and commonly referred by the scholars in the field of writing and particularly in the field of writing metacognition. In their model, Flower and Hayes (1981) examine what writers do and what potential rhetorical problems they face when they write. They divide the writing process into three main stages: planning, translating and reviewing. These stages also well represent the mechanisms of metacognitive regulation, which are planning, monitoring and evaluating. In the first stage, planning, L2 writers go through various sub-stages such as setting goals, defining the target audience, producing ideas through brainstorming, organising the ideas to select the most appropriate ones, and making an outline to develop the structure of their writing task. The next stage, translating, refers to the process of putting ideas into words. In the last stage, reviewing, L2 writers are expected to evaluate and revise their written products.

In process approach, the teacher's role is more like a facilitator or guide who provides students with ample opportunities to generate ideas and organise them, to write drafts and revise their works in the light of the teacher's feedback. Unlike product approach, the main concern of the teacher is not correct language use or a final written paper, but the writing process that is managed by students.

Although cognitive writing models have provided scholars and writing instructors with profound insights into the cognitive processes of writers, so how to teach them more effectively, the process approach to writing has come under some criticism. Primarily, process approach is theoretically based on the ground of L1 writing models that fail to recognise the socio-cultural factors affecting L2 composing (Kern, 2000). It also does not take into consideration the linguistic competence of the writer (Myles, 2002). Many L2 writers do not have the necessary linguistic competence to benefit from process approach. Therefore, Myles (2002) claims that

process approach is favourable only if L2 learners are provided with sufficient feedback and if they are proficient enough in L2 to apply the higher order writing strategies (i.e. revision) they have already gained in their L1. As a result, few L2 teachers favour this approach for students with low language proficiency, and they are mostly inclined to teach some basic skills such as grammar, vocabulary and spelling and detect and correct errors (Ammon, 1985; Zamel, 1987). Finally, the process approach comes under criticism for putting the writer into the centre of writing instruction and ignoring the purpose of writing, the role of the reader and cross-cultural differences in the writing process.

   *2.1.3.3. Genre approach.* Genre approach was introduced by British scholar Michael Halliday towards the end of the 1970s as a reaction to the drawbacks of the process approach. This relatively current approach to writing instruction mainly focuses on the context where writing occurs, the expectations of the intended audience and conventions of a particular discourse community.

   Hyland (2004) defines the genre approach as "explicit, systematic, needs-based, supportive, empowering, critical and consciousness-raising" (p.11). In genre approach, writing is viewed as a social and cultural activity; therefore, to interact with the other members of the society through writing, writers are expected to identify and fulfil their potential readers' expectations and provide them with good content, language, and appropriate tone. In this approach, students are explicitly taught about specific genres, their linguistic and discourse features, the context they are used in and the conventions accepted by its readership. As they both attach importance to the linguistic knowledge and a final product and suggest similar stages, the genre and product approaches are claimed to share some similarities. However, in genre approach, the linguistic forms to be used in a particular text are determined according to the

social context that it is written for, the anticipation and needs of the target audience, and the primary purpose of writing.

More importantly, the recent shift away from cognitive towards socio-cultural approaches to the writing makes it necessary to explore writing within the context that it takes place. The insights that we gain from theoretical or pedagogical research on L1 or SL writing fail to satisfy FL students' needs because each of these learning environments has unique characteristics and different contextual variables that significantly affect the pedagogical practices (Bhowmik, 2009). Hence, research on L2 writing that takes the context-specific variables and the personal and cultural traits that FL students bring into their classes into consideration helps us develop more comprehensive approaches to FL writing instruction.

To conclude, the best approach to L2 writing instruction in any situation depends on various factors such as students' proficiency level, the curriculum, the text types being studied. "Institutional constraints, various logistical problems, such as large class sizes, unique teaching and learning approaches and ideologies",  the potential dominant role of central or institutional education authorities, "an exam-dominated educational culture", "teachers' heavy workloads" are among the factors that greatly affect the approaches to writing instruction in various FL contexts (Bhowmik, 2009, pp.338-359). Therefore, claiming one of these three approaches as the ideal is an unrealistic approach. Factors that are exclusive to a specific writing environment usually lead teachers to make individual decisions regarding their classroom practices.

## 2.2.  Metacognition

American developmental psychologist John Flavell coined the term metacognition for the first time to refer to one's "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (Flavell, 1979, p. 906). Although the term metacognition does not have a long history, the subject matter of metacognition roots back to the 6th century to the saying carved into the Temple of Apollo at

Delphi, "Know Thyself" or the famous saying of Socrates "To know thyself is the beginning of wisdom". In his famous poem, Knowledge Should Mean a Full Grasp of Knowledge, Yunus Emre highlights the significance of knowing oneself in Turkish culture with these lines:

> Knowledge should mean a full grasp of knowledge:
> Knowledge means to know yourself, heart and soul.
> If you have failed to understand yourself,
> Then all of your reading has missed its call. (Halman, 1993)

Flavell (1976) defines metacognition simply as "one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them" and he adds, "metacognition refers, among many other things, to the active monitoring and consequent regulation and orchestration of these processes in relation to the cognitive objects or data which they bear, usually in the service of some concrete goal or objective" (p.232). In plain terms, metacognition refers to both one's knowledge about what he/she knows and does not know, and it involves the higher order thinking skills that he/she employs to monitor and control cognitive processes in an attempt to achieve certain goals (Livingston, 2003).

To define metacognition, many scholars in the field of cognitive psychology suggest slightly different definitions referring to its various aspects. Hennessey (1999)'s definition of metacognition is one of the most comprehensive ones. She defines metacognition as

> ...awareness of one's thinking, awareness of the content of one's conceptions, an active monitoring of one's cognitive processes, an attempt to regulate one's cognitive processes in relationship to further learning, and an application of a set of heuristics as an effective device for helping people organise their methods of attack on problems in general. (p.3)

For over 40 years, metacognition has been widely studied in basic and applied psychological research. According to Schoenfeld (1992), along with problem-solving, metacognition was the most commonly referred to and studied concept in the 1980s in this field.

Theoretical and basic research focuses mainly on the conceptualisation of metacognition and gives insights into the nature, components or functioning mechanisms of metacognition. Developmental and educational research, on the other hand, addresses itself to investigate and explain the development of metacognition and teachability of metacognitive skills and strategies (Efklides & Misailidi, 2010).

For the first time, Flavell (1979) mentioned a relationship between metacognition and learning. A lot of research has been carried out in various contexts about various subject areas for almost 40 years to verify this proposition of Flavell. Research on metacognition is of great importance for educational psychology because it provides us with insights about the complex cognitive processes that individuals go through while learning (Devine, 1993) and about its various benefits for the learning process of individuals. According to Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1990), metacognition is one of the most reliable predictors of learning.  It promotes successful learning, higher academic performance and greater problem-solving ability of individuals (Davidson & Sternberg, 1998; Kramarski, 2004; Kramarski, Mevarech & Arami, 2002; Kramarski, Mevarech & Lieberman, 2001; Mevarech & Kramarski, 1997; Schraw and Dennison, 1994; Vandergrift, 2002). Metacognitive skills can potentially  develop one's thinking capacity (Anderson, 2002), increase the achievement in new learning tasks (Vann & Abraham, 1990), enhance learning outcomes (Anderson, 2002; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994) and compensates for some cognitive limitations or deficits in general intelligence and prior knowledge on a subject (Veenman, Wilhelm, & Beishuizen, 2004).

Considering all these benefits, we can conclude that metacognition carries successful implications for instructional interventions (Livingston, 2003), and any efforts to improve learners' metacognition may promote the achievement in foreign language skills to a considerable degree. Before examining the relationship between metacognition and FL/SL

learning, in this section of the study, the concept of metacognition will be addressed comprehensively.

      **2.2.1. Distinguishing between cognition and metacognition.** The imprecision of the term 'metacognition' is a much-debated issue in the literature. Metacognition includes various dimensions related to cognition, knowledge and learning process (Brown, Bransford, Ferrera, & Campione, 1983). While some notions we use to describe metacognition "are purely metacognitive by nature" (Veenman et al., 2006, p. 4), others are both metacognitive and cognitive. This causes a complex relationship between cognition and metacognition and makes it difficult to distinguish between the two systems. Therefore, it is important to draw a distinction between what is meta and what is cognitive to understand the nature of metacognition properly (Brown, 1987; Graham, 1997; Nelson, 1999; Nelson & Narens, 1994).

      Flavell (1979) argues that metacognition and cognition are similar in their form and quality so both can be acquired and forgotten, are stored in the memory, and can be correct or incorrect. On the other hand, the significant difference between them lies in their content and function. Cognition involves the states and processes involved in knowing, which in their completeness include perception and judgment. It includes all conscious and unconscious processes by which knowledge is accumulated, such as perceiving, recognising, conceiving, and reasoning. Put differently, cognition "is a state or experience of knowing that can be distinguished from an experience of feeling or willing" (Encyclopaedia Britannica Website, 2019).

      Metacognition, on the other hand, involves the knowledge, skills and strategies about mental states and processes. It acts like a "higher order agent overlooking and governing the cognitive system, while simultaneously being part of it" (Veenman et al., 2006). Whereas cognitive skills and strategies are vital for individuals to carry out a task or to solve a problem in

order to reach their goals, metacognitive skills and strategies are needed to understand how to carry out a task and to ensure that the goal has been achieved (Garner, 1987; Livingston, 2003). To give an example, a student needs to use his/her cognition to read a text in the target language, but he/she also needs to use metacognition to monitor his/her understanding of the text. In brief, while cognitive skills are needed to make cognitive progress, metacognitive skills are more commonly used to monitor the cognitive process (Flavell, 1979).

However, Flavell (1979) emphasises the close and reciprocal relationship between cognition and metacognition. Whereas cognition is a prerequisite for metacognition, metacognition is a requisite for cognition (Gourgey, 1998; Veenman et al., 2006). Therefore, it is not easy for one to have metacognitive knowledge if he/she does not have cognitive knowledge in a specific domain. On the other hand, one needs metacognitive knowledge or strategies to monitor, control and evaluate his/her own cognitive processes.

**2.2.2. The framework of metacognition.** Despite being widely researched in various fields, "including psychology, education, learning sciences, neuroscience, and clinical psychology" (Scott & Levy, 2013), metacognition is still considered to be a fuzzy and mysterious concept by many scholars (Akturk and Sahin, 2011; Flavell, 1981). Veenman et al. (2006) define metacognition as an umbrella term involving

> ...(m)etacognitive beliefs, metacognitive awareness, metacognition experiences, metacognitive knowledge, feeling of knowing, judgement of learning, theory of mind, metamemory, metacognitive skills, executive skills, higher order skills, metacomponents, comprehension, monitoring, learning strategies, heuristic strategies, and self-regulation.
> (p. 4)

Some of these terms refer to "more general knowledge and skills in metacognition", while "others address rather specific ones for certain age groups or types of tasks" (Veenman et al., 2006, p. 4).

All these terms and different definitions help us to understand this phenomenon better, but that much diversity has accompanied a variety of alternative or different perspectives on the construct of metacognition. As a result, several frameworks have been developed by scholars to conceptualise metacognition and identify its components. In the next subsections, three prominent models of metacognition developed by Flavell (1979), Brown (1987), and Schraw and Moshman (1995) will be introduced to the reader.

*2.2.2.1. Flavell's Model of Cognitive Monitoring.* Flavell's Model of Cognitive Monitoring is important as it lays the foundations of the metacognition theory. In his model, Flavell (1979) makes the first attempt to define the components of metacognition and the interactions among these components. He states that the monitoring of various cognitive enterprises emerges via "actions or interactions" among (1) metacognitive knowledge, (2) metacognitive experiences, (3) goals (or tasks) and (4) actions (or strategies) (p.906).

Flavell (1979) defines *metacognitive knowledge* as "that segment of your stored knowledge that has to do with people as cognitive creature and with their diverse cognitive tasks, goals, actions, and experiences" (p.906). It involves the knowledge or beliefs concerning one's general cognitive processes. According to him, metacognitive knowledge is not different from other kinds of knowledge stored in the long-term memory in form and quality; therefore, it can be learned, enhanced, revised or deleted. He divides metacognitive knowledge into three distinct but highly interactive and intertwined variables: person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge. For successful learning, an individual needs to have deep knowledge about self as a

learner, about the task at hand, and about effective strategies to attain predetermined cognitive goals (Devine, 1993; Flavell, 1979; Kasper, 1997).

Person knowledge stands for individuals' self-knowledge and beliefs about their abilities, strengths and weaknesses to achieve a certain task as well as their general knowledge about human learning and information processing (Flavell, 1979; Wenden, 1998). Later, Flavell develops his model in 1987 and mentions that there are three dimensions of person knowledge: intraindividual knowledge, interindividual knowledge and universals of cognition. Intraindividual knowledge comprises individuals' knowledge about their proficiency in a given domain and the specific knowledge that they have about the factors affecting the quality of their learning. It also refers to their beliefs about themselves as thinkers, learners, or task-doers. For example, learners' judgements about their learning experiences or processes such as 'I learn a subject better if I take notes' or 'I communicate my ideas more successfully while I am writing rather than speaking'. Interindividual knowledge is more about the comparison of personal style or abilities of oneself and others. 'I am better than my siblings in mathematical calculations, whereas they are more successful in understanding what they read' can be an example for interindividual knowledge. Universals of cognition, on the other hand, entail the knowledge of human attributes that facilitate or hamper learning such as age, motivation, aptitude, and self-efficacy. One's statement as 'language acquisition is a matter of exposure' is an example for his or her knowledge about the universals of cognition.

The second variable, task knowledge, refers to one's awareness of the nature, complexity and demands of a proposed task (Flavell, 1979; Wenden, 1991, 1998). Learners who can treat the task at hand correctly are often more successful at defining their purposes and devoting the correct amount of cognitive effort to accomplish that task. Learners with task knowledge can more readily experience mental, affective and social processes involved in a task and analyse

factors that influence their task performance. This type of knowledge also helps individuals predict the degree of success that they are likely to achieve.

Lastly, the strategy variable is more about the knowledge of cognitive, metacognitive and social-affective strategies that can be employed to perform a specific type of task efficiently. Individuals who have strategy knowledge are better able to identify strategies that are appropriate or inappropriate for certain tasks and use them accordingly. Similarly, learners who lack the knowledge of certain strategies available to address a learning challenge cannot achieve their goals or accomplish their tasks (Anderson, 2012).

The other major component in Flavell's framework of metacognition is *metacognitive experiences*. Flavell (1979) describes metacognitive experiences as "any conscious cognitive and affective experiences that accompany… and pertain to any intellectual enterprise" (p.906). It involves the actions a person takes to regulate and control his/her cognitive processing while learning or doing a task. Metacognitive experiences show learners where they are in a task, what kind of progress they are making or likely to make, and they guide them to set new goals or regulate the previous ones. According to Flavell (1979), metacognitive experiences work as 'quality control checks' for learners to test and revise their goals. Knowledge gained through metacognitive experiences helps individuals to develop, delete or reform their pre-existing metacognitive knowledge and activate certain strategies to attain cognitive or metacognitive goals (Duman, 2013). "Metacognitive experiences usually precede or follow a cognitive activity", and "they often occur when cognitions fail" (Livingston, 2003, p.4). A student's negative feelings in case of failure or inadequacy during a cognitive activity can be an example of metacognitive experiences.

In Flavell's model (1979), *the goals or tasks* refer to the actual objectives of a cognitive endeavour that may activate the use of metacognitive knowledge and lead to metacognitive

experiences. Finally, *actions or strategies* are certain steps or behaviours employed to accomplish these goals. According to Anderson (2012), greater awareness of these four key elements results in greater control of the learning process by individuals.

*2.2.2.2. Brown's Model of Metacognition.* Ann Leslie Brown is another famous name that contributed to the theory of metacognition. According to Brown (1987), metacognition refers to the "understanding of knowledge, an understanding that can be reflected in either effective use or overt description of the knowledge in question" (p.65). Briefly, it involves learners' conscious reflection on and regulation of their cognitive activities.

In Brown's (1987) model, metacognition encompasses two broad categories: knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition. She describes metacognitive knowledge as "stable, statable but fallible, or late developing" information that learners have about their cognition and cognitive processes and about the learning context (p.67). On the other hand, metacognitive regulation, which involves the self-regulatory activities which are carried out to monitor and control cognitive processes, is "relatively unstable, rarely stable, and age independent" (p.68). According her, these two components of metacognition are closely related but readily distinguishable.

In her framework, Brown (1987) renames Flavell's metacognitive experiences as regulation of cognition; thus, she emphasises the executive role of metacognition. Executive control processes involve the integration of planning, monitoring and evaluating, and they direct how one uses metacognitive knowledge to regulate cognition.

*2.2.2.3. Schraw and Moshman's Model of Metacognition.* As previously mentioned knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition were defined as the two facets of metacognition by Brown (1987). Schraw and Moshman (1995) elaborated Brown's model defining their subcomponents. In their model, knowledge of cognition refers to one's knowledge

about his/her cognition. Within this framework, knowledge of cognition has been comprised of three distinct, but closely related components: declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge. Declarative knowledge relates to one's knowledge about self, strategies, and factors affecting his/her cognitive processes. (i.e. an individuals' awareness of his/her inefficiency in remembering new words or his ideas about the complexity of a task). It is also referred as the knowledge about things in the related literature (Hacker, 1998; Pressley & Harris, 2006). Procedural knowledge, on the other hand, is related to one's knowledge of how to employ strategies to make use of declarative knowledge. Learners with procedural knowledge may use procedural skills more readily and may employ correct strategies more effectively to accomplish tasks or to solve problems. Finally, conditional knowledge is mostly connected with the knowledge of when, where and why to use declarative and procedural knowledge (Garner, 1990; Harris et al., 2010). It refers to one's knowledge about both what he/she can do in a particular situation and how can he/she does it. It is mentioned to be the most crucial and late developing one among all three components of metacognitive knowledge as it requires the selection of the best strategies and makes the controlling decision to accomplish a task correctly (Reynolds, 1992).

The second component of metacognition, regulation of cognition, refers to the self-regulatory activities and strategies that learners use to monitor and control their learning and to improve their performance in a variety of ways (Baker & Brown, 1984; Brown, 1987; Jacobs & Paris, 1987; Schraw, 2001; Schraw & Denisson, 1994). According to Schraw and Moshman (1995), regulation of cognition entails three self-regulatory strategies: planning, monitoring, and evaluating. Primarily, planning refers to the decision of learning or task objectives, selection of appropriate means and strategies and activation of previous knowledge to organise the learning process or to accomplish a particular task (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Schraw, 1998). Besides, planning involves the allocation of resources and the correct amount of time and effort.

The second self-regulatory strategy, monitoring, refers to one's on-line self-observation and self-evaluation of his/her performance. Moreover, it involves the awareness of comprehension and task performance and implementation of particular measures to handle the difficulties that impede the learning process (Flavell, 1981).  Lastly, evaluating relates to individuals' assessment of the effectiveness of their learning processes, task performances or strategy use. It also involves revisiting and revising one's pre-determined goals.

    **2.2.3.  Teachability of metacognition and teachers' role in metacognitive instruction.** Educational research provides us with considerable evidence for the positive influence of explicit instructional interventions regarding metacognition on the learners' effective learning and higher academic achievement (Davidson & Sternberg, 1998; Kramarski, 2004; Kramarski et al., 2002; Mevarech & Kramarski, 1997; Kramarski et al., 2001; Schraw & Dennison, 1994; Vandergrift, 2002). It is argued that metacognitive instruction strongly promotes learners with varying learning types, and especially the ones who are academically weak benefit from it more (Veenman, Elshout & Busato, 1994). Despite being a difficult target to attain, metacognition is considered to be a teachable and learnable phenomenon by many scholars (Cross & Paris, 1988; Gama, 2001; Kramarsky & Maverech, 2003; Schraw, 1998). Schraw (1998) claims, "even younger students can acquire metacognitive skills via instruction" (p.114). However, there are still important questions await answers about what components of metacognition to teach and how to teach them.

    First of all, whether metacognition is general by nature (crossing subject or task domains) or domain specific (relating to a particular subject or task) is a controversial issue among scholars. A number of studies approach metacognition as a constituent which concerns a certain task or domain (i.e. reading, writing or math problem-solving) and has to be taught domain separately. Although the research examining the metacognition across various tasks or

domains presents inconclusive results, Veenman and Spaans (2005) argue that metacognitive

skills develop initially within certain separate domains, and later the skills learnt in one domain

may transfer and generalise across other domains or tasks. Arguing about the significant role of

metacognitive instruction on individuals' learning processes, Veenman et al. (2006) mention

about four ways that teachers may follow: (1) embedding metacognitive instruction in the subject

matter to ensure connectivity; (2) informing learners about the usefulness of metacognitive

activities to make them exert the initial extra effort; and (3) the prolonged training to guarantee

the smooth and guaranteed maintenance of the metacognitive activity (p.9).

However, many others argue that metacognition is domain-general in nature (see Glaser,

Schauble, Raghavan, & Zeitz, 1992; Kelemen, Frost, & Weaver, 2000; Schraw, 1998; Schraw,

Dunkle, Bendixen, & Roedel, 1995; Schraw & Nietfeld, 1998; Veenman, Elshout, & Meijer,

1997; Veenman & Verheji, 2003; Veenman et al., 2004) because it is related to expertise and

cognitive abilities rather than domain-specific skills (Schraw, 1998). That is to say, when learners

are instructed about certain metacognitive skills and strategies, they can retrieve and utilise them

in specific subjects or domains. Also, emphasising its multidimensionality, Schraw (1998)

suggests four key principles that teachers should adhere to develop students' knowledge of

cognition and regulation of cognition in the classroom environment: "(1) promoting general

awareness of the importance of metacognition, (2) improving knowledge of cognition, (3)

improving regulation of cognition, and (4) fostering environments that promote metacognitive

awareness" (p.118).

Although metacognition refers to the inner processes allowing learners to monitor and

control their learning, as Vygotsky mentions in his theory of Zone of Proximal Development,

learners need scaffolding and guidance of an expert to learn. By employing certain instructional

strategies, teachers can promote their learners' general metacognitive awareness (Cross & Paris,

1988; Brown & Palincsar, 1989). There is further evidence in this regard to suggest that teachers with their knowledge, attitudes and metacognitive awareness have an essential role in the instructional process to facilitate and improve metacognitive constituents in their learners. Extensive research and its concrete results on the vital role of metacognitive knowledge and experiences on learning are valuable, but to guarantee better classroom practice, teachers who are pedagogically knowledgeable, self-regulated, prepared and informed about implementing the innovative research results to classroom practices are irreplaceable.

Hartman (2001a) refers to two complementary processes in teaching metacognition: "teaching *with* metacognition" and "teaching *for* metacognition" (Hartman, 2001a, p. 149). Teaching with metacognition requires teachers to think over their own thinking in regard to their "goals, teaching strategies, sequence, materials, students' characteristics and needs and other issues related to curriculum, instruction and assessment before, during and after lessons in order to maximize their instructional effectiveness" (p. 149). It also refers to teachers' implementation of their metacognitive knowledge and abilities in their teaching behaviours. Teaching for metacognition, on the other hand, refers to teachers' thoughts and actions regarding the ways they get into to "develop and activate their students' metacognition" (p. 149). It requires teachers to provide their students with metacognitive knowledge and skills in an ideal environment through a variety of strategies so that they can learn about, practice and make use of metacognition.

If teachers are well equipped with the knowledge of metacognition in addition to how learners learn more efficiently, they will be better able to reappraise their role as effective teachers and guide their learners in their efforts to succeed in learning. However, many teachers who are supposed set good examples in guiding students to gain awareness of their learning process, "lack sufficient knowledge about metacognition" (Veenman et al., 2006, p.10). Veenman, Kok and Kuilenburg's (2001) study reveals that teachers are eager to teach

metacognition in their classes, yet they lack the useful tools, means, or activities to integrate metacognition to their lessons. Therefore, teacher training programs, teacher educators and school administrators have an exclusive responsibility for training prospective teachers about metacognition, ensuring in-service teachers' ongoing professional development in metacognition, and bringing them together to share their practices and experiences.

**2.3. Metacognition and L2 Learning**

With the recognition of its significant role in learning, metacognition has received special attention of SL/FL scholars (Anderson, 2012; Devine, 1993). Wenden (1987) is the first person to draw attention to the great potential of metacognition to understand FL learning process. Following her, research in recent decades on metacognition has also revealed positive results on behalf of language use and acquisition. They demonstrate that metacognition promotes language learning and academic achievement across a range of ages, cognitive abilities, diverse learning areas or domains including oral communication of ideas, listening, reading and text comprehension, and writing. (Devine, 1993; Kasper, 1997; Vandergrift, 2002). Graham (1997) also regards metacognition as an essential skill that SL or FL learners should possess to plan, control, and evaluate their learning. According to Wenden (1998), learners of different ages and FL proficiency levels can acquire metacognitive knowledge, and this knowledge shapes their approach to their language learning journeys and expectations about the outcome of their efforts.

However, there are currently only a small number of studies that examine metacognition as an area of academic research within teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) and applied linguistics (Zhang, 2010), and more research is needed to investigate to what extent metacognition contributes to the success of ESL/EFL learning. Besides, the majority of the existing studies have examined the role of metacognition in L2 learners' performance of

receptive skills, namely reading and listening rather than productive skills such as writing and speaking (Devine 1993; Vandergrift, 2002; 2007; Yang & Zhang, 2002).

Li and Larkin's (2017) study with approximately 500 EFL students studying in different educational, cultural and social contexts is valuable in this regard. They compared metacognitive knowledge, awareness and strategy use of successful and less successful EFL learners coming from different countries and areas. They limited language learning to reading and writing in English, ignoring other dimensions of language since the two skills both required reflective thinking and conscious decision making. The findings based on think-aloud protocols and retrospective interviews gave evidence to a strong relationship between metacognitive awareness and academic success in learning a FL. They found that proficient and less proficient EFL learners employed different metacognitive strategies to complete L2 reading and writing tasks. Their findings based on 'Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI)' (an assessment instrument developed by Schraw and Dennison in 1994) gave evidence for the significant contribution of metacognition to FL reading and writing achievement in four dimensions: conditional knowledge, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

Zhang (2010) also broadened our understanding of metacognition and EFL reading with the study he conducted with 20 Chinese EFL learners. Right after his participants read two expository texts of 5000 words, they were called to attend interviews which aimed to examine their motivation, self-efficacy, feelings and attitudes while reading. He discussed the results of his study considering his participants' knowledge about self, knowledge about the cognitive task and knowledge about the strategies for effective reading. The findings of the study revealed that successful readers had more awareness about themselves as readers and their motivation, confidence, self-efficacy and interest differed considerably from poor readers.

Regarding studies on EFL and metacognition in Turkey, they predominantly focused on reading skill, as well. They mainly investigated Turkish EFL learners' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies, the type and frequency of metacognitive strategies they used while reading and the potential impact of these strategies on their reading comprehension skills (see Dundar, 2016; Incecay, 2013; Kocaman & Beskardesler, 2016; Sarıcoban & Behjoo, 2017; Temur & Bahar, 2011; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2012). There are also some studies which explored the effects of metacognitive strategy training on Turkish EFL learners' reading performance (see Cubukcu, 2008; Razi, 2014). The findings of these studies concurringly indicated that instructional training on metacognitive reading strategies benefited EFL learners' reading comprehension considerably.

One of the latest studies conducted in Turkish EFL context regarding the reading skill belongs to Kocaman and Beskardesler (2016). They focused on EFL teacher trainees' metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use and examined the types of reading strategies they used. The participants were 122 English Language Teaching (ELT) students ranging from 1st to 4th grade. Data gathered through 'the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI)' (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002) revealed that 4th grade students were more aware of reading strategies when compared to other three groups, and global reading strategies (rather than problem-solving or support reading strategies) were used the most by all participants regardless of their grades. Mean scores of reading strategy use by male and female participants also displayed a significant difference in favour of the females in both global and support reading strategy use, but no statistically significant difference was noticed between both genders in their use of problem-solving strategy.

In a similar study, Saricoban and Behjoo (2017) investigated the effects of metacognitive awareness of reading strategies on Turkish EFL learners' reading comprehension. Participants

were 82 freshman students. Data were gathered through the 'MARSI'. The findings of the study

revealed a significant relationship between participants' metacognitive awareness of reading

strategies and their reading achievement. Saricoban and Behjoo (2017) found that students

frequently used global, problem solving and support reading strategies to varying degrees while

reading, but successful readers used problem-solving strategies more frequently than the other

two groups.

Although listening and speaking are the skills which are positively correlated with overall

L2 achievement, the number of studies investigating their relationship with metacognition is

quite limited. A small number of studies investigating metacognitive awareness and ESL/EFL

listening ability reported significant findings in this regard.  They revealed that providing

language learners with metacognitive instruction increased their metacognitive knowledge and

improved their listening performance considerably (Goh, 2008; Liu & Goh, 2006; Mareschal,

2007; Vandergrift, 2007; Vandergrift and Goh, 2011). Vandergrift and Goh (2011) provided a

theoretical foundation for a metacognitive approach to ESL listening instruction and offered

several principles to develop learners' self-regulation in listening. They presented a framework of

metacognition, which was based on three key components: experience, knowledge, and strategy.

Among these three components, metacognitive knowledge and strategy were the ones that should

be integrated into listening instruction as they facilitated effective listening, confidence, and

motivation.

In the context of EFL listening, a few Turkish researchers ave centred upon the

metacognitive strategies and their role in listening proficiency (see Balaban & Camlıbel-Acar,

2017; Coskun, 2010; Harputlu & Ceylan, 2014). In their study, Harputlu and Ceylan (2014)

investigated the relationship among listening proficiency, motivation and metacognitive strategy

use. Data for the study were collected from 33 ELT students via two quantitative data collection

instruments, Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) and Language Learning Orientations Scale (LLOS), and the listening section of the TOEFL. In light of the findings, the researchers revealed that there was not a significant correlation between the participants' listening proficiency and metacognitive awareness.

Coskun (2010) investigated the potential effects of metacognitive listening strategy training on Turkish EFL students' listening performance. 40 beginner preparatory school students were divided into two groups, a control group (n=20) and an experimental group (n=20). The students in the experimental group were presented with instruction on metacognitive listening strategies, which was integrated into their listening course book for five weeks. The control group did not take any training on metacognitive strategies. The t-test scores indicated that participants in the experimental group outperformed in listening tasks.

Besides studies investigating the role of metacognition on certain language skills such as reading and listening, some others have focused on the role of metacognition on the overall language proficiency of EFL learners. Adiguzel and Orhan (2017) carried out a study with 310 preparatory students to investigate if there was a significant correlation between their metacognitive skills and academic achievement in English. The researchers additionally explored whether various factors associated with participants' demographical features had any impact on their metacognitive skills. Participants' metacognitive skills were measured through 'Metacognition Scale' which was adapted from Schraw and Dennison (1994) by Turan (2009). Students' scores in an institutional exam determined their academic achievement in English. The findings pointed out that the participants of the study possessed a high level of metacognitive skills, yet these skills did not appear to provide any evidence for their academic success in English. Besides, gender seemed to have an effect on metacognitive skills, in favour of the female participants.

Lastly, in their study, Alci and Yuksel (2012) investigated whether there was a significant correlation among prospective English teachers' academic performance, their sense of self-efficacy and metacognitive awareness. They further examined if self-efficacy beliefs and metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers varied by grades. One hundred forty-three undergraduate students majoring in an ELT department participated in the study. The study was based on the data collected through 'Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)' (Capa, Cakiroglu, & Sarikaya, 2005) and 'MAI'. Findings revealed that there was a correlation among participants' self-efficacy, metacognition and academic achievement. The researchers found a statistically significant correlation between students' self-efficacy and metacognition, self-efficacy and academic performance, and metacognition and academic performance, respectively. However, according to the regression analysis conducted to identify to what extent participants' self-efficacy and metacognition predicted their academic performance, only metacognitive awareness seemed to predict academic performance. Finally, the researchers suggested that both self-efficacy and metacognitive awareness of participants showed significant differences according to their grades.

**2.4. Metacognition and Writing Skill**

The developments in the cognitive psychology have suggested possible research directions for investigating the promising and critical role of metacognition in writing performance (Harris et al., 2010) and facilitated scholars or writing instructors to put a relatively different perspective on writing instruction to tackle composing challenges. Richards and Renandya (2003) refer to the writing as "the most difficult skill for second language learners to master" (p. 303). Similarly, Nunan (2000) stresses the great challenge of producing "a coherent, fluent, extend piece of writing in L2" (p. 217). As any complex cognitive activity calling for control over a number of variables simultaneously, writing requires a considerable amount of

deliberate, conscious and reflective thinking, and the activation of metacognitive knowledge and self-regulatory strategies.  Flavell (1979) claims that:

> Metacognitive experiences are especially likely to occur in situations that stimulate a lot of careful, highly conscious thinking: in a job or school task that expressly demands that kind of thinking; in novel roles or situations, where every major step you take requires planning beforehand and evaluation afterwards; where decisions and actions are at once weighty and risky; where high affective arousal or other inhibitors of reflective thinking are absent (cf. Langer, 1978). Such situations provide many opportunities for thoughts and feelings about your own thinking to arise and, in many cases, call for the kind of quality control that metacognitive experiences can help supply. (p.908)

At this point, Flavell's (1979) descriptions of the situations where metacognitive experiences are likely to occur fit well with Flower and Hayes' (1980, 1981) description of the process of writing. They describe writing as a complex cognitive activity involving the three main stages of planning, translating and reviewing. For this very reason, it is believed that that the dramatic difference between struggling and skilful writers lies in their knowledge to control and monitor their writing process, so in their writing metacognition (Bereiter, 1980; Flower & Hayes 1980).

     **2.4.1.  Metacognitive knowledge and self-regulatory strategies regarding writing skill.** Metacognitive knowledge, as explained broadly in the previous sections, involves three basic components: person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge (Flavell, 1979). In the context of writing, knowledge of person refers to all kinds of thoughts and feelings that individuals have about themselves as writers in the cognitive process of writing. It also involves the "perceptions of writing environment, writing self-efficacy, and motivation" (Ruan, 2005, p. 182).  According to You & Joe (2001), having such an awareness of oneself as a writer and

knowing own strengths and weaknesses help EFL writers monitor the writing process and develop compensatory skills when necessary.

Concerning writing, knowledge of task involves one's knowledge about the writing topic, common writing conventions or rhetoric structures, coherence, audience and task purposes. Having a heightened awareness about task requirements or various factors related to task knowledge affects the quality and content of EFL learners' written work considerably. According to Ruan (2005), to write smoothly and proficiently, EFL learners require a good command of vocabulary and grammar, topic knowledge about a particular task, textual information about how to organise ideas logically and awareness about audience and task purposes.

For writing, knowledge of strategy involves the metacognitive knowledge of effective writing strategies to achieve predetermined writing goals. Knowing about certain writing strategies and both when and how to use them help EFL writers upskill and cope with writing tasks more efficiently. Planning, pre-writing, monitoring of errors, post-writing, or rereading one's writing aloud as a reader to check its coherence are examples of strategic writing behaviour.

Self-regulatory writing strategies, namely planning, monitoring and evaluating, on the other hand, stand for the mental operations or procedures that learners use to regulate their writing process and to complete a writing task effectively. Planning for writing is assumed to be essential for EFL students to set up tangible goals before they start writing and to attain them soon through their writing. It also involves the identification and organisation of how the goals can be achieved. By engaging in planning, students can consider what they want to achieve by the task at hand and why they need to achieve it. Hence, they can think about their audience and select the appropriate strategies. For example, planning for writing may include brainstorming for

generating ideas, organising their ideas, developing their content, preparing a simple or detailed outline, and employing the effective techniques to preserve unity and coherence.

Following the planning, monitoring comes into play as a vital step to be actively engaged in writing metacognition. To produce a good piece of writing, EFL writers need to monitor the work they have done till that moment by pausing occasionally, question themselves in connection with their purpose, audience and the relevant strategies available to them and check the appropriateness and accuracy of their writing. It provides the students with the opportunity to consider their progress of writing development in light of the goals they set and to assess the chances of achieving them. Monitoring the strategies they use while composing, writers can "keep themselves on track" to meet their writing goals (Anderson, 2002, p.3).

Evaluating one's writing performance as a whole is necessary for efficacy in EFL writing. Learners, at this phase, judge the success of their writing after completing it and determine the acceptability of it. They may check whether they have given the right amount of information for their audience, made their writing unified and coherent, and used correct strategies.They are also able to assess the appropriateness of their goals and the effectiveness of their overall plans and writing strategies. In the light of their evaluation, writers can engage in some macro level strategies such as revising and editing.

**2.4.2. An overview of studies on metacognition and ESL/EFL writing.** When Flavell (1979) coined the term metacognition, he reported that it facilitated reading comprehension, writing and language acquisition.  To examine the relationship between metacognition and language learning, most scholars have selected reading and writing as focused areas because they are both complicated cognitive endeavours requiring a process of meaning-making or meaning-discovery and an engagement of deliberate and conscious thinking (Gregg & Steinberg, 1980; Li & Larkin, 2017; You & Joe, 2001). These two domains of language also require similar

instructional conventions such as "pre-reading, reading, responding, exploring and applying" for reading and "re-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing" for writing, and similar kinds of knowledge such as "knowledge about language, knowledge about genre conventions, knowledge about organisation and structure, knowledge of pragmatics and extra-linguistic knowledge" (Li & Larkin, 2017, p.6).

Much of the earlier research in metacognition and ESL/EFL reading and writing was mostly descriptive examining the extent of learners' metacognition and strategy use other than focusing on their correlation with language learning achievement (Li & Larkin, 2017). Moreover, studies exploring reading ability in relation to metacognition vastly outnumbered the studies exploring writing ability, and the issue of integrating metacognition into writing was neglected until the early 1990s. The findings of the research on metacognition and reading skill have reported considerable benefits for L2 reading development, yet still more needs to be done to investigate the role of metacognition on L2 writing.

Devine, Railey, & Boshoff's (1993)'s study has an important place in the field as it was one of the first few attempts made to investigate the cognitive models of L2 writers and to assess the influence of these models on their writing achievement. The study was carried out with 20 first-year college students from various language backgrounds. 10 students were L1 basic writers and 10 students were L2 writers. The researchers aimed to collect information concerning subjects' notions about person, task, and strategy variables in writing. Subjects' writing samples were evaluated holistically, and further evaluation determined compositional and grammatical proficiency. Findings of the study revealed that L1 basic and L2 writers hold different cognitive models, and there was a potential link between the cognitive models that L' learners had and their actual writing performance.

To clarify the relationship between metacognition and ESL writing performance, Kasper (1997) surveyed 120 ESL students coming from diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Students were divided into two groups as advanced (n=53) and intermediate levels (n=67) depending on their TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) scores. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected over a period of six consecutive semesters. Kasper (1997) noted that the findings of her study not only confirmed a significant positive correlation between metacognitive variables (i.e. person, task, strategy) and actual writing performance of ESL students but also shed light on the certain effects of these variables at different levels of linguistic proficiency. In both groups, students who performed better on the final assessment also received higher ratings on person, task and strategy variables. Based on the findings of her study, Kasper (1997) claimed that students' knowledge about person and task variables did not create a fundamental change as they become linguistically more proficient. However, their strategy knowledge showed a significant increase as they progressed from the intermediate to the advanced level.

Ruan (2005) was another researcher who underlined the strong linkage between EFL writers' metacognitive knowledge (person knowledge, task knowledge and strategic knowledge) and their writing behaviours and performance. The study examined the role of an empirically based instructional approach on the development of metacognitive knowledge and skills. He also integrated self-regulatory mechanisms into a course framework on Chinese students' English writing performance so that they could "apply goal-setting, planning, self-monitoring, self-evaluation and revising to their existing executive procedure of task performance" and had an awareness of "their cognitive and affective aspects of learning to write". In his study, Ruan actively involved students in writing through "scaffolding the use of self-regulatory writing strategies, applying a process approach to instruction with extensive adoption of peer evaluation

and self-assessment, constructing writing portfolios, and keeping learning journals" (p. 178).

Findings of the study demonstrated that engaging EFL writers in self-regulated writing practices

facilitated their development of metacognitive knowledge and skills. In regard to person

knowledge, participants of Ruan's study made encouraging progress including reflecting upon

their EFL writing experiences more positively, appreciating the shifting role of teachers from

"judgemental examiner" to "a source of feedback and encouragement", having more positive

self-efficacy beliefs and gradual confidence in themselves as EFL writers, and showing greater

willingness to engage in writing tasks (p. 184). When task knowledge was considered, students'

initial perceptions about their limited vocabulary size and grammatical knowledge as major

constraints on high-quality L2 writing performance did not considerably change for better during

the instructional time.  However, it was claimed that students developed a better awareness and

understanding about target audience, a variety of task purposes which pertained to English essays

and cross-language differences between their L1 and L2 writing. Moreover, metacognitive

instruction seemed to produce a particularly notable shift from the knowledge telling approach to

knowledge transforming approach in students' L2 writing process. Regarding strategic

knowledge, engaging in such a writing program did not create a considerable change in

participants' planning habits or perceptions, but it brought about considerable, positive change

with regard to evaluating and revising. In the beginning of instruction, students had tended to

treat writing process as "a first-and-final draft to be examined by the teacher". The writing

instruction which aimed to  foster  self-regulation affected students' perceptions in that  "writing

was a self-regulated and recursive process that constituted idea generation, drafting, receiving

feedback, self-evaluating and revision, a process for which they needed to assume their own

responsibility" (p. 198).

In another study with Iranian intermediate EFL learners, Panahandeh and Esfandiari Asl (2014) investigated the effects of monitoring and planning skills as metacognitive strategies on the argumentative writing performance. The researchers allocated eight weeks for instructional time to employ certain metacognitive learning strategies and to teach students in the experimental group about how to use these strategies while composing. The findings of the study showed that instruction on metacognitive strategies utilised intermediate EFL learners greatly in their argumentative writing skills.

Finally, Li and Larkin (2017) revealed that high proficient EFL learners differed from low proficient EFL learners in their use of metacognitive strategies while writing, particularly in the areas of planning, monitoring and evaluation. Less proficient writers in the study tended to rush into writing when a task was assigned without a grand plan in their mind, or they used less acceptable means such as composing in their L1 and translating it into the target language. Proficient writers, on the other hand, devoted considerable time for each phase of their writing. In regard to monitoring and evaluating, there was little or no evidence of the effective use of these strategies in less proficient students' writing processes whereas most of high proficient learners seemed to monitor their task and the strategies that they had used. Some of them even engaged in evaluating their task performances in line with their expectations and pre-determined goals.

To conclude, all these studies seem to agree in that there is a positive correlation between learners' both metacognitive knowledge and strategy use and their ESL/EFL writing performances. Students who gain experiences with a certain task are expected to learn and use particular strategies to write more proficiently in L2. As a result, metacognitive instruction is claimed to enhance writing performance especially among poor or unskilled writers.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**Methodology**

This chapter is mainly devoted to explaining the methodological procedures adopted for the current study. First, the research methods are explained. Next, readers are provided with basic information about the setting and participants of the study. Data collection instruments are presented, followed by data collection procedure. Finally, data analysis procedures are explained.

**3.1. Research Design of the Study**

The primary purpose of the present study is to investigate the extent of Turkish EFL students' metacognitive knowledge and use of metacognitive writing strategies and their role in their writing achievement. For this purpose, the researcher investigated whether the independent variables (metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive control) have an influence on the dependent variable (writing achievement).

In the current study, mixed type research method was used. According to Creswell (2003), using qualitative and quantitative data together, in a way that they support each other, increases the validity and reliability of the studies. Thus, by integrating both quantitative and qualitative data, the study aims to provide a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the research problem and overcome the weaknesses or potential bias inherent to each approach.

Questionnaires were employed to collect quantitative data for the present study. As they are easily applicable to large groups of participants, questionnaires are an increasingly attractive method of data collection in the area of metacognition. However, they have their drawbacks. Their greatest challenge is that the scores in the questionnaires may not be effective in predicting actual behaviour or performance of an individual during a task (Veenman, 2005; Veenman, Prins, & Verheij, 2003). They may also offer incomplete information about learners' cognition for a variety of reasons (i.e. misinterpretation of the items by respondents, social desirability and

teacher/ researcher's expectation issues, and students' difficulty in eliciting required information from long term memory). Therefore, in this study, interviews were also used to elaborate, clarify and build on the large-scale quantitative data collected through questionnaires and to triangulate them by compensating their potential weaknesses.

## 3.2. Setting of the Study

The current study was carried out at the School of Foreign Languages at Yalova University in Turkey. The main reasons for the selection of this school for the study are the researchers' professional connections with academic and administrative staff and the ease to access to the participants. The researcher has been working in this institution for nearly five years.

The university provides educational opportunities to approximately 14.000 students and comprises five faculties. Two out of five faculties, including the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Engineering offer English medium-instruction to their students. Before they start their undergraduate studies at specific departments at these faculties, students are required to have B2 level English proficiency described by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Therefore, after their placement to the departments where the medium of instruction is English, students have to either provide evidence for their B2 level English proficiency through official test scores determined by Council of Higher Education or score at least 60 on the proficiency exam administered by the School of Foreign Languages. Students who cannot meet these requirements have to attend the Intensive English Preparatory Program offered by the School of Foreign Languages and complete the program successfully in minimum two years before pursuing their undergraduate studies at their respective faculties.

**3.2.1.  The Intensive English Preparatory Program.** The Intensive English Preparatory Program, which is run at the School of Foreign Languages, has been designed considering CEFR. In line with the reference levels described in the guide book *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (Council of Europe Website, 2018), the modular system is implemented. One academic year consists of four modules and an optional fifth module called summer school. Each module corresponds to one level: A1 (elementary), A2 (pre-intermediate), B1 (intermediate), and B2 (upper-intermediate). To identify at which level students will start the program, they are given a placement test administered by the School of Foreign Languages at the beginning of the academic year. Each module takes eight weeks and has its aims. Students are placed in the classes regardless of their majors, and class sizes consist of approximately 20-25 students depending on the number of the enrolment in the current module. Class hours differ based on the levels. Only in A1 module, courses are structured into integrated skills classes (main course) and writing classes that are thought by two different instructors. In the A2, B1 and B2 modules, each class is instructed on four basic English skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) and grammar by four different instructors.

During their eight-week-instruction in each module, students take a mid-term and a final examination. Furthermore, portfolio scores that are comprised of a skills test (including reading and listening comprehension question) and four in-class writing tasks form an essential part of the whole assessment procedure.  In both mid-term and final examinations, students are tested on grammar and three language skills, including listening, reading, and writing. To move to an upper level, students have to get at least 60 out of 100 as the average score of both their mid-term and final examinations and portfolio results. The ones who score below 60 are placed in repeat classes. They repeat the same level using different course books and classroom materials. Students who fail once in one of the modules but complete the B1 level successfully at the end of

the spring term can attend the summer school and complete the program successfully. The ones who cannot complete B2 level in anyways can take the proficiency exams held for repeat students at the end of the current academic year or at the beginning of the next academic year. The students who fail to achieve a score of 60 or above in one of these proficiency exams need to attend the English preparatory program for one more year.

       **3.2.2.  Writing instruction for B2 level students.** For the B2 module, 8 class hours are allocated for each course, including Grammar, Reading and Writing and the remaining 8 hours are allocated to the instruction of Listening and Speaking in an integrated way. In the specifically designed Writing classes for B2 level students, each class is taught by a different instructor following the same syllabus and textbook. The total time allocated for the Writing course in the B2 module is 64 hours. The course content is mainly based on the *Longman Academic Writing Series 4 (5th ed.), Level 4, Essays* by Alice Oshima and Ann Hogue (2013), Pearson Education. In the B2 module, students are expected to learn about how to produce well-organised and developed essays on 4 major essay types, including process, cause/effect, comparison/contrast, and argumentative.

       For each essay type, nearly 12 class hours (one and a half week) are allocated. First, in a usual writing class, students are introduced with a model essay for guidance, and they examine the text in detail. After they are provided with an explanation and extensive practice on a certain genre, they get to the phase of controlled production. In a step-by-step approach, they decide on their thesis statement for the writing topic given by the teacher, construct an introductory paragraph, develop topic sentences for each body paragraph and write the body paragraphs, and finally write a concluding paragraph. In each of these phases, students usually get immediate feedback during the class hour. At the end of each chapter, students write an entire essay on their own either at home or in class without any time limitation and get feedback from their teacher

about their writing. This feedback usually centres on organisation (introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion), unity and coherence, and mechanics (i.e. grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation). In all B2 writing classes, before moving on to the next essay type, students take a writing pop-quiz about the essay type they have studied recently. The essays are checked and scored by their writing instructors according to a rubric developed by the testing office. All student writings are completed in a single draft. As mentioned in the previous section, students' writing scores in 4 writing pop-ups, quiz and final examination have a significant role in their overall academic achievement in the English language.

**3.3. Participants of the Study**

Participants of the study were the B2 level university students attending the Intensive English Preparatory Program at Yalova University at the fourth module of the 2017-2018 academic year. The total number of students who enrolled in the B2 level was 147. The majority of these students were the ones who had completed the previous modules (A1, A2, and B1) successfully and had acquired the right to study the B2 level.  Only 10 of the students were the ones who had already studied the B2 level but had to repeat it either because they had failed to achieve a score of 60 or above in the exams or because they had not attended the classes regularly. Of the total 147 B2 level students, 138 participants agreed to participate in the current study. 18 out of 138 students were removed from the study as either they went off-topic in their argumentative tasks (and their papers were not graded by the raters) or they did not complete the questionnaires. As a result, data from 120 students received for consideration. Of the total students who attended the study, 69 (57.5 %) were female, and 51(42.5 %) were male students with an age range of 18 to 24. The mean age of these students at the time of the study was 19.36, with a standard deviation of 1.17. Thirty-five volunteers who represented nearly 30% of the total survey respondents were selected to be interviewed.

Table 1

*Frequency distribution for the gender and departments of the participants*

| Gender and Departments | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | % |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 51 | 42,5 |
| Female | 69 | 57,5 |
| Department | | |
| Computer Engineering | 27 | 22,5 |
| Industrial Engineering | 23 | 19,2 |
| Energy Systems Engineering | 11 | 9,2 |
| Chemistry and Process Engineering | 5 | 4,2 |
| Polymer Engineering | 3 | 2,5 |
| Transportation Engineering | 26 | 21,6 |
| Economics | 8 | 6,7 |
| Business Administration | 15 | 12,5 |
| Others | 2 | 1,7 |

## 3.4. Data Collection Instruments

Data for the study were collected through four major sources: an argumentative essay writing task, Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey (MKWS) (Appendices 4 and 5), Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey (MSWS) (Appendices 6 and 7) and retrospective interviews (Appendices 8 and 9). MKWS, MSWS and interview questions were developed by adapting Xiao's (2016) instruments and then refining them through pilot testing.

The reliability analysis of Xiao (2016) for the three subscales of MKWS revealed that Cronbach's Alpha was .783 for person knowledge, .791 for task knowledge, and .742 for strategy knowledge. Therefore, the items had high internal consistency within each subscale. The reliability analysis for the three subscales of MSWS revealed that Cronbach's Alpha was .845 for the planning subscale, which was considered excellent, and .788 for the monitoring subscale, and .756 for the self-evaluating subscale, both of which were considered good indicating relatively high internal consistency within each subscale.

Questionnaire items and interview questions in Xiao (2016) were translated from English to Turkish for the present study by the researcher, whose L1 is Turkish. Three language instructors, who had their degree on translation and interpreting, reviewed the translated versions of the instruments in terms of language and comprehensibility of the items by the respondents. Back translation was employed by the researcher and another instructor to check translation accuracy, and some amendments were made.

At a later stage, to measure their reliability, translated versions of the original surveys were piloted on 31 B2 level students. A reliability analysis was performed on the results of both surveys via Cronbach's Alpha after piloting. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency reliability for the Turkish version of the MKWS was founded to be .87 and for MSWS .80. In the pilot study, students were also asked to comment on any difficulties they had in answering the questions. The researcher revised and modified some items slightly in the questionnaires based on the data derived from the pilot study and the feedbacks of respondents regarding ambiguous wording, difficult questions and format of the survey. Five items in MKWS (items 14, 21, 22, 29, 33) and two items in MKWS (items 32 and33) were amended to make the meaning more precise and concise for respondents. As the two questions (Questions 1 and 2) in the interview sessions seem inefficient to collect relevant and meaningful data, their wording was changed.

Five out of 31 students took the questionnaires also in English to assure the accuracy of the translation. Students were asked about the different responses they had given to the same items in Turkish and English versions of MKWS and MSWS. It was seen that the problems were caused by the students not understanding some items in English. Revised questionnaires and interview questions were administered to the participants for the main part of the study.

**3.4.1. Argumentative writing tasks.** Argumentative writing requires some basic characteristics of the literate and educated individuals such as taking a position on a matter and

defending it strenuously to persuade the target audience to adopt a certain position or to take similar action. Research on metacognition and writing process reveals that writing topic or text-type are significant factors influencing writers' implementation of metacognitive strategies (Bacha, 2010; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008). When the task is too easy, it fails to encourage writers to act metacognitively. As written argumentation requires the various cognitive processes, it is considered to be more helpful to learn more about students' developmental cognitive processes (Panahandeh & Esfandiari Asl, 2014). Being a challenging genre for EFL learners to master (Panahandeh & Esfandiari Asl, 2014), argumentative type of writing was chosen to measure the writing achievement of participants in the current study.

The participants were asked to write an argumentative essay, including an introductory paragraph, at least three body paragraphs and a concluding paragraph in response to one of the following essay prompts within an hour (sixty minutes):

Essay prompt 1: Some people believe that studying at university or college is necessary for a successful career while others believe that it is better to get a job straight after school. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Essay prompt 2: Some people believe that some jobs are undoubtedly suitable just for men or women while others believe that both women and men can work at any job without any discrimination. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

**3.4.2. Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey.** MKWS was used to measure respondents' metacognitive knowledge about English writing. The instrument adapted from Xiao (2016) was originally based on the studies of Devine (1993), Flavell (1985), Victori (1999), Wenden (1998), H. Wu (2008) and Y. Wu (2008). It was designed as a 6-point-likert scale with 50 items and three sections. Each item was a statement about a certain aspect of students' metacognitive knowledge described by Flavell (1979): person knowledge, task knowledge, and

strategy knowledge. Among all items, items 1 to 12 were concerned with person knowledge, items 13 to 24 with task knowledge and items 25 to 50 with strategy knowledge. 9 out of 50 items were reversed.

The reliability analysis performed for each of the three sections of the MKWS survey revealed .767 for Person knowledge, .354 for Task Knowledge, and .756 for Strategy Knowledge, indicating relatively high internal reliability for Person and Strategy Knowledge subscales, but low reliability for Task Knowledge subcale. Two items were deleted in the task section (items 23 and 24) to improve the reliability of the instrument. In the revised version of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient reached .575 for the task knowledge. According to Taber (2018), a threshold of acceptability for alpha values does not imply that lower values of alpha indicates an unsatisfactory instrument because "slightly increasing the number of items would lead to acceptable values for Cronbach's alpha" (p.6). Accordingly, although the alpha value mentioned here is not highly satisfactory, it is acceptable and sufficient (see Taber, 2018).

**3.4.3.  Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey.** The MSWS, adapted from Xiao (2016), was used to measure participants' metacognitive strategy use while writing in English. It was originally based on the studies of Brown et al., (1983), Flavell (1985), O'Maley and Chamot (1990), and Wu, Li, and Xie (2008). The survey was designed as a 6-point-likert scale comprising 38 items and three sections: Planning with 17 items, Monitoring with 13 items, and Evaluating with 8 items. Items in each section reflected the second component of metacognition, namely, metacognitive strategies involving planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Flavell, 1979; Brown, 1987; Jacobs & Paris, 1987; Schraw & Moshman, 1995). Of the 38 statements in the survey, 15 were reversed. In the revised version of the questionnaire, The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was .836 (high reliability) for Planning, .884 (high reliability) for Monitoring, and .453 (low, but acceptable reliability) for Evaluating.

**3.4.4. Retrospective interviews.** Interviews are considered as the most commonly used qualitative research methods to clarify learners' metacognitive knowledge and strategies. In the current study, retrospective interviews were also carried out to elicit further information from respondents on their perceptions about their L2 writing processes. Interview questions which were adapted from Xiao (2016) were originally based on the study of Kasper (1997). Interview questions were grouped in 2 sections: Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing and Metacognitive Strategies of Writing.

The first section of the interview consisted of 9 questions and three subcategories, Self-Knowledge as a Writer, Metacognitive Awareness of Writing Tasks and Metacognitive Awareness of Strategies. Among all questions, questions 1 to 3 were concerned with person knowledge, questions 4 to 6 with task knowledge, and questions 7 to 9 with strategy knowledge. The researcher aimed to gather more in-depth information about interviewees regarding their previous writing experiences, self-perceptions as a writer, awareness about both the task and available strategies.

The second section of the interview, Metacognitive Strategies of Writing, consisted of 7 questions about the strategies that participants had used in the planning, monitoring, and evaluating phases of their argumentative tasks. It aimed to elicit information from interviewees about certain aspects of their argumentative writing process, such as describing the whole writing process, outlining, writing the thesis statement and expanding it, using remedial strategies to overcome difficulties while writing and revising.

Participants were interviewed in their native language, Turkish, so that they could express themselves more easily and accurately; thus, the researcher also wanted to prevent participants' English proficiency from becoming a confounding factor in the interview results.

**3.5. Data Collection Procedure**

Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics committee of the researcher's university before the implementation of the study. Data collection for the study was hold in four sessions. In the first session of the study, all B2 level students from 7 classes were informed about the overall goal and the data collection procedure of the study. Before they participated in the surveys and interviews, respondents who agreed to attend the study signed an informed consent form and responded to a question about whether they would like to attend retrospective interviews (see Appendix 3).

In the second session, participants wrote an argumentative essay in an hour. For fear that the questionnaires might have had an influence on the students' writing process, argumentative essay writing tasks were assigned first. Immediately after students had completed their writing tasks, the questionnaires were administered. Participants were given 40 minutes to respond both the MKWS and MSWS, respectively. It lasted less than 30 minutes for most students to submit the papers.

After the survey data were gathered, in the last session, the researcher and another instructor working in the same institution conducted interviews with each of the 35 students. Each interview took approximately 10 minutes. In total, interviews with all 35 participants took nearly two weeks.

**3.6. Data Analysis Procedure**

The current study focused on the relations between metacognition and Turkish EFL learners' writing achievement. Data collection instruments were employed, and data analyses were conducted grounding on the purpose and research questions of the study.

**3.6.1. Analysis of the quantitative data.** In both surveys (MKWS and MSWS), respondents were asked to read each statement and indicate the extent to which they agreed with

it on a scale going from 1. 'never true of me', 2. 'usually not true of me', 3.'somewhat not true of me', 4. 'somewhat true of me', 5. 'usually true of me' to 6. 'always true of me'. Scoring of both questionnaires (MKWS and MSWS) accounted for the responses that participants gave to each item. All the data collected from questionnaires were typed into the computer.

Table 2

*The relations between research questions and data collection instruments*

| Data Collection Instruments For Research Questions | | |
|---|---|---|
| Research Questions | Data Collection Instruments | Data Analyses |
| RQ1. What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables? | Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey (MKWS) | A descriptive analysis of each of the variables concerning metacognitive knowledge about writing<br><br>Correlation analyses of all three subscales |
| RQ2. While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating? | Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey (MSWS) | A descriptive analysis of each of the components concerning metacognitive strategies of writing<br><br>Correlation analysis of all three subscales |
| RQ3. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing? | Argumentative essay writing tasks<br><br>Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey (MKWS) | A correlation analysis |
| RQ4. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing? | Argumentative essay writing tasks<br><br>Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey (MSWS) | A correlation analysis |
| RQ5. What do Turkish EFL learners think about their metacognitive knowledge about writing? | Retrospective interviews | A content analysis |
| RQ6. What do Turkish EFL learners think about the metacognitive strategies they used in a given writing task? | Retrospective interviews | A content analysis |

The data gathered were analysed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 25.0 software package programme. In order to answer the first research question, *'What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables?',* and second research question, *'While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating?'*, descriptive analyses were employed.  Mean scores of the three MKWS subscales (person, task, and strategy variables) and three MSWS subscales (planning, monitoring, and evaluating) were examined, and findings were reported for all participants together. Furthermore, students were grouped as high-performing (HP), average-performing (AP) and low-performing (LP) writers according to their argumentative writing task scores. Students scoring 18 and higher were placed in the HP group (n=36), students scoring between 14 and 17.5 in the AP group (n=44) and students scoring 13.5 and lower in the LP group (n=40) (See Table 3 for the grading criteria of EFL learners' writing proficiency).

Table 3

*Grading criteria of EFL learners' writing proficiency*

| Writing Competence Level | |
|---|---|
| Level | Mean |
| High | 18-25 |
| Average | 14-17,5 |
| Low | 0-13,5 |

Mean scores of the three MKWS subscales and three MSWS subscales were also examined for each group individually to see if the extent of students' metacognitive knowledge and regulation varied across groups. The criteria adopted for judging the level of participants' metacognitive knowledge and their use of metacognitive strategies are presented in Table 4.

Correlational analyses of three subscales in both questionnaires were also performed to see the effect size of the association between variables.

Table 4

*Grading criteria of metacognitive knowledge and the use of metacognitive strategies*

| The Level of Participants' Metacognitive Knowledge and Their Use Of Metacognitive Strategies | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level | Mean | Options |
| High | 4,40 – 6 | Always true of me |
| | | Usually true of me |
| Average | 2,70 – 4,39 | Somewhat true of me |
| | | Somewhat not true of me |
| Low | 1– 2,69 | Usually not true of me |
| | | Never true of me |

Research questions 3 and 4 examined whether there was a significant relationship among Turkish EFL learners' writing achievement and both their metacognitive knowledge about writing and metacognitive strategy use. Both questions were addressed by appealing to correlation analyses.

For rating students' writing tasks, a scoring rubric was developed by the researcher (see Appendix 10). It was an analytic scoring rubric in which the evaluation process was broken down into three parts: organisation, unity and coherence, and mechanics. For each component in the rubric, numbers were assigned, and the scores for each component were totalled, generating a total writing score. The highest possible score for the argumentative essay tasks was 25 points, and the lowest was 0. Half points were allowed.

Two experienced English instructors (the researcher and another instructor working in the same institution) graded each component in participants' essays independently according to the rubric. Before they started the rating process, raters came together and held a rater norming session to negotiate on behalf of the use of the rubric and to achieve inter-rater reliability. The

mean of the two scores for each essay was adopted as the final grade and were used in the analyses. Whenever the two scores of an essay disagreed by three points or above, the two raters reexamined that paper and reached a final agreement. The inter-rater reliability between the two raters was calculated via Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (.967), and a strong positive relationship was found between the two raters (see Table 5).

Table 5

*Inter-rater reliability*

|  | Correlation Coefficient | %95 Confidence interval | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Raters | 0,9 67 | 0,953-0,977 | <0,001** |

**Correlation is significant at 0.001.

Participants' performances on the argumentative writing task and their responses to each item in MKWS and MSWS were scored and entered in SPSS programme for the correlation analyses.

**3.6.2. Analysis of the qualitative data.** The last two research questions were concerned with Turkish EFL learners' thoughts about their metacognitive knowledge about English writing and the strategies they had used when they engaged in an argumentative writing task. To gain more insight into the extent of students' metacognition and to support and enhance the findings from quantitative data, qualitative data were collected through retrospective interviews. The recorded interviews were first transcribed in Turkish and then translated into English.

In order to analyse and explain qualitative data, a content analysis was adopted. In a content analysis, similar data are organised and interpreted clearly within the framework of certain concepts and themes (Yıldırım & Simsek, 2005). Yıldırım and Simsek (2005) suggest four stages for a content analysis: coding data, creating themes, organising data according to the codes and themes, and interpreting data.

These four stages were followed in the present study. Interviewees were classified as HP, AP and LP writers according to their scores in argumentative writing tasks. Firstly, the data collected from each interview were examined closely with a bottom-up approach. Transcriptions were coded for each group in relation with predetermined categories which were mainly based on the metacognitive framework suggested by previous researchers (Flavell, 1985; Brown, 1987; Schraw & Moshman, 1995). Afterwards, a list including the whole coded data was compiled. Sections in the list were studied in detail and consistency of the data with the codes was ensured. Codes with similar meanings in the list were examined and coding was revised. In the next stage, codes showing similar characteristics were categorised into more comprehensive units, and so main themes were created. Lastly, the themes were interpreted in relation to two core categories, metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive strategy use. The first core category, metacognitive knowledge, included references to the categories - person knowledge, task knowledge, and strategy knowledge. The second core category, metacognitive strategy use, subsumed references to the categories of planning, monitoring, and evaluating. Same procedures were repeated for each group separately.

To test the reliability of the content analysis of placing codes into themes and categories, another experienced EFL instructor working in the same institution analysed the codes in 4 randomly selected student transcriptions independently. There was 94% agreement on the classification of references for the categories of metacognitive knowledge and 91% agreement on the classification of references for the categories of metacognitive strategy use between the two raters. They re-examined the lists again to remove the divergences in the classification and reached a final agreement.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Results

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented by direct reference to the research questions raised in the study:

1. What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables?

2. While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating?

3. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

4. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing?

5. What do Turkish EFL learners think about their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

6.  What do Turkish EFL learners think about the metacognitive strategies they used in a given writing task?

**4.1. Quantitative Results of the Study**

In order to answer the first four research questions, quantitative data were gathered through MKWS and MSWS (Xiao, 2016). 8 out of 48 items in the MKWS and 15 out of 38 items in MSWS were reversed. Both questionnaire were designed as 6-point-likert scales.

**4.1.1.  Research question I.** RQ 1: What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables?

In order to answer the first research question, a descriptive analysis was employed. Table 6 presents the participants' metacognitive knowledge status concerning its three dimensions: person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge.

Table 6

*Descriptive statistics of mean scores of MKWS subscales*

MKWS Subscales

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Minimum | Maximum | Grouped Median |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| High-performing group | | | | | | | |
| Person Knowledge | 36 | 4,1667 | ,53080 | 4,2083 | 2,58 | 5,33 | 4,1944 |
| Task Knowledge | 36 | 4,6068 | ,4589 | 4,6000 | 3,70 | 5,40 | 4,600 |
| Strategy Knowledge | 36 | 4,0866 | ,46010 | 4,0192 | 2,96 | 5,27 | 4,0192 |
| Average-Performing Group | | | | | | | |
| Person Knowledge | 44 | 3,7361 | ,77190 | 3,8333 | 1,67 | 5,42 | 3,8333 |
| Task Knowledge | 44 | 4,3576 | ,4956 | 4,3667 | 3,40 | 5,20 | 4,3667 |
| Strategy Knowledge | 44 | 3,8471 | ,48900 | 3,8189 | 2,68 | 4,88 | 3,8098 |
| Low-Performing Group | | | | | | | |
| Person Knowledge | 40 | 3,6905 | ,63176 | 3,7083 | 2,33 | 5,00 | 3,7083 |
| Task Knowledge | 40 | 4,4123 | ,6041 | 4,4500 | 3,00 | 6,00 | 4,4667 |
| Strategy Knowledge | 40 | 3,6031 | ,47858 | 3,5769 | 2,62 | 4,65 | 3,5769 |
| Total | | | | | | | |
| Person Knowledge | 120 | 3,8501 | ,68750 | 3,9167 | 1,67 | 5,42 | 3,9524 |
| Task Knowledge | 120 | 4,4506 | ,5304 | 4,5000 | 3,00 | 6,00 | 4,5056 |
| Strategy Knowledge | 120 | 3,8376 | ,51088 | 3,8462 | 2,62 | 5,27 | 3,8654 |

First, to see the overall status of the participants' metacognitive knowledge, mean scores of the three MKWS subscales were examined for all participants together. It was found that participants had an average level of metacognitive knowledge for the person variable subscale (M=3.8501, SD=.68750) and strategy variables subscale (M=3.8376, SD=.51088) while they had a high level of metacognitive knowledge for the task variables subscale (M=4.4506, SD=.5304). For the grading criteria used to evaluate metacognitive knowledge of the participants, see Table 4.

In order to investigate if the extent of participants' metacognitive knowledge varied across writing proficiency groups (based on their writing achievement scores), mean scores of the

three MKWS subscales were also examined for HP writers, AP writers and LP writers separately. The mean scores of three subscales for each group indicated that HP writers had a higher level of metacognitive knowledge in all three subscales (M=4.1667, SD=.53080 for person variables, M=4.6068, SD=.4589 for task variables, and M=4.0866, SD=.46010 for strategy variables). Mean scores of three subscales for the AP group (M=3.73.61, SD=.77190 for person variables, M=4.3576, SD=.4956 for task variables, and M=3.8471, SD=.48900 for strategy variables) and the LP group (M=3.6905, SD=.63176 for person variables, M=4.4123, SD=.6041 for task variables, and M=3.6031, SD=.47858 for strategy variables) were found close to each other. However, it is worth pointing out that mean scores for task variables were found to be relatively high in all three groups (M=4.6068, M=4.3576, and M=4.4123 for HP, AP, and LP groups, respectively).

Table 7 presents the mean and standard deviation of each intended aspect concerning metacognitive knowledge together with its corresponding item number in the questionnaire. The descriptive statistics results of the participants' person knowledge revealed an average level of awareness for all items in the subscale except for the item 12. To be more specific, participants seemed to have a heightened awareness only about their weaknesses in English writing (M=4.479).

Regarding the task variable, students' responses to most items, again, indicated an average level of awareness. However, it was a promising finding that they had a fairly high awareness about the importance of understanding the requirements of a writing task (item 13, M=4.449). They could write according to the genre (item 16, M=5.084) and use their knowledge of English discourse (item 17, M=4.840). Moreover, they knew that they needed to develop the content of an essay (item 19, M=5.205) and organise their ideas (item 20, M=5.127).

Table 7

*Descriptive statistics of each MKWS subscale*

Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Person Knowledge** | | | |
| 1. I am very interested in English writing. | 120 | 3,758 | 1,335 |
| R2. I find English writing very challenging. | 120 | 3,542 | 1,414 |
| R3. My purpose of learning English writing is to pass English exams. | 120 | 4,192 | 1,584 |
| 4. I am quite aware of my English writing competence. | 120 | 4,175 | 1,157 |
| 5. I am quite aware of how much I know about English writing. | 120 | 4,000 | 1,195 |
| 6. I know a lot about English writing. | 120 | 3,067 | 0,914 |
| 7. I am well aware of some grading rubrics that my writing instructor uses to grade my English argumentative essays. | 118 | 3,712 | 1,602 |
| 8. When writing, I am able to use various writing techniques (i.e.  using synonyms and transitional words). | 119 | 3,958 | 1,108 |
| 9. When writing, I am able to use appropriate writing strategies (i.e.  outlining and drafting). | 120 | 3,775 | 1,306 |
| 10. I am able to predict the writing problems that I may have during writing before I start writing an essay. | 120 | 3,758 | 1,328 |
| 11. I am well aware of my strengths in English writing. | 120 | 3,808 | 1,298 |
| 12. I am well aware of my weaknesses in English writing. | 119 | 4,479 | 1,185 |
| **Task Knowledge** | | | |
| 13. I think it is very important to understand the requirements of a writing task. | 118 | 4,449 | 1,412 |
| 14. It is easy for me to understand the requirements of a writing task. | 117 | 3,932 | 1,172 |
| 15. I usually set up my writing goals based on the requirements of a writing task. | 115 | 4,235 | 1,119 |
| 16. I write according to the genre (i.e. , argumentative, cause-effect, compare-contrast, process) of an essay. | 119 | 5,084 | 0,859 |
| 17. I use my knowledge of English discourse (i.e. , thesis statement, topic sentences, coherence, transitional words) to complete a writing task. | 119 | 4,840 | 1,058 |
| 18. I have a strong awareness of my readers and my communication with them. | 118 | 3,398 | 1,295 |
| 19. I know I need to develop the content of an essay. | 117 | 5,205 | 0,886 |
| 20. I know I need to organize my ideas. | 118 | 5,127 | 1,017 |
| 21. My challenge in completing a writing task is generating ideas. | 116 | 4,164 | 1,389 |
| 22. My challenge in completing a writing task is my lack of finding examples to support my ideas. | 115 | 4,052 | 1,419 |
| *R23. My challenges in completing a writing task are grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. | 118 | 3,407 | 3,130 |
| *24. My challenge in completing a writing task is my lack of writing strategies. | 117 | 3,162 | 1,497 |
| **Strategy Knowledge** | | | |
| R25. I usually come up with ideas in Turkish before I translate them into English. | 119 | 2,487 | 1,540 |
| 26. I usually think in English when I write English essays. | 119 | 2,908 | 1,490 |
| 27. I tackle the problems that I encounter during the writing process with appropriate remedial strategies. | 119 | 3,798 | 1,183 |
| 28. When writing an argumentative essay, I consider the views from both sides of the argument. | 120 | 4,200 | 1,274 |
| 29. My composing process is usually like this: analyzing the writing prompt, generating ideas, planning, outlining, drafting, and revising. | 120 | 3,783 | 1,336 |
| 30. Based on the situation, I would repeat one or more of the above writing steps to revise my essay. | 119 | 3,555 | 1,155 |
| 31. When writing, I pay more attention to the content development of my essay. | 118 | 4,305 | 1,009 |
| 32. When writing, I pay more attention to the organisation of my essay. | 120 | 4,350 | 1,128 |
| R33. When writing, I pay more attention to the grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. | 120 | 3,100 | 1,198 |
| 34. I highly value the planning before writing. | 118 | 3,737 | 1,522 |
| 35. I think outlining and drafting are very helpful. | 119 | 4,151 | 1,629 |
| 36. I think after finishing writing, revising is necessary. | 120 | 4,625 | 1,290 |
| 37. I mainly revise the content of my essay. | 119 | 4,160 | 1,353 |
| 38. I mainly revise the organisation of my essay. | 118 | 4,017 | 1,307 |
| R39. I mainly revise the grammar, vocabulary, and spelling of my essays. | 119 | 3,092 | 1,372 |
| 40. When revising, I check if my viewpoints are convincing enough. | 120 | 3,850 | 1,388 |
| 41.  When revising, I check if the meaning of the sentences and the whole essay are clear enough. | 120 | 4,083 | 1,319 |
| 42. When revising, I check if my examples are specific enough. | 119 | 4,126 | 1,312 |
| 43. When revising, I check if my language is concise enough. | 118 | 3,958 | 1,317 |
| 44. I think I am able to monitor the whole process of my writing effectively. | 119 | 3,454 | 1,261 |
| R45. To improve my writing, I think the key is to improve my grammar. | 120 | 3,142 | 1,546 |
| R46. To improve my writing, I think the key is to memorize more vocabulary. | 120 | 2,483 | 1,384 |
| 47. To improve my writing, I think the key is to read more English essays (including model essays). | 120 | 4,925 | 1,245 |
| 48. To improve my writing, I think the key is to write as many English essays as possible. | 120 | 5,100 | 1,064 |
| R49. Previously, I knew very little about the English writing knowledge mentioned in this survey. | 119 | 3,714 | 1,468 |
| 50. I think the English writing knowledge mentioned in this survey is very helpful. | 119 | 4,731 | 1,148 |

*Note:* *Removed items, R=Reversed items

The results of the strategy variable revealed that strategic knowledge was the poorest among the three components of metacognitive knowledge. Considering their responses to item 46, which was a reversed item, a significant number of students regarded memorising more vocabulary as the key to improving their writing (M=2.483). Nevertheless, when the items indicating a higher awareness of participants about strategy variables were examined, four stood out. Participants regarded revising as necessary after they finished writing (item 36, M=4.625). They considered reading more English essays (item 47, M=4.925) and writing as many English essays as possible (item 48, M=5.100) as keys to improving their writing. They generally found the English writing knowledge mentioned in the survey beneficial (item 50, M=4.731.)

Table 8

*Correlations of MKWS subscales*

|  |  | Person Knowledge | Task Knowledge |
|---|---|---|---|
| Task Knowledge | R | 0,458 | |
|  | P | <0,001** | |
|  | N | 120 | |
| Strategy Knowledge | R | 0,637 | 0,371 |
|  | P | <0,001** | <0,001** |
|  | N | 120 | 120 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level.

A correlation analysis of all three subscales was also performed to see the effect size of association between two variables (see Table 8). The following guidelines were used for interpretation: $.00 < |r| < .19$ = very weak correlation; $.20 < |r| < .39$ = weak correlation; $.40 < |r| < .59$ = moderate correlation; $.60 < |r| < .79$ = strong correlation; and $.80 < |r| < 1.0$ = very strong correlation (Evans, 1996). Results revealed the correlation between the person and task variables as .458 (p<0,001), between the person and the strategy variables as .637 (p<0,001) and

between the task and strategy variables as .371 (p<0,001). Accordingly, there was a moderate positive correlation between the person and task variables, a strong positive correlation between the person and the strategy variables, and a weak positive correlation between the task and the strategy variables.

**4.1.2. Research question II.** RQ 2: While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating?

Table 9 presents the overall status of participants' use of metacognitive strategies including planning, monitoring and evaluating. The results of descriptive statistics demonstrated that participants had an average level of metacognitive awareness for planning, monitoring and evaluating strategies (M= 4.1333, SD= .67551; M= 4.12224, *SD*= .80259; M= 3. 9719, SD= 59816, respectively).

To investigate whether the use of metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating varied across the HP, AP and LP groups, mean scores of the three MSWS subscales were also examined individually. It was found that HP writers (M = 4.4103, SD = .59953 for planning, M = 4.3202, SD = .74103 for monitoring, and M = 4.1819, SD = .58726 for evaluating) and AP writers (M = 4.1297, SD = .69222 for planning, M = 4.2443, SD = .78810 for monitoring, and M = 4.0303, SD = .62602 for evaluating) scored relatively higher in all three subscales than LP writers (M = 3.8880, SD = .63946 for planning, M = 3.8104, SD = .79698 for monitoring, and M = 3.7188, SD = .48973 for evaluating).

Table 9

*Descriptive statistics of mean scores of MSWS subscales*

| MSWS Subscales | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Minimum | Maximum | Grouped Median |
| High-performing group | | | | | | | |
| Planning | 36 | 4,4103 | ,59953 | 4,4706 | 3,06 | 5,53 | 4,4706 |
| Monitoring | 36 | 4,3202 | ,74103 | 4,5385 | 2,31 | 5,69 | 4,5000 |
| Evaluating | 36 | 4,1819 | ,58726 | 4,2250 | 2,88 | 5,50 | 4,2071 |
| Average-Performing Group | | | | | | | |
| Planning | 44 | 4,1297 | ,69222 | 4,0294 | 2,59 | 5,65 | 4,0235 |
| Monitoring | 44 | 4,2443 | ,78810 | 4,3173 | 2,69 | 5,54 | 4,2949 |
| Evaluating | 44 | 4,0303 | ,62602 | 3,9375 | 3,13 | 5,50 | 3,9531 |
| Low-Performing Group | | | | | | | |
| Planning | 40 | 3,8880 | ,63946 | 3,7353 | 2,59 | 5,29 | 3,7353 |
| Monitoring | 40 | 3,8104 | ,79698 | 3,6795 | 2,31 | 5,85 | 3,6709 |
| Evaluating | 40 | 3,7188 | ,48973 | 3,6250 | 2,63 | 5,00 | 3,7000 |
| Total | | | | | | | |
| Planning | 120 | 4,1333 | ,67551 | 4,0588 | 2,59 | 5,65 | 4,0924 |
| Monitoring | 120 | 4,1224 | ,80259 | 4,1186 | 2,31 | 5,85 | 4,1303 |
| Evaluating | 120 | 3,9719 | ,59816 | 4,0000 | 2,63 | 5,50 | 3,9625 |

The descriptive statistics of each intended aspect regarding metacognitive strategies of writing are presented in Table 10 with its corresponding item number in the MSWS questionnaire. The mean scores of items in each subscale proved that participants' implementation of metacognitive strategies regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating was neither satisfactory nor very poor, belonging to the average level in general. However, hopefully, participants paid attention to the genre (item 1, M=5.358) and the purpose of a writing task (item 2, M=5.167) when planning. The descriptive statistics of the results of monitoring subscale indicated that participants checked to see if the content of their essay was relevant to the topic. Finally, regarding evaluating, they considered the English writing strategies mentioned in the MSWS as helpful (M=4.879).

Table 10

*Descriptive statistics of each MSWS subscale*

Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Planning** | | | |
| 1. Before writing, I pay attention to the genre (i.e. , argumentative, cause-effect, compare- contrast, process) of a writing task. | 120 | 5,358 | 0,977 |
| 2. Before writing, I pay attention to the purpose (i.e. , to express opinion, to inform, etc.) of a writing task. | 120 | 5,167 | 0,956 |
| 3. Before writing, I pay attention to the audience (i.e. , my instructor or advisor, my classmates, general public...etc.) of a writing task. | 119 | 3,832 | 1,422 |
| 4. Before writing, I pay attention to specific parts of the language (i.e. , the wording and grammar) of a writing task. | 120 | 4,275 | 1,077 |
| 5. Before writing, I set up my goals based on the requirement of a writing task. | 120 | 4,342 | 1,149 |
| 6. Before writing, I make plans for achieving my goals. | 120 | 4,042 | 1,428 |
| 7. Before writing, I consciously recall the model essays related to the writing prompt | 120 | 3,750 | 1,349 |
| 8. Before writing, I consciously recall the template pertaining to the writing prompt. | 119 | 3,714 | 1,348 |
| R9. Before writing, I seldom recall the knowledge pertaining to the writing prompt. | 120 | 3,883 | 1,323 |
| R10. Before writing, I seldom recall the contexts pertaining to the writing prompt. | 118 | 4,025 | 1,237 |
| 11. Before writing, I consciously recall the words and sentences relevant to the writing prompt. | 120 | 3,842 | 1,202 |
| 12. Before writing, I consciously generate new ideas for writing. | 116 | 3,940 | 1,340 |
| R13. Before writing, I seldom make plans for organizing and arranging the content of my essay. | 119 | 4,000 | 1,479 |
| 14. Before writing an argumentative essay, I first decide upon the thesis statement of the essay. | 120 | 3,958 | 1,542 |
| R15. Before writing, I seldom consider my thesis statement from both sides of an argument (critical thinking). | 120 | 3,950 | 1,401 |
| 16. Before writing, I outline the topic sentence of each paragraph. | 120 | 4,142 | 1,285 |
| 17. Before writing, I come up with examples to support each one of my viewpoints. | 119 | 4,017 | 1,289 |
| **Monitoring** | | | |
| 18. When writing, I check to see if my essay meets the requirements of the writing task. | 120 | 4,292 | 1,040 |
| 19. When writing, I monitor my awareness of the audience. | 120 | 3,100 | 1,191 |
| 20. When writing, I check to see if the content of my essay is relevant to the topic. | 120 | 4,800 | 1,089 |
| R21. When writing, I seldom check to see if the organisation of my essay is logical. | 120 | 4,117 | 1,445 |
| R22. When writing, I seldom check to see if the language of my essay is clear enough. | 118 | 4,085 | 1,362 |
| 23. When writing, I check to see if my word usage is accurate enough. | 120 | 4,275 | 1,209 |
| 24. When writing, I check to see if my grammar is correct. | 120 | 4,300 | 1,220 |
| R25. When writing, I seldom check to see if my sentence structures vary a lot. | 119 | 3,933 | 1,212 |
| R26. When writing, I seldom adjust my writing plan. | 116 | 4,190 | 1,351 |
| 27. When writing, I try to identify my problems and my deficits during the process of writing. | 117 | 4,120 | 1,321 |
| R28. When writing, I seldom check to see if my writing strategies are effective enough. | 120 | 3,908 | 1,335 |
| R29. When writing, I seldom think about what writing strategies I should employ. | 120 | 4,308 | 1,302 |
| R30. When writing, I seldom think about when or where to employ writing strategies. | 120 | 4,200 | 1,320 |
| **Evaluating** | | | |
| R31. After finishing writing, I seldom self-evaluate the content of my essay to see if any addition or deletion is needed. | 119 | 4,328 | 1,303 |
| R32. 32. After finishing writing, I mainly focus on self-evaluating the accuracy of my grammar. | 119 | 3,361 | 1,358 |
| 33. After finishing writing, I self-evaluate my use of words to see if they vary a lot. | 119 | 4,017 | 1,164 |
| R34. After finishing writing, I seldom self-evaluate the organisation of my essay to see if it is clear enough. | 118 | 3,983 | 1,294 |
| 35. After finishing writing, I self-evaluate my essay holistically to see if it achieves the goals of the writing task. | 120 | 4,150 | 1,294 |
| 36. Based on the results of self-evaluation, I repeat the recursive composing process of "compose and revise, revise and compose". | 116 | 3,526 | 1,361 |
| R37. Previously, I knew very little about the English writing strategies mentioned in this survey. | 116 | 3,500 | 1,602 |
| 38. I think the English writing strategies mentioned in this survey is very helpful. | 116 | 4,879 | 1,231 |

R=Reversed item

A correlation analysis was also performed to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship of each subscale with other subscales in MSWS (see Table 11). It was found that the three subscales correlated with each other. The Pearson correlation coefficient value for planning and monitoring was .657 (p<0,001), which confirmed a strong positive relationship between the two variables. On the other hand, the Pearson correlation coefficient value for planning and evaluating was .521 (p<0,001) and for monitoring and evaluating was .542 (p<0,001) indicating a moderate positive relationship between the two variables.

Table 11

*Correlations of MSWS subscales*

|            |   | Planning   | Monitoring |
|------------|---|------------|------------|
|            | R | 0,657      |            |
| Monitoring | P | <0,001     |            |
|            | N | 120        |            |
|            | R | 0,521      | 0,542      |
| Evaluating | P | <0,001**   | <0,001**   |
|            | N | 120        | 120        |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level.

**4.1.3. Research question III.** RQ 3: Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

A correlation analysis was used to answer the third research question. The strength of the relationship between students' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing was examined based on the scores they got in their argumentative tasks and the responses they gave to the MKWS. Students' writing achievements were evaluated by taking the average of the grades given by two independent raters. Table 12 summarizes the results of the participants' overall writing achievement.

Table 12

*Participants' English writing achievement*

**English Writing Achievement**

| N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Median | Minimum | Maximum | Grouped Median |
|---|------|----------------|--------|---------|---------|----------------|
| 120 | 15,1479 | 4,04199 | 15,0000 | 5,00 | 23,50 | 15,0385 |

Table 13

*Correlations between writing achievement and MKWS subscales*

**Writing Achievement**

| | r | p | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Person Knowledge | 0,307 | >0,05* | 120 |
| Task Knowledge | 0,157 | >0,05* | 120 |
| Strategy Knowledge | 0,373 | >0,05* | 120 |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

As regards to the results of the correlation analysis (see Table 13), there was a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievement (argumentative writing task average scores) and both their person knowledge (r=.307, p>0,05) and strategy knowledge (r=.373, p>0,05). The Pearson correlation coefficient value of .157 (p>0,05) indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between students' task knowledge and writing achievement.

**4.1.4. Research question IV.**RQ 4: Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing?

A correlation analysis was used to examine the strength of the relationship between students' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing, as well. As regards to the results of the correlation analysis (see Table 14), there was a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievement (argumentative writing task average scores)

and their use of planning (r=.300, p>0,05), monitoring (r=.278, p>0,05) and evaluating (r=.279, p>0,05) strategies.

Table 14

*Correlations between writing achievement and MSWS subscales*

| Writing Achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | r | p | N |
| Planning | 0,300 | >0,05* | 120 |
| Monitoring | 0,278 | >0,05* | 120 |
| Evaluating | 0,279 | >0,05* | 120 |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

## 4.2. Qualitative Results of the Study

To support the findings of the quantitative data and to elicit further information from respondents on their perceptions about their English writing achievement and processes, retrospective interviews were carried out. By using a content analysis, the study aimed to interpret the findings of qualitative data and answer the fifth and sixth research questions. First, the data collected from three groups of writers through interviews were coded. Then the main themes were created for each group of writers with regard to six categories which were commonly addressed in the literature: person knowledge, task knowledge, strategy knowledge (Devine, 1993; Flavell, 1985; Kasper, 1997) as well as planning, monitoring and evaluating (Brown, 1987; Jacobs & Paris; 1987; Schraw and Moshman, 1995). The reason why a content analysis was employed for each group separately was to identify the similarities and differences among the three groups' metacognitive knowledge about English writing and their use of metacognitive strategies.

**4.2.1.  Research question V.** RQ 5: What do Turkish EFL learners think about their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

A close examination of students' perceptions regarding themselves as writers, the tasks they engage in and the strategies they know may be a useful attempt to highlight what can be done to improve their writing processes and to fulfil their needs as EFL writers. Table 15 illustrates the themes created under the categories of person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge for HP, AP and LP writers.

From a recursive analysis of the interview data collected from HP and AP writers and the codes emerged, seven themes under the category of person knowledge, four themes under the category of task knowledge and six themes under the category of strategy knowledge were created (see Table 15). The themes derived from LP group data were the same as the ones from HP and AP groups' data concerning task and strategy variables. Regarding the person variable, six themes were common in all groups, but the theme *person-related factors affecting writing performance positively* did not occur in LP writers' data.

Table 15

*Themes for the core category of metacognitive knowledge about writing*

| Categories | Themes for HP writers (n=11) | Themes for AP writers (n=15) | Themes for LP writers (n=9) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Person Knowledge | ▪ Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively ▪ Person-related factors affecting writing performance positively ▪ Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance ▪ Awareness of strengths ▪ Awareness of weaknesses ▪ Endeavours to improve English writing ▪ Goals to learn English writing | ▪ Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively ▪ Person-related factors affecting writing performance positively ▪ Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance ▪ Awareness of strengths ▪ Awareness of weaknesses ▪ Endeavours to improve English writing ▪ Goals to learn English writing | ▪ Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively - ▪ Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance ▪ Awareness of strengths ▪ Awareness of weaknesses ▪ Endeavours to improve English writing ▪ Goals to learn English writing |
| Task Knowledge | ▪ Task-related factors affecting writing performance ▪ Challenges in completing a writing task ▪ Awareness of task requirements ▪ Features of a good writing | ▪ Task-related factors affecting writing performance ▪ Challenges in completing a writing task ▪ Awareness of task requirements ▪ Features of a good writing | ▪ Task-related factors affecting writing performance ▪ Challenges in completing a writing task ▪ Awareness of task requirements ▪ Features of a good writing |
| Strategy Knowledge | ▪ Objectives of writing goals ▪ Planning ahead of writing ▪ Monitoring while writing ▪ Revising ▪ Editing ▪ Criteria for self-evaluation | ▪ Objectives of writing goals ▪ Planning ahead of writing ▪ Monitoring while writing ▪ Revising ▪ Editing ▪ Criteria for self-evaluation | ▪ Objectives of writing goals ▪ Planning ahead of writing ▪ Monitoring while writing ▪ Revising ▪ Editing ▪ Criteria for self-evaluation |

***4.2.1.1. Results of the analysis of the data on person knowledge.*** The codes that emerged under the category of person knowledge in HP, AP and LP groups' interview data are presented in Tables 16, 17, and 18, respectively. Findings showed that person related factors affecting writing performance, self- efficacy beliefs, awareness of strengths and weaknesses, endeavours and goals to learn English writing constituted students' awareness of person variable.

*4.2.1.1.1. Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively.* When asked about the experiences they felt unsuccessful as EFL writers, participants mentioned about some *person related factors affecting their writing performance negatively*. Although 'exam anxiety' and 'writing anxiety' emerged as recurrent codes in all groups, students in the LP group were more likely to complain about anxiety. One of these students remarked, "I feel very nervous before I start writing, especially if I write for an exam" (LPS-66).

20% of the AP group and 22% of the LP group mentioned their 'lack of efforts to improve writing' as another factor preventing them from performing better in English writing tasks. One student in the AP group reported that she was getting worse at writing each day because she did not do anything to improve it (APS-57). 'Being in a negative mood' (APS-7, LPS-58, APS-115) on the day of the writing task' and 'lack of interest in reading (APS-12, APS-32)' were noted as the other factors leading to failure in English writing by a couple of students in the AP and HP groups.

*4.2.1.1.2. Person-related factors affecting writing performance positively.* Unlike their LP counterparts, students in the HP and AP groups mentioned some person-related factors affecting their English writing performance positively. First of all, 'having learned about or practised in a certain genre' was a recurrent code detected in HP and AP groups' data (45.45 % and 26.67%, respectively). One of the HP students (HPS-13) expressed that when she had sufficient

knowledge about the writing topic or the type of writing she carried out, she could write more easily and effectively.

The other factors uttered by a limited number of students in the HP and AP groups commonly were 'experience in L1 writing' (HPS-24, APS-7, APS-12) , 'interest in English writing' (HPS-24, APS-113) 'interest in L2 reading' (HPS-24) and 'interest in learning a FL'(APS-57, APS-113).

*4.2.1.1.3. Self-efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance.* Under the theme of *self-efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance*, students mentioned both their positive and negative self-efficacy beliefs. As Table 18 demonstrates, 44.44 % of the LP writers felt incompetent at EFL writing. When compared to their HP and AP counterparts, they were more inclined to complain about their inabilities and weaknesses in EFL writing. Showing a low self-concept toward her writing skill, one student in the LP group noted: "I find none of my writing tasks successful. They are either bad or average" (LPS-28).

4.2.1.1.4.*Awareness of strengths.* Awareness of strengths and awareness of weaknesses were the two most prominent themes that emerged from the analysis of interviewees' utterances. Regardless of their writing achievement, each participant had some weaknesses and strengths in English writing. When students were asked specifically about their strengths as EFL writers, the most common response in the HP and AP groups was 'generating ideas'. 54.55% of HP writers and 46.67% of AP writers were sure about their ability to produce ideas. One student in the AP group said, "I'm creative. I don't have any excitement or stress while writing because I don't have a problem producing ideas" (APS-57). Another student in the HP group further mentioned that he was quite good at generating ideas and organising his essays; thus, he could produce a cohesive and coherent piece of writing.

Differently from AP and HP writers, in the LP group's data 'grammatical competence' emerged as a recurrent code under the theme *awareness of strengths*, and it was expressed by 6 out of 9 students (66.67%). Like LPS-54, majority of the students in this group mentioned being good at using English grammar while writing.

'Using discourse markers appropriately' (HPS-30, APS-32, LPS-71) , 'writing a good introductory paragraph' (APS-11, HPS-30, LPS-87)  'conveying ideas to the audience effectively' (APS-7, HPS-24, APS-26, HPS-114), 'controlling writing anxiety and stress' (APS-57, HPS-80) 'lexical competence' (LPS-52, LPS-54, APS-57, LPS-58), 'time management' (HPS-80), 'being good at essay organisation' (HPS- 24, HPS- 74, HPS-80) and 'writing coherently and in unity' (HPS-24) were the other codes emerged under the theme of *awareness of strengths*.

*4.2.1.1.5. Awareness of weaknesses.* Participants' responses to the question regarding their weaknesses in EFL writing pointed up their widely-held perceptions about their limited vocabulary size and lack of ideas. First of all, 8 out of 11 students (72.73%) in the HP group, 10 out of 15 students (66.67%) in the AP group and 4 out of 9 students (44.44%) in the LP group articulated 'limited repertoire of English vocabulary' as their major weakness in English writing. Underlining her limited lexical knowledge, a student in the LP group expressed writing with the same simple words all the time and having a lack of knowledge about synonyms (LPS-87). Complaining about the same problem, another student in the AP group mentioned, "Sometimes I change what I'm going to write because I don't know a word or can't remember it. If I think I can't get anywhere with the words I know, I may even change the topic I will write about" (APS-82).

Secondly, 63.64% of HP writers, 46.67% of AP writers, and 66.67% of LP writers cited 'lack of ideas' as another severe weakness that prevented them from succeeding in English

writing tasks. A student in the AP group expressed her concerns about this issue thus: "I am good at using grammar and discourse markers. However, because I have great trouble producing ideas, it doesn't do much good for me to be good at them" (APS-32).

Furthermore, while a considerable number of students in the HP (54.55%) and AP (60%) groups complained about their poor grammatical knowledge as a weakness, only two students (22.22%) in the LP group mentioned 'poor grammar' as a constraint upon their high-quality English writing performance. A student in the HP group noted that it was easy for her to produce original ideas in her mother tongue, but because of her lack of grammar competence, she could not put her ideas into the paper as effectively as she wanted (HPS-24). Similarly, 'lack of English proficiency' was cited as a weakness by more students in the HP and LP groups (27.27% and 33.33%, respectively). Only one student in the LP (LPS-66) group found herself incompetent in English.

Students in all groups articulated 'mental translation' as the other significant barrier to EFL writing. However, when compared to HP and LP writers, more students in the AP group (46.67%) complained about translating from their mother tongue while writing in English. A student in this group stated that when she thought like a Turk but wrote in English, she could never be sure about whether she could give what she meant or not (APS-57). Another student in the LP group described the situation with these sentences:

> I think in Turkish and try to write in English. It seems like an advantage at first because I can find profound ideas. However, my English is so poor that when I try to write my ideas out, they sound silly, and my teachers usually don't understand what I mean. (LPS-28)

*4.2.1.1.6. Endeavours to improve English writing.* The codes identified under the theme of *endeavours to improve English writing* and their frequencies of occurrence in interview

transcriptions indicated that AP writers tended to engage in more diverse activities to improve their EFL writing performance (see Table 17). The most common activity in all groups to improve writing skill was 'studying the structures and vocabulary in the thesis statements of model texts to write an appropriate thesis statement'. 36.36% of HP writers, 46.67% of AP writers and 44.44% of LP writers mentioned writing their statements by using the formulaic expressions they had seen in model texts. The other common practices that some participants in each group engaged in were 'studying model essays on the Internet' (APS-12, LPS-28, HPS-49, LPS-52, LPS-54, HPS-79) and 'doing extra reading' (HPS-49, LPS-54, APS-57, APS-104, HPS-114).

    *4.2.1.1.7. Goals to learn English writing.* Goal setting is considered to be a significant characteristic of metacognitive learners. When the goals that the participants of this study set to learn English writing were examined, it was seen that high achievers tended to set more diverse goals.

    Whereas passing their English exams was stated as the ultimate goal to learn English writing by most students in the HP (54.55%) and AP groups (53.33%), only two students in the LP group (22.22%) mentioned it as a goal. One student in the HP group said, "... I have no other goal than making good grades and satisfying my teachers' expectations" (HPS-30).

    The other goal to learn English writing articulated recurrently by respondents in three groups was 'learning writing to transfer ideas'. 18.18% of HP writers, 40% of AP writers and 55.45% of LP writers regarded writing as a means to share their thoughts with or pass their experiences on others. Unlike their LP counterparts, HP and AP writers also aimed at learning English writing for academic and professional purposes. An HP group writer expressed that getting a high score had never been her ultimate goal because she was more concerned about how she could use what she learned in writing classes in her academic or professional life (HPS-53).

Only HPS-24 in the HP group aimed at learning writing to improve her overall English

proficiency.

Table 16

*Themes and codes under the category of person knowledge for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively | Exam anxiety | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing anxiety | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Being in a negative mood | 1 | 9,09 |
| Person-related factors affecting writing performance positively | Experience in L1 writing | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Interest in English writing | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Text-type familiarity | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Interest in L2 reading | 1 | 9,09 |
| Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance | Positive self-efficacy beliefs | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Negative self-efficacy beliefs | 2 | 18,18 |
| Awareness of strengths | Generating ideas | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Grammatical  competence | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Using discourse markers appropriately | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing a good introductory paragraph | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Conveying ideas to the audience effectively | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Controlling writing stress and anxiety | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Writing coherently and in unity | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Time management | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Being good at essay organisation | 3 | 27,27 |
| Awareness of weaknesses | Limited repertoire of English vocabulary | 8 | 72,73 |
| | Poor grammar | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Lack of ideas | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Lack of English proficiency | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Mental translation | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the introductory paragraph | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the body paragraphs | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Having difficulty in using discourse markers | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing long and meaningless sentences | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Writing short paragraphs | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Making capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes | 2 | 18,18 |
| Endeavours to improve English writing | Studying model essays on the Internet | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Studying the structures and vocabulary  in the thesis statements of model texts to write an appropriate thesis statement | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Doing extra reading | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Reading classmates' writing tasks as models | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Keeping a writing notebook and revising prior writing tasks at intervals | 1 | 9,09 |
| Goals to learn English writing | Learning writing to pass exams | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Learning writing to transfer ideas | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Learning writing for academic or professional purposes | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Learning writing to improve overall English proficiency | 1 | 9,09 |

Table 17

*Themes and codes under the category of person knowledge for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively | Exam anxiety | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Writing anxiety | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Lack of efforts to improve writing | 3 | 20 |
| | Being in a negative mood | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Lack of interest in reading | 2 | 13,33 |
| Person-related factors affecting writing performance positively | Experience in L1writing | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Interest in English writing | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Text-type familiarity | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Interest in learning a FL | 2 | 13,33 |
| Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance | Positive self-efficacy beliefs | 3 | 20 |
| | Negative self-efficacy beliefs | 1 | 6,67 |
| Awareness of strengths | Generating ideas | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Grammatical competence | 3 | 20 |
| | Using discourse markers appropriately | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Writing a good introductory paragraph | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Conveying ideas to the audience effectively | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Controlling writing anxiety and stress | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Lexical competence | 1 | 6,67 |
| Awareness of weaknesses | Limited repertoire of English vocabulary | 10 | 66,67 |
| | Poor grammar | 9 | 60 |
| | Lack of ideas | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Lack of English proficiency | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Mental translation | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the introductory paragraph | 3 | 20 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the body paragraphs | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the thesis statement | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Having difficulty in using discourse markers | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Writing too simply | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Lack of writing fluency | 3 | 20 |
| Endeavours to improve English writing | Studying model essays on the Internet | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Studying the structures and vocabulary in the thesis statements of model texts to write an appropriate thesis statement | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Doing extra reading | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Reading classmates' writing tasks as models | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Writing in English as much as possible | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Keeping a journal | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Watching videos on the Internet that teach writing | 1 | 6,67 |
| Goals to learn English writing | Learning writing to pass exams | 8 | 53,33 |
| | Learning writing to transfer ideas | 6 | 40 |
| | Learning writing for academic or professional purposes | 3 | 20 |

Table 18

*Themes and codes under the category of person knowledge for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Person-related factors affecting writing performance negatively | Exam Anxiety | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Writing anxiety | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Lack of efforts to improve writing | 2 | 22,22 |
| Self- efficacy beliefs regarding writing performance | Positive self-efficacy beliefs | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Negative self-efficacy beliefs | 4 | 44,44 |
| Awareness of strengths | Generating ideas | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Grammatical competence | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Using discourse markers appropriately | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Writing a good introductory paragraph | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Lexical competence | 3 | 33,33 |
| Awareness of weaknesses | Limited repertoire of English vocabulary | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Poor grammar | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Lack of ideas | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Lack of English proficiency | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Mental translation | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the introductory paragraph | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the thesis statement | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Writing too simply | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Lack of writing fluency | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Failure in following the organisational rules and conventions of English discourse | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Having difficulty in organising ideas in a logical order | 1 | 11,11 |
| Endeavours to improve English writing | Studying model essays on the Internet | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Studying the structures and vocabulary in the thesis statements of model texts to write an appropriate thesis statement | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Doing extra reading | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Learning new vocabulary | 1 | 11,11 |
| Goals to learn English writing | Learning writing to pass exams | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Learning writing to transfer ideas | 5 | 55,56 |

***4.2.1.2. Results of the analysis of the data on task knowledge.*** Tables 19, 20, and 21 illustrate the codes emerged for task knowledge and their frequencies observed across the data collected from HP, AP, and LP groups, respectively. Findings revealed that students' task knowledge involved their awareness of task-related factors affecting their writing performance, challenges they faced in completing a task, and requirements and basic features of well-written text.

*4.2.1.2.1.Task-related factors affecting writing performance.* Eliciting the factors that Turkish EFL writers encounter while engaging in a writing task is important to scrutinise their existing problems. While commenting on their previous writing experiences, students in all groups commonly mentioned about three main task-related factors involved in their writing process: 'writing topic', 'genre', and 'writing environment'.

All students in the AP group (100%) and 10 out of 11 students in the HP group (90.91%) referred to 'writing topic' as the most significant factor affecting the quality of their English writing. However, only two students in the LP group (22.22%) highlighted it as an essential factor. Interview discussions revealed that students generally performed better and were more motivated to write when a writing topic attracted their attention, when they were familiar with the writing topic, when they wrote about themselves or their experiences, when they chose their writing topics, or when the writing topic did not restrict their creativity. A student in the AP group stated his opinion on the subject as follows:

> My performance is affected dramatically by the writing topic given. When I write on a topic I don't like, it is a kind of torture. For example, they want us to write about the effects of alcoholism or smoking on human health. Such dull topics do not encourage me to be creative or bring a new perspective. (APS-104)

Following the 'writing topic', 'genre' was the second most commonly mentioned factor by respondents in all three groups. 54.55% of HP writers, 80% of AP writers and 55.56% of LP writers regarded 'genre' as a significant factor affecting their writing performance. It also seemed to affect the level of their self-efficacy. A student from the AP group reported that she could write cause and effect essays more easily than argumentative essays. Because telling the causes and effects of something was less complicated than developing arguments and counter-arguments, writing in that genre made her feel more comfortable (APS-32.) For the majority of

participants, the argumentative essay was the most challenging in all genres they had studied. Another student in the HP group described the difficulty that she had while writing in this genre with her following comments:

> I have great difficulty in writing an argumentative essay. It is already my major weakness to generate ideas. In this genre, I have to find original ideas to defend my arguments. What is more, I have to find some counter-arguments and rebut them. (HPS-68)

> Finally, the writing environment was the other factor that some students in the HP

(18.18%), AP (40%) and LP (11.11%) groups emphasized. LPS-7 described the possible impacts of the writing environment on his writing performance as follows:

> When I write at home, I feel more comfortable and stress-free, so more productive. I can spare time for planning and revising. However, when I have to write in the classroom in a limited time, I get nervous; thus, I lose the train of thought and wander off easily.

*4.2.1.2.2. Challenges in completing a writing task.* There are many challenges facing EFL writers in completing a writing task and influencing their performance negatively. The greatest challenge mentioned by the participants of this study was the time-limit on a particular task. 72.73% of HP writers, 86.67% of AP writers and 55.56% of LP writers addressed to it to explain their performance failures. Referring to her poor performance in the final exam of B1 module, LPS-28 explained, "While writing, time goes too fast, and this makes me so stressed, nervous or even frustrated that I cannot concentrate at all".

Another challenge mentioned commonly by writers in all groups was the fear of 'going off-topic'. As shown in Tables 19, 20, and 21, interview discussions revealed that HP writers (54.55%) were more worried about deviating from the topic or losing coherence in their writings. The percentages of students who were concerned about being off-topic in the AP and LP groups were 26.67% and 22.22%, respectively. Describing it as the biggest challenge to his writing

performance, APS-7 noted that while re-reading his writings, he was always in doubt whether he had gone off-topic or not.

    *4.2.1.2.3. Awareness of task requirements.* L2 writers' conscious awareness about the requirements of the writing tasks they undertake is influential in the quality of their writing, and the absence of it affects their writing performance negatively. Regarding the participants of the present study, in all three groups, students seemed to have some awareness about genre conventions, target audience and English discourse and organisational rules, but frequencies of occurrence of each code varied among groups (see Tables 19, 20, and 21).

    First of all, in their responses to interview questions, 72.73% of HP writers, 86.67 of AP writers and 77.78 of LP writers gave some clues about their heightened awareness of English discourse and organisational rules.  A student in the LP group explained how she organised her essays thus:

> I try to follow the organisational rules while I'm writing in English. I elaborate on the
>
> topic in the introductory paragraph. In the thesis statement, I summarise my main points
>
> for my body paragraphs. I think of the examples or supporting details I can give in my
>
> body paragraphs. In the concluding paragraph, I summarise what I have mentioned in my
>
> topic sentences and give my personal opinion. (LPS-28)

    When participants' awareness about genre conventions was explored, HP (54.55%) and AP (53.33%) writers seemed to have greater awareness of it than LP writers (22.22%) did.  In this respect, one of the students in the AP group said:

> A writer should be careful about his readers' opinions and feelings not to offend them. It
>
> is especially important if you are writing an argumentative essay because it is very easy to
>
> get out of the line and hurt the reader unintentionally. A writer also should write in

keeping with the conventions and organisational rules that are specific to a certain genre. (APS-112)

These statements of him implied that he was not only aware of genre conventions, but he was also knowledgeable about how to organize his essays accordingly. He did not ignore the intended audience in the writing process. Finally, when compared to their HP (45.45%) and LP (53.33%) counterparts, poor writers (77.78%), unexpectedly, seemed to have greater audience awareness.

*4.2.1.2.4. Features of a good writing.* In their responses to the question 'in your opinion, in general, what makes good writing?', participants touched upon a variety of features. Out of nine codes in the HP group's data, eight codes in the AP group's data and six codes in the LP group's data, four were found to be common: 'a profound content', 'accurate use of mechanical aspects', 'organisation', and 'lexical diversity'.

In their description of a good piece of writing, 90.91% of HP writers, 80% of AP writers and 88.88% of LP writers attached importance to the content. According to these students, the success of a text depended on the fact that it was informative and had the details and examples that would attract the reader's attention.

The percentages of students who valued *'accurate use of mechanical aspects'* were 45.45% in the HP group, 60% in the AP group and 66.67% in the LP group. An HP writer addressed to the profound content and correct use of mechanical aspects when she remarked, "First of all, a good text must be interesting and informative. It should be rich in ideas, but shouldn't bore the reader with dull details. Further to that, proper use of grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation is equally essential" (HPS-49).

Finally, 'organisation' was highlighted as necessary by 45.45% of HP writers, 46.67% of AP writers and 33.33% of LP writers. Other features that a couple of students put emphasis on

were 'lexical diversity' (APS-7, APS-26, APS-50, APS-57, HPS-74, LPS-98, APS-115),

'appropriate tone' (APS-7, HPS-24, APS-104, APS-112), 'fluency' (APS-11, HPS-68, APS-82,

APS-104), 'originality' (HPS-13, LPS-52, LPS-54), 'appropriate use of discourse markers' (HPS-

53), 'simple language use' (HPS-24), 'grammatical diversity' (LPS-4, LPS-98), and 'relevancy to

the writing topic' (APS-12, APS-51, APS-60, APS-104).

Table 19

*Themes and codes under the category of task knowledge for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| Task-related factors affecting writing performance | Writing topic | 10 | 90,91 |
| | Genre | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Writing environment | 2 | 18,18 |
| Challenges in completing a writing task | Time limit on a particular task | 8 | 72,73 |
| | Going off-topic | 6 | 54,55 |
| Awareness of task requirements | Awareness of genre conventions | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Awareness of the target audience | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Awareness of English discourse and organisational rules | 8 | 72,73 |
| Features of a good writing | A profound content | 10 | 90,91 |
| | Accurate use of mechanical aspects | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Organisation | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Lexical diversity | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Appropriate tone | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Fluency | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Originality | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Appropriate use of discourse markers | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Simple language usage | 1 | 9,09 |

Table 20

*Themes and codes under the category of task knowledge for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Task-related factors affecting writing performance | Writing topic | 15 | 100 |
| | Genre | 12 | 80 |
| | Writing environment | 6 | 40 |
| Challenges in completing a writing task | Time limit on a particular task | 13 | 86,67 |
| | Going off-topic | 4 | 26,67 |
| Awareness of task requirements | Awareness of genre conventions | 8 | 53,33 |
| | Awareness of the target audience | 8 | 53,33 |
| | Awareness of English discourse and organisational rules | 13 | 86,67 |
| Features of a good writing | A profound content | 12 | 80 |
| | Accurate use of mechanical aspects | 9 | 60 |
| | Organisation | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Lexical diversity | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Grammatical diversity | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Appropriate tone | 3 | 20 |
| | Fluency | 3 | 20 |
| | Relevancy to the writing topic | 4 | 26.67 |

Table 21

*Themes and codes under the category of task knowledge for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Task-related factors affecting writing performance | Writing topic | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Genre | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Writing environment | 1 | 11,11 |
| Challenges in completing a writing task | Time limit on a particular task | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Going off-topic | 2 | 22,22 |
| Awareness of task requirements | Awareness of genre conventions | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Awareness of the target audience | 7 | 77,78 |
| | Awareness of English discourse and organisational rules | 7 | 77,78 |
| Features of a good writing | A profound content | 8 | 88,88 |
| | Accurate use of mechanical aspects | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Organisation | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Lexical diversity | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Grammatical diversity | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Originality | 2 | 22,22 |

***4.2.1.3. Results of the analysis of the data on strategy knowledge.*** A substantial body of research reveals that writers who are aware of the significant role of higher order processes and strategies (i.e. planning or revising) while writing have a head start over others (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Harris et al., 2010). When the responses the participants gave to the question, How do you usually go about completing a writing task?, were examined, significant differences were recognised among three groups of writers in their awareness of metacognitive strategies.

The content analysis of qualitative data revealed that regardless of their expertise in English writing, the participants' awareness of strategy variables included *objectives of writing goals, planning ahead of writing, monitoring while writing, revising and checking for mistakes, editing, and criteria for self-evaluation.* Tables 22, 23, and 24 display the codes identified under each theme regarding HP, AP and LP writers' strategy knowledge, respectively.

*4.2.1.3.1. Objectives of writing goals.* The goals that the writers in each group set were diverse, and they varied based on their prior writing experiences in, expectations for and drawbacks to EFL writing. Tables 22, 23, and 24 show the categorisation of these goals in relation to their objectives. Among all, 'organisation and genre-related goals', 'content-related goals' and 'goals related to learning, transfer and performance' were the goal objects that students in three groups noted commonly.

First of all, 'organisation and genre-related goals' was a recurrent code emerged in the HP (45.45%), AP (33.33%) and LP (55.56%) groups' interview data. While some of these students defined their goals in general terms such as writing according to the organisational rules and genre conventions (APS-26, HPS-53, HPS-68, HPS-79, HPS-80)*,* others were quite specific about their goals such as starting the essay with a hook (APS-51, LPS-52, LPS-54, LPS-66, HPS-68, LPS-71, HPS-80, HPS-114), detailing the writing topic in the introductory paragraph (APS-7) or writing a good thesis statement (LPS-58).

Another common goal object that participants in the HP (36.36%), AP (46.67%) and LP (55.56%) groups addressed to was 'content-related goals'. Paying special attention to the coherence and relevance to the writing topic, an HP writer said, "I try to give the same idea in my entire essay. I want to make sure that the examples I give are relevant. My major purpose while writing is to provide the reader with a coherent text" (HPS-79). Some other goals that participants cited regarding this code were using discourse markers appropriately (HPS-24, HPS-53), writing briefly / simply (APS-12, HPS-49, APS-60), and providing the audience with rich content / good examples (LPS-4, APS-5, APS-11, HPS-49, LPS- 52, LPS- 66, LPS- 71).

In regard to the code 'goals related to learning, transfer and performance', participants expressed several goals such as applying what was learnt in class into writing tasks (HPS-24, APS-26, HPS-80, HPS-86, LPS-87, APS-112), performing better at each task (LPS-28), writing like a real author (LPS-4, HPS- 13, LPS-98) and meeting the requirements of tasks  or expectations of their teachers (APS-7, HPS-30, HPS- 80, HPS-86, APS-112) .  To exemplify, one student in HP group noted that it was important to him to score high in writing tasks and satisfy his teachers' expectations, but his primary goals were reflecting on what he had learned during lectures and applying them to his writings (HPS- 86).

Next, 'language-related goals' was a significant goal object that emerged only in the AP and LP groups' data (26.67% and 55.56%, respectively). Writing accurately (APS-5, APS-11, LPS-28, LPS-58, LPS-87, and LPS-98), forming complex and compound sentences (APS-11, APS-112) and using a variety of structures and vocabulary (APS-11, LPG-54, LPG-58, and APS-60) were some examples found for 'language-related goals'. When asked about the details of his writing process, an LP writer also reported, "I want my message to reach the audience in the best way, and I know that it is only possible if I can use grammar correctly and vocabulary effectively. Thus, I always aim to develop my grammatical and lexical knowledge" (LPS-58).

Although not very frequent as abovementioned goal objects, in the HP and AP groups, goals related to the composing process (i.e. writing fast/ slowly/ cautiously) and in the LP group, goals related to the affective states (i.e. managing writing anxiety/stress) were also noted.

*4.2.1.3.2. Planning ahead of writing.* A close examination of planning behaviours of the participants revealed that very few students in all three groups allocated enough time for planning and went through the trouble to make a detailed plan ahead of writing. One student in the AP group declared self-assuredly:

I never outline because it seems a waste of time to me. I tried it once because my teacher asked for it, but it didn't work as I didn't know how to make it. When I read the writing topics, I come up with a couple of ideas. Then I start writing immediately. (APS-26)

Another student in the LP group explained why he did not engage in any planning as follows:

Writing in English is similar to driving in the dark. As I write, I see what I can do. During writing, I may come up with a very original idea. Then I revise what I've written, erase some parts and rewrite again. That's why I decide on my goals and even the content after I start writing. (LPS-54)

Only two students in the AP group mentioned allocating time to make a detailed outline before they started writing. One of these students mentioned, "I started outlining in the B1 module. I write my main points down in English or Turkish before I start writing. I also note down the supportive ideas as much as I can" (APS-57.)

Brainstorming was a recurrent planning strategy noted by a considerable number of students in all groups. Seven students in the HP group (63.64%), six students in the AP group (40%) and six students in LP group (66.67%) stated that they brainstormed for ideas in the pre-writing phase. These students engaged in brainstorming for two major reasons: to choose the ideal writing topic and to produce ideas on the topic they chose. Regarding this issue, one student

in the HP group mentioned, "Before I decide on the writing topic, I consider on which topic I can produce more ideas. I brainstorm for three main points and some details to support them" (APS-24). Another student added, "I focus on the writing topic first. I think about what I know about it and try to recall everything in my memory" (LPS-58). Other participants, on the other hand, seemed to choose the most attractive or familiar topic without thinking critically or in depth on it. On how he chose the writing topic, an AP student said, *"Actually I don't think over it much. I choose the topic that attracts my attention most"* (APS-26).

Apart from 'brainstorming for ideas', 'mental planning', 'taking sporadic notes' and 'relying on the mother tongue to generate ideas' stood out as common planning behaviours in three groups. For 90.91% of HP writers, 80% of AP writers and 55.56% of LP writers, planning was limited to taking sporadic notes. In their notes, students mostly wrote down three main points for their body paragraphs, the examples they found to support them or some useful English vocabulary they could use in their texts. A student in the HP group summarised his planning phase as follows:

> I scribble on a piece of paper before writing because it is difficult to me to start writing. I write down my main points and some keywords reminding me what I want to write about them. I may also write down the words that are associated with the topic. (HPS-74)

Although not as frequent as brainstorming and taking sporadic notes, 'mental planning' was a strategy that some students in all groups referred to. A student in the AP group noted that she never had a written plan. She planned what she was going to write in her mind (APS-113).

Surprisingly, relying on Turkish to generate ideas was found as a planning strategy mostly preferred by HP (63.64%) and AP (73.33) writers. While some of these writers came up with ideas in Turkish and translated them to English, others came up with ideas in English but fell back upon Turkish if they deem necessary. The number of writers depended on their mother

tongue to plan their work in the LP group, on the other hand, was only 2 with a percentage of 22.22. Considering translation useful in the planning stage, an HP student cited, "I think in Turkish especially while I am looking for ideas because I can be more creative when I think in my mother tongue" (HPS-80).

These findings revealed that while planning their work, a significant number of participants focused their attention on idea generation than essay organisation. Only two students in the HP group (18.18%) mentioned "categorising ideas to organise them logically", and two students in the AP group (13.33%) mentioned "planning how to organise the essay according to the genre".

*4.2.1.3.3. Monitoring while writing.* Under the theme of *monitoring while writing*, five codes were common in all groups: 'acting upon initial planning', 'developing initial planning while writing', 'replanning', 'rereading the text at intervals', and 'skimming the text at intervals to check cohesion and coherence'. However, their frequencies of occurrence varied slightly among groups (see Tables 22, 23, and 24).

To begin with, in the HP group, 54.55% of the students mentioned developing their initial planning while writing. The number of students mentioned acting upon their initial planning, on the other hand, was only two (18.18%). Similarly, in the AP group, the number of students who developed their initial planning while writing (n=6, 40%) was more than the ones who acted upon their initial planning (n=3, 20%). Only one student in the LP group addressed to each of these codes.

Secondly, 63.64% of HP writers, 26.67% of AP writers and 77.77% of LP writers engaged in replanning in their monitoring phase. When compared to their HP and LP counterparts, fewer students in the AP group tended to replan their tasks. The content analysis of interview data also revealed that high achievers fell back upon replanning either when they came

up with better ideas (36.36%) or when they felt stuck (27.27%). One of them said that she generally depended on her initial planning, but she went back and brainstormed to produce ideas when she got stuck (HPS-30). Poor writers, on the other hand, were inclined to replan their task when being stuck (66.67%) other than coming with better or new ideas (n=1, 11.11%). Addressing to the times he was stuck, a student in the LP group mentioned pausing for a while and brainstorming again to find new ideas (LPS-58).

'Rereading the text at intervals' was another common behaviour among HP (63.64%), AP (60%), and LP (44.44%) writers. About this issue, an HP writer noted, "After I write two or three sentences, I pause to read them because my sentences need to be compatible with each other. Also, if I write it all out at a sitting, it's unlikely to fix the mistakes I have made" (HPS-30). For most students, this was a strategy they regularly repeated while composing. For a couple of others, it was a strategy they applied only when they were stuck (APS-11, HPS-49, APS-51, HPS-79, LPS-98).

Finally, in the HP, AP and LP groups, some students mentioned 'skimming their texts at intervals to check cohesion and coherence' (45.45%, 20%, 22.22% respectively), but it was a behaviour pertaining more to high achievers. Addressing this issue during interview discussions, an HP student stated, "I go back in two or three sentences and skim what I wrote. I check the coherence. If I think I'm going off topic, I make some changes in my sentences" (HPS-74).

Two strategies which emerged in the HP and AP groups' data, but did not in the LP group's data were 'writing nonstop and going back when coming up with an idea' (36.36% and 33.33%, respectively) and 'using remedial strategies' (45.45%, 26.67%, respectively). A student in the AP group expressed, "If I can't find any ideas or can't remember a word, I don't stop and wait. I continue writing with what I have at hand. While writing, I usually come up with what I am looking for" (APS-11). Referring to one of his past writing experiences, another student in the

same group said, "Once I noticed that I was off topic. I didn't have enough time to change my topic sentences. Instead, I changed my thesis statement and solved the problem smoothly" (APS-50).

  *4.2.1.3.4. Revising.* Considering the theme *revising*, three codes prevailed in the HP, AP, and LP groups' interview data: 'rereading the entire text at the end for revision', 'checking for mistakes at intervals' and 'checking the entire text for mistakes at the end'. 72,73% of HP writers, 46,67% of AP writers and 44,44% of LP writers mentioned rereading their entire writings to check the organisation, unity and coherence, content or accuracy of their texts. A student in the HP group cited:

> I don't give pauses to read what I have written before I complete the entire essay. If I have some time, I read it once at the end. However, my revision here is for correcting my grammatical errors rather than improving my content. (HPS-80)

Another common revising strategy that participants in the HP, AP and LP groups appealed to was 'checking for mistakes at intervals (45.45%, 40%, and 44.44% respectively). On this issue, an AP writer noted, "I usually read each paragraph after I complete it. If I have mistakes to correct, I put a tick next to them. When I'm all done, I go back and correct the sentences I ticked" (APS-112*).*

  'Checking the entire text for mistakes at the end' was a more common monitoring behaviour in the HP and AP groups (45.45% and 66.67%, respectively). The number of students who applied this strategy in the LP group was only two (22.22%). Apart from the strategies given above, 'rereading only the problematic sentences or paragraphs for revision' (HPS-114, APS-50) and 'giving oneself time between writing and final revision' (APS-104) were the two strategies that a couple of students in the HP and LP groups employed.

*4.2.1.3.5. Editing.* As Tables 22, 23, and 24 show, the greatest difference among the three groups of writers was in their editing strategies. Most students in the LP group failed to devote some time and energy to editing. Even the ones who mentioned engaging in some editing either focused on their grammar (n=2, 22.22%), capitalisation, spelling and punctuation (n=2, 22.22%), and vocabulary mistakes (n=1, 11.11%) or made some additions to write longer texts (n=1, 11.11%). Emphasising the role of the writing environment on his editing behaviours, an LP writer mentioned:

> After I complete my writing task, I edit it. I usually correct my grammar errors. If I am at home, I can make some amendments to improve the content because I have a lot of time. However, at school, I can't do it. I correct the superficial mistakes that I notice. (LPS-4)

When the editing behaviours of AP and HP writers were considered, 80% of students in the AP group and 54.55% of students in the HP group seemed to spend most of their time for correcting their grammar mistakes, as well. One of these students expressed, "Before I submit my tasks, I check my entire essay. The changes and corrections I make are mostly on my grammatical mistakes. I never change the content" (APS-51).

However, unlike poor writers, some in the HP and AP groups mentioned making content related changes or corrections (45.45% and 20%, respectively). One HP writer noted:

> When I go back to revise my text, I would rather improve my content than correct my grammar errors. Of course, I correct the obvious grammar mistakes I've done if I can notice. However, I care more about my content, so I make sure that all my ideas are relevant. (HPS-79)

*4.2.1.3.6. Criteria for self-evaluation.* Participants' responses to the question, how would you decide if your writing is effective or not?, deepen our understanding of the criteria by which they evaluate their writing performance. Findings of the present study also revealed that the goals that the participants set were determinative of the criteria they used to evaluate their task achievement. While evaluating the effectiveness of their tasks, participants in all groups focused on five major points: 'language use', 'pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions', 'pertinence to assessment rubrics', 'transfer of existing knowledge to the task' and 'content'.

The most cited criteria for evaluation in the HP group were 'language use' (54.55%), 'pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions' (45,45%), 'content' (54,55%) and 'comparison' (45.45%). Concerning their language use, these students addressed to the effective use of English to express ideas (HPS-13, HPS-30, HPS-80, HPS-114) in general and making a few or no grammar mistakes (HPS-79) and using fancy words in specific (HPS-53). Considering 'pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions', one HP student stated:

> To evaluate my task, I look at to what extent I have used transitional signals or conjunctions. I look at the coherence and cohesion in my text. I check whether I have gone from general to specific in my introductory paragraph, whether I have used a variety of vocabulary in my body paragraphs or whether I have given a good summary of my ideas in the concluding paragraph (HPS-53).

Under the code 'content', HP writers generally talked about issues such as writing simply (HPS-114), appropriate use of discourse markers (HPS-24, HPS-53), relevancy to the writing topic (HPS-53, HPS-79, HPS-86), being rich in ideas (HPS-79, HPS-86), and originality (HPS-13). Finally, to evaluate their tasks, some HP writers compared them with their prior performances (HPS-74), with their classmates' tasks (HPS-24, HPS-53, HPS-79, and HPS-86) and with the model texts they studied (HPS-74).

While evaluating their task performances, AP writers depended mostly on 'language use' (60%), 'content' (40%) and 'comparison' (33.33%). Differently from HP writers, some students in this group underlined the variety of vocabulary and grammar structures (APS-7, APS-11, APS-51, APS-112, APS-115) as a criterion related to language use. Regarding his self-evaluation process, an AP writer expressed that if he could communicate his thoughts with grammatically correct sentences and a variety of vocabulary, he felt satisfied with his writing performance (LPS-26). AP writers' definitions for a good 'content' was very similar to the HP writers' and involved writing simply (APS-60), appropriate use of discourse markers (APS-12), relevancy to the writing topic (APS-7, APS-11), and being rich in ideas (APS-26, HPS-51). Some students in this group also used 'comparison' as a self-evaluation strategy and compared their task performances either with their previous tasks (APS-12, APS-82) or with their classmates' tasks (APS-11, APS-57, APS-112).

Concerning self-evaluation, in the LP groups' interview data, 'language use' (55.56%), and 'content' (66.67%) stood out as significant foci. Under the code 'language use', LP writers stressed similar aspects such as making a few or no grammar mistakes (LPS-54, LPS-58, LPS-87), effective use of English to express ideas (LPS-2), and using a variety of vocabulary and structures (LPS-54, LPS-58, LPS-98). However, more students here noted 'pertinence to assessment rubrics' (33.33%) and 'transfer of existing knowledge to the task' (33.33%)' as criteria for self-evaluation. One student in this group noted, "Since I am aware of the rubric that my teacher uses to evaluate my texts, I can guess my score more or less" (LPS-4). Another LP writer said that to evaluate her writings, she looked at how much she used what she had learned in class or how successfully she used the patterns she had seen in model texts (LPS-87).

Table 22

*Themes and codes under the category of strategy knowledge for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| Objectives of writing goals | Organisation and genre-related goals | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Goals related to composing processes | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Content-related goals | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Goals related to learning, transfer and performance | 5 | 45,45 |
| Planning ahead of writing | Brainstorming for ideas | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Mental planning | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Taking sporadic notes | 10 | 90,91 |
| | Relying on the mother tongue to generate ideas | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Categorising ideas | 2 | 18,18 |
| Monitoring while writing | Acting upon initial planning | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Developing initial planning while writing | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Replanning | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Rereading the text at intervals | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Skimming the text at intervals to check cohesion and coherence | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Writing nonstop and going back when coming up with an idea | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Using remedial strategies | 5 | 45,45 |
| Revising | Rereading the entire text at the end for revision | 8 | 72,73 |
| | Checking for mistakes at intervals | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Checking the entire text for mistakes at the end | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Rereading only the problematic sentences or paragraphs for revision | 1 | 9,09 |
| Editing | Editing for grammar mistakes | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Editing for capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Editing for  vocabulary mistakes | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Making content-related changes or corrections | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Lengthening the essay | 1 | 9,09 |
| Criteria for self-evaluation | Language use | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Pertinence to assessment rubrics | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Transfer of existing knowledge to the task | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Content | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Comparison | 5 | 45,45 |

Table 23

*Themes and codes under the category of strategy knowledge for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Objectives of writing goals | Language-related goals | 4 | 26.67 |
| | Organisation and genre-related goals | 5 | 33.33 |
| | Goals related to composing process | 2 | 13.33 |
| | Content-related goals | 7 | 46.67 |
| | Goals related to learning, transfer and performance | 3 | 20 |
| Planning ahead of writing | Brainstorming for ideas | 6 | 40 |
| | Mental planning | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Taking sporadic notes | 12 | 80 |
| | Relying on the mother tongue to generate ideas | 11 | 73.33 |
| | Making a detailed outline | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Planning the organisation according to the genre | 2 | 13,33 |
| Monitoring while writing | Acting upon initial planning | 3 | 20 |
| | Developing initial planning while writing | 6 | 40 |
| | Replanning | 4 | 26.67 |
| | Rereading the text at intervals | 9 | 60 |
| | Skimming the text at intervals to check cohesion and coherence | 3 | 20 |
| | Writing nonstop and going back when coming up with an idea | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Using remedial strategies | 4 | 26,67 |
| Revising | 1. Rereading the entire text at the end for revision | 7 | 46,67 |
| | 2. Checking for mistakes at intervals | 6 | 40 |
| | 3. Checking the entire text for mistakes at the end | 10 | 66.67 |
| | 4. Rereading only the problematic sentences or paragraphs for revision | 1 | 6,67 |
| | 5. Giving oneself time between writing and final revision | 1 | 6,67 |
| Editing | Editing for grammar mistakes | 12 | 80 |
| | Editing for capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Editing for vocabulary mistakes | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Making content-related changes or corrections | 3 | 20 |
| | Lengthening the essay | 2 | 13,33 |
| Criteria for self-evaluation | Language use | 9 | 60 |
| | Pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Pertinence to assessment rubrics | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Transfer of existing knowledge to the task | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Content | 6 | 40 |
| | Comparison | 5 | 33.33 |

Table 24

*Themes and codes under the category of strategy knowledge for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| Objectives of writing goals | Language-related goals | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Organisation and genre-related goals | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Content-related goals | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Goals related to learning, transfer and performance | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Goals related to affective states | 2 | 22,22 |
| Planning ahead of writing | Brainstorming for ideas | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Mental planning | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Taking sporadic notes | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Relying on the mother tongue to generate ideas | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Making a rough outline | 2 | 22,22 |
| Monitoring while writing | Acting upon initial planning | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Developing initial planning while writing | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Replanning | 7 | 77,77 |
| | Rereading the text at intervals | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Skimming the text at intervals to check cohesion and coherence | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Rereading the writing topic when feeling stuck | 2 | 22,22 |
| Revising | Rereading the entire text at the end for revision | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Checking for mistakes at intervals | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Checking the entire task for mistakes et the end | 2 | 22,22 |
| Editing | Editing for grammar mistakes | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Editing for capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Editing for vocabulary mistakes | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Lengthening the essay | 1 | 11,11 |
| Criteria for self-evaluation | Language use | 5 | 55,56 |
| | Pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Pertinence to assessment rubrics | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Transfer of existing knowledge to the task | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Content | 6 | 66,67 |

**4.2.2. Research question VI.** RQ 6: What do Turkish EFL learners think about the metacognitive strategies they used in a given writing task?

Having a strategic behaviour is crucial for learning in academic life, but it has been proved to be especially useful in writing achievement (Harris et al., 2010). In the second section of the interview sessions, participants responded to a variety of questions about their use of self-regulatory writing strategies including planning, monitoring, and evaluating in their argumentative tasks. Table 25 illustrates the themes created under the core category of Metacognitive Strategies of Writing for HP, AP and LP writers.

Based on the codes identified by the content analysis of the interview data, 3 themes under the category of planning (*defining goals for the argumentative task*, *planning ahead of the argumentative writing* and *planning while writing the argumentative task*) , 2 themes under the category of monitoring (*revising the argumentative task* and *editing the argumentative task*) and 3 themes under the category of evaluating (*students' evaluation of their argumentative task performance*, *attribution for success* and a*ttribution for failure*) were found to be shared in the HP and AP groups.

The themes derived from the LP group's data were the same as the ones derived from the HP and AP groups' data considering monitoring and evaluating strategies. However, differently from the other two groups, in the LP group, only one theme under the category of planning, *planning ahead of argumentative writing* emerged. Contrary to their HP and AP counterparts, poor writers had not set any goals for their argumentative tasks before they started writing, and they did not engage in any planning during writing.

Table 25

*Themes for the core category of metacognitive strategies of writing*

| Categories | Themes for HP writers (n=11) | Themes for AP writers (n=15) | Themes for LP writers (n=9) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Planning | ▪ Defining goals for the argumentative task<br>▪ Planning ahead of the argumentative writing<br>▪ Planning while writing the argumentative task | ▪ Defining goals for the argumentative task<br>▪ Planning ahead of the argumentative writing<br>▪ Planning while writing the argumentative task | -<br>▪ Planning ahead of the argumentative writing<br><br>- |
| Monitoring | ▪ Revising the argumentative task<br>▪ Editing the argumentative task | ▪ Revising the argumentative task<br>▪ Editing the argumentative task | ▪ Revising the argumentative task<br>▪ Editing the argumentative task |
| Evaluating | ▪ Students' evaluation of their argumentative task performance<br>▪ Attribution for success<br>▪ Attribution for failure | ▪ Students' evaluation their argumentative writing performance<br>▪ Attribution for success<br>▪ Attribution for failure | ▪ Students' evaluation their argumentative writing performance<br>▪ Attribution for success<br>▪ Attribution for failure |

**4.2.2.1. Results of the analysis of the data on planning strategy.** Concerning writing, planning consists of the decision of task objectives, selection of appropriate means and strategies, allocation of resources, enough amount of time and effort and activation of previous knowledge (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Schraw, 1998; Schraw & Moshman, 1995). The codes generated under the category of planning for the HP, AP and LP groups are displayed in Tables 26, 27, and 28, respectively with their frequencies of occurance.

*4.2.2.1.1. Defining goals for the argumentative task.* During interview discussions, HP and AP writers mentioned having set several individual goals for their argumentative tasks before they started writing. 'Defending arguments and rebutting opponents' arguments all through the essay' and 'giving counter-arguments in the introductory paragraph' were the common goals uttered by writers in both groups. To give an example, an HP writer stated, "According to our teacher, we should touch upon the opposite views while writing an argumentative essay. That is why I paid special attention to it while planning my essay" (HPS-

24). As clearly seen in Table 28, LP writers, on the other hand, were more likely to rush into composing as soon as they were assigned with the task without a goal in mind.

    *4.2.2.1.2. Planning ahead of the argumentative writing.* As previously mentioned, none of the LP writers set any clear goals for their argumentative tasks, and very few of them engaged in strategic planning ahead of writing. While telling about her argumentative writing process, LPS-66 said that she had not planned what to write beforehand. She had not thought about the writing topic, either. She had started writing directly and written down what she had remembered or recalled at that moment. Although three out of nine students (33.33%) in this group mentioned having made a plan in their mind, as LPS-28 noted they could not act within their plans. For the others in the same group, planning consisted of merely 'finding three main points for the body paragraphs' (n=2; 22.22%) and 'listing ideas and examples in small notes' (n=2, 22.22%). Only one student in this group (LPS-4) mentioned having outlined.

    In the AP group, 'finding three main points for the body paragraphs' was the most common planning behaviour among writers (53.33%). For instance, about her pre-writing phase, an AP student told that she had decided on her main points for body paragraphs, but had not engaged in any detailed planning. She had had to develop her supporting details and examples while writing (APS-57). 'Listing ideas and examples in small notes' (26.67%) and 'planning in mind only' (26.67%) were the second most applied strategies by the AP writers. On his pre-writing phase, APS-12 said:

    Because I was short on time, I could neither make an outline nor decide on my thesis

    statement before writing. I just took some notes in English. I couldn't remember some

    English words, so I wrote them in Turkish not to forget. Then I started writing.

    Unlike their HP and LP counterparts, two AP writers also mentioned having predetermined their examples before writing. One said:

I decided on the topic sentences of my body paragraphs and the examples I would give to support them before I started. I wrote them on the exam paper. As it is useful to present statistical data to persuade the reader in this genre, I made up some data. I had found them before writing, but I decided where to use them while writing. (APS S104)

Finally, just like AP writers, high performers tended to find three main points for their body paragraphs (45.45%) and list ideas and examples in small notes (54.55%) in their pre-writing phase. One student in this group mentioned that she had brainstormed for five minutes or even less to generate ideas. She found three main points for her body paragraphs and noted them down (HPS-13). Furthermore, as Tables 26 and 27 show, predetermining arguments and counter-arguments was a common trait between HP and AP writers. For example, HPS-49 mentioned that she had decided on her arguments and counter-arguments before she started writing. However, to choose the most appropriate writing topic, more students in the HP group (45.45%) mentioned having brainstormed for ideas for each writing topic given. HPS-49 noted, "Two different subjects were given. First, I brainstormed about both. I thought about what I could write and whether I had enough knowledge about each topic. Then I chose one".

*4.2.2.1.3. Planning while writing the argumentative task.* No clues were found in the LP groups' data with the theme *planning while writing the argumentative task*. On the other hand, a couple of students in the AP group preferred either planning their work after they wrote their introductory paragraphs (13.33%) or replanning when needed (13.33%). Regarding planning while writing, two students in the HP group (18.18%) mentioned having given a pause to plan each paragraph before writing it, and one student (9.09%) mentioned having taken simple notes while writing.

Table 26

*Themes and codes under the category of planning for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defining goals for the argumentative task | Defending own arguments and rebutting opponents' arguments all through the essay | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Giving counter-arguments in the introductory paragraph | 1 | 9,09 |
| Planning ahead of argumentative writing | Planning in mind only | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Finding three main points for the body paragraphs | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Listing ideas and examples in small notes | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Brainstorming for ideas for the each writing topic given to choose the most appropriate one | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Thinking about own position in the argument | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Thinking about how to rebut the opposite view | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Self questioning to choose the most appropriate writing topic | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Noting down the signal words to be used in the argumentative essay | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Coming up with ideas in English | 1 | 9,09 |
| Planning while writing the argumentative task | Giving a pause to plan each paragraph before writing it | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Taking simple notes while writing | 1 | 9,09 |

Table 27

*Themes and codes under the category of planning for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defining goals for the argumentative task | Defending own arguments and rebutting opponents' arguments all through the essay | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Giving counter-arguments in the introductory paragraph | 2 | 13,33 |
| Planning ahead of argumentative writing | Planning in mind only | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Finding three main points for the body paragraphs | 8 | 53,33 |
| | Listing ideas and examples in small notes | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Making an outline | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Brainstorming for ideas for the each writing topic to choose the most appropriate one | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Thinking about own position in the argument | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Thinking about how to rebut the opposite view | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Finding examples | 2 | 13,33 |
| Planning while writing the argumentative task | Planning after writing the introductory paragraph | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Replanning when necessary | 2 | 13,33 |

Table 28

*Themes and codes under the category of planning for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Planning ahead of argumentative writing | Planning in mind only | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Finding three main points for the body paragraphs | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Listing ideas and examples in small notes | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Making an outline | 1 | 11,11 |

*4.2.2.2. Results of the analysis of the data on monitoring strategy.* Monitoring relates to writers' on-line self-observation of their performance. Checking the progress of a specific task or accomplishment of overall development plans is considered to have considerable importance in effective writing as it promotes the implementation of appropriate measures to handle the difficulties that impede the writing process. Under the category of monitoring, 'revising the argumentative task' and 'editing the argumentative task' emerged as recurrent themes in all three groups' data (see Tables 29, 30, and 31).

*4.2.2.2.1. Revising the argumentative task.* The content analysis of interview discussions with HP writers provided insight into when they revised their texts (revising during or after writing) besides the scope (revising the entire text or specific parts) and objectives (revising for content, language use or organisation) of their revisions. Table 29 shows that a considerable number of students (81.82%) in this group revised their argumentative essays after they had completed them. One of these writers said, "I checked my essay out. I could read it once at the end" (HPS-86). Also, seven out of eleven HP writers (63.64%) revised their entire essays while four of them (36.36%) preferred revising certain parts in their texts such as rereading only topic sentences, introductory or concluding paragraphs (HPS-24, HPS-80, HPS-114). What HP writers prioritised during revision was the other significant point that the content analysis revealed. More than half of the HP writers (54.55%) mentioned having focused on content in their revisions. The number of students who had revised their language use was four (36.36%). For example, about the revision of his argumentative essay, HPS- 86 told, "I made sure that the main points I gave were relevant. I checked my grammar, and I paid special attention to my use of punctuation because I always have trouble there". Only one student in this group mentioned having revised his argumentative writing, considering organisation and genre (HPS-114).

As Table 30 illustrates, there was little evidence of effective use of monitoring strategies in AP writers' data. One student in this group mentioned that she had started writing directly without any plans in her mind, and she had been unable to complete her argumentative essay. She was so disappointed that she had not felt it necessary to revise her work or make any changes (APS-32). Most of the AP writers who engaged in revision told having revised their argumentative essays after completing it (46.67%), and they mostly revised their entire texts (33.33%). Besides, their revisions were generally for their language use, so much the more their grammar use. APS-57 described her revising stage as follows:

> I read it one last time before I submitted my task. I focused on my language use. I noticed some grammar errors I had made. I realised that I had written some words in Turkish and had forgotten to go back to write the English words for them. I fixed them.

Three students (20%) in this group mentioned revising their text for content, and one of them uttered, "I skimmed my completed text. I checked the relevancy of my thesis statement to the writing topic" (APS-104).

Findings of the content analysis for LP writers revealed that they lacked the self-regulatory strategies necessary to monitor their work. In response to the question about how she revised her argumentative essay, LPS-52 stated, "I did not do anything to revise or edit my text. I don't like reading what I have written. I never read my entire text at the end. I didn't do that in my argumentative essay, either". Although some LP writers mentioned having revised their text during writing (22.22%) or after having completed their argumentative essays (66.67%), they did not give any details about the scope of their revisions. Moreover, they revised their text in an attempt either to improve their content (22.22%) or to detect their grammatical errors (44.44%).

*4.2.2.2.2. Editing the argumentative task.* Interview discussions revealed that no matter which group they were in, most of the participants failed to devote special attention to editing their argumentative tasks.  A student in the HP group expressed that she had not gone back to check on it because she had had to write fast. After writing, she had just 40 seconds or maybe a minute to revise her work, so she could not edit anything, but just added a sentence to her second body paragraph (HPS-68). Another student in the same group, added, "I didn't make corrections after I completed my essay because I was afraid to make it worse. I have a feeling like the more I work on my text, the more I fail" (HPS-80).

The writers who edited their argumentative essays in the HP, AP, and LP groups were mostly inclined to fix their grammatical errors (27.27%, 33.33%, and 44.44%, respectively). To give an example, an LP student stated, "After I completed my argumentative essay, I read it. I corrected a few grammatical mistakes I noticed" (LPS-58). Even, it would not be wrong to say that, for most LP writers, editing meant correcting grammar errors.

Differently from LP writers, in the HP and AP groups, two students in each group mentioned having fixed their vocabulary mistakes or having replaced some words with their synonyms. One of these students said, "I noticed that I had overused some words, so I replaced them with their synonyms" (APS-7). Among all the participants who attended the interview sessions, only one student in the HP group mentioned having fixed the capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes in his argumentative text (HPS-86).

Table 29

*Themes and codes under the category of monitoring for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|--------|-------|---|---|
| Revising the argumentative task | Revising during writing | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Revising after completing the task | 9 | 81,82 |
| | Revising the entire text | 7 | 63,64 |
| | Revising certain parts in the text | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Revising for content | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Revising for language use | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Revising for organisation | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Fixing grammar mistakes | 3 | 27,27 |
| Editing the argumentative task | Fixing vocabulary mistakes and replacing words | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Fixing  capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes | 1 | 9,09 |

Table 30

*Themes and codes under the category of monitoring for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|--------|-------|---|---|
| Revising the argumentative task | Revising during writing | 3 | 20 |
| | Revising after completing the task | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Revising the entire text | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Revising certain parts in the text | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Revising for content | 3 | 20 |
| | Revising for language use | 6 | 40 |
| Editing the argumentative task | Fixing grammar mistakes | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Fixing vocabulary mistakes and replacing words | 2 | 13,33 |

Table 31

*Themes and codes under the category of monitoring for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|--------|-------|---|---|
| Revising the argumentative task | Revising during writing | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Revising after completing the task | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Revising for content | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Revising for language use | 4 | 44,44 |
| Editing the argumentative task | Fixing grammar mistakes | 4 | 44,44 |

*4.2.2.3. Results of the analysis of the data on evaluating strategy.* Evaluating is

necessary for efficacy in EFL writing. In this phase, students are expected to judge the success of

their writing and determine the acceptability of it. In the light of their evaluation, they can check

whether they have given the right amount of information for their audience, made their writing

unified and coherent, and used correct strategies. They can assess the appropriateness of their

goals and the effectiveness of their overall plans and writing strategies. Therefore, it was important to know whether the participants of the present study were aware of the significant role of evaluating and to what extent they could apply it. Under the category of evaluating, s*tudents' evaluation of their argumentative task performance, attribution for success*, and *attribution for failure* emerged as the common recurring themes for the three groups of writers. The codes generated under these themes for HP, AP and LP writers are displayed in Tables 32, 33, and 34, respectively.

   *4.2.2.3.1. Students' evaluation of their argumentative task performance.* The findings of the content analysis revealed that participants' evaluation of their argumentative tasks were more or less compatible with the scores they got. In response to the questions 'How did you evaluate your essay? Are you happy with your writing?, five students (45.45%) in the HP group mentioned feeling satisfied with the performance they put in their argumentative tasks. One of these students expressed her satisfaction with these words: "I was happy with my writing, and I wrote that fast for the first time. I was expecting a high score, and I got it" (HPS-79). While three HP writers (27.27%) expressed their dissatisfaction with their writings, the other three students (27.27%) found them neither good nor bad.

   The number of students who were pleased with their task performances in the AP group was only three (20%). Whereas four students (26.67%) in this group described their task performances as neither good nor bad, eight students (53.33%) found them inadequate. For instance, APS-50 said, "I'm not pleased with my argumentative task performance. I didn't like what I wrote. I could neither fully express my ideas nor refute the opponents' arguments" (APS-50).

   In the LP writers' group, while seven out of nine students (77.78%) described their performance inadequate, the rest (22.22%) found them neither good nor bad. No students in the

LP group were happy with their writings, and one of them said, "My performance was very poor. Paragraph lengths were problematic. I could not express my opinion and summarise my main points in the concluding paragraph. My sentences were too simple" (LPS-87).

     *4.2.2.3.2. Attribution for success.* Causal attributions refer to the individuals' perceptions regarding the causes of their success or failure in a particular task. According to the findings of qualitative data regarding the theme *attribution for success*, unlike LP writers, HP and AP writers reported a variety of factors promoting the efficacy of their writing. However, the frequency of each code was relatively low, which made it difficult herfor the researcher to make valid generalisations. Eight common codes were derived from the data collected from these two groups: 'coming up with good ideas and examples', 'following the organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays', 'finding strong arguments to rebut opposite ideas and to defend own position effectively', 'writing fluently', 'expressing ideas clearly', writing about an attractive topic', 'writing a good introductory paragraph', and 'writing a good concluding paragraph' (for the full lists of codes and their frequencies of occurrence, see Tables 32, 33, and 34). One student in the AP group explained her thoughts about her argumentative task as follows:

> It was a successful essay because the topic was very good. Issues about women rights attract my attention. That is why I could defend my point very well. I had many ideas, and I had very strong reasons to defend my argument. I supported my ideas very well. I kept writing without any pauses. (APS-S51)

    Another student in HP group attributed his success to his writing speed and ability to produce ideas, and he stated, "It was interesting, but I wrote it very quickly. I didn't have trouble producing ideas and refuting the opponents' arguments" (HPS-S86).

Regarding *attribution for success,* in the LP group only one student (11.11%) mentioned having come up with good ideas and examples, and two students (22.22%) mentioned having followed organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays.

*4.2.2.3.3. Attribution for failure.* Interviewees, who responded to the question 'Are you happy with your writing?' with 'No', attributed their poor performances to lots of internal and external causal factors hindering efficacy in writing. To begin with poor writers, they were mostly dissatisfied with their argumentative tasks. The primary reasons they articulated for their failure in their argumentative writing were 'time limit' (44.44%), 'having to write about a difficult/unfamiliar topic' (44.44%), 'having failed in finding ideas, facts and examples' (77.78%), 'not knowing how to write an argumentative essay or lack of experience in writing it' (88.89%), and 'the difficulty of writing an argumentative essay' (66.67%). For example, LPS-4 described his argumentative writing as a complete failure because he could not come up with any ideas. He further stated that he did not think that he had comprehended how to write an argumentative essay. Similarly, another student in the same group made the following comments about his performance:

> The last argumentative essay I wrote was my worst writing experience. Argumentative is the most challenging genre that we have studied so far. I found it very difficult to produce ideas. I had great difficulty in writing my thesis statement. I wasted a lot of time. For example, while I wrote an opinion essay in half an hour, I couldn't complete this one in an hour. I didn't have any ideas about the topic, and I guess I didn't fully understand how to write an argumentative essay. (LPS-58)

The causes commonly reported for failure by HP and AP writers were also very similar to the ones reported by LP writers. Six students in the HP group (54.55%) and seven students in the

AP group (46.67%) complained about time pressure as the primary causal factor influencing their writing performance negatively. A student in the HP group described the situation thus:

> It was difficult to write an argumentative essay. I loved the writing topic a lot. I could have written three pages on this topic if I had had enough time or if I had written in Turkish, but I found it difficult to express myself on this topic in English. I couldn't find the right words. I had to change my sentences, and it cost me much time. I wrote very similar sentences and continuously used the same verbs. I felt like I was repeating myself. I think the major reasons for my failure were time and vocabulary. (HPS-24)

Another causal factor commonly reported by HP and AP writers was 'having failed in finding ideas, facts and examples' (36.36%; 40% respectively). A student in the HP group told that he had a hard time producing ideas. He continued, "To defend or rebut a controversial issue, you should have a complete idea about it. Normally, when I plan an essay, I take notes. Yesterday I couldn't find anything worth noting down" (HPS-80).

While 'having failed in rebutting opponents' arguments' (45.45%), 'overusing the same structures and vocabulary (36.36%) and 'making grammar mistakes' (54,55%) emerged as the major obstacles to the better performance of high achievers, AP writers, like their LP counterparts, attributed their poor performance partly to 'not knowing how to write an argumentative essay or lack of experience in writing it' (33.33%). An AP writer expressed the difficulty he had in the argumentative task as follows:

> I couldn't do any planning before I started writing because I didn't know how to write an argumentative essay. I wrote it, relying on some second-hand information I had got from my classmates. I took a side and criticised the opponents' ideas in the three body paragraphs. It was not very easy. Due to my lack of knowledge about how to write or organise an argumentative essay, I can't even explain the difficulty I had. (HPS-82)

Table 32

*Themes and codes under the category of evaluating for HP writers (n=11)*

| Themes | Codes | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students' evaluation of their argumentative task performance | Finding task performance inadequate | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Finding task performance neither good nor bad | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Being pleased with task performance | 5 | 45,45 |
| Attribution for success | Coming up with good ideas and examples | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Following the organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Finding strong arguments to rebut opposite ideas and to defend own position effectively | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Writing fluently | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Expressing ideas clearly | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing about an attractive topic | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing a good introductory paragraph | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing a good concluding paragraph | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Applying what have been learned into argumentative writing performance | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Using transition signals and conjunctions | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Time management | 1 | 9,09 |
| Attribution for failure | Time limit | 6 | 54,55 |
| | Having to write about a difficult/unfamiliar topic | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Having failed in finding ideas, facts and examples | 4 | 36,36 |
| | 4. Having failed in defending own arguments | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Having failed in rebutting opponents' arguments | 5 | 45,45 |
| | Overusing same structures and vocabulary | 4 | 36,36 |
| | Not knowing how to write an argumentative essay or lack of experience in writing it | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Using very simple vocabulary and structures | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Writing very short paragraphs | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Making grammar mistakes | 6 | 54,55 |
| | The difficulty of writing an argumentative essay | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Lack of vocabulary knowledge | 3 | 27,27 |
| | Having failed in writing the concluding paragraph | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Having failed in writing the body paragraphs | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Lack of English proficiency | 2 | 18,18 |
| | Being in a bad mood | 1 | 9,09 |
| | Having failed in using appropriate transition signals and conjunctions | 1 | 9,09 |

Table 33

*Themes and codes under the category of evaluating for AP writers (n=15)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students' evaluation of their argumentative writing performance | Finding task performance inadequate | 8 | 53,33 |
| | Finding task performance neither good nor bad | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Being pleased with task performance | 3 | 20 |
| Attribution for success | Coming up with good ideas and examples | 3 | 20 |
| | Following the organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Finding strong arguments to rebut opposite view and to defend own position effectively | 3 | 20 |
| | Writing fluently | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Expressing ideas clearly | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Writing about an attractive topic | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Writing a good introductory paragraph | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Writing a good concluding paragraph | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Using a variety of vocabulary | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Using grammar correctly | 2 | 13,33 |
| Attribution for failure | Time limit | 7 | 46,67 |
| | Having to write about a difficult/unfamiliar topic | 3 | 20 |
| | Having failed in finding ideas, facts and examples | 6 | 40 |
| | Having failed in defending own arguments | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Having failed in rebutting opponents' arguments | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Overusing same structures and vocabulary | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Not knowing how to write an argumentative essay or lack of experience in writing it | 5 | 33,33 |
| | Using very simple vocabulary and structures | 3 | 20 |
| | Writing very short paragraphs | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Making grammar mistakes | 3 | 20 |
| | The difficulty of writing an argumentative essay | 3 | 20 |
| | Lack of vocabulary knowledge | 4 | 26,67 |
| | Having failed in writing the introductory paragraph | 2 | 13,33 |
| | Having failed in writing the concluding paragraph | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Not planning the task ahead of writing | 1 | 6,67 |
| | Lack of English proficiency | 3 | 20 |
| | Having failed in following organisational rules and conventions of an argumentative essay | 1 | 6,67 |

Table 34

*Themes and codes under the category of evaluating for LP writers (n=9)*

| Themes | Codes | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students' evaluation of their argumentative writing performance | Finding task performance inadequate | 7 | 77,78 |
| | Finding task performance neither good nor bad | 2 | 22,22 |
| Attribution for success | Coming up with good ideas and examples | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Following the organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays | 2 | 22,22 |
| Attribution for failure | Time limit | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Having to write about a difficult/unfamiliar topic | 4 | 44,44 |
| | Having failed in finding ideas, facts and examples | 7 | 77,78 |
| | Having failed in defending own arguments | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Having failed in rebutting opponents' arguments | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Overusing same structures and vocabulary | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Not knowing how to write an argumentative essay or lack of experience in writing it | 8 | 88,89 |
| | Using very simple vocabulary and structures | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Writing very short paragraphs | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Making grammar mistakes | 1 | 11,11 |
| | The difficulty of writing an argumentative essay | 6 | 66,67 |
| | Lack of vocabulary knowledge | 3 | 33,33 |
| | Having failed in writing the introductory paragraph | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Having difficulty in writing the thesis statement | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Having failed in organising ideas in a logical order | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Being in a bad mood | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Suffering from test anxiety | 2 | 22,22 |
| | Deviating from writing topic | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Not knowing how to make an outline | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Non-proportional paragraph lengths | 1 | 11,11 |
| | Not planning the task ahead of writing | 1 | 11,11 |

# CHAPTER FIVE

## Discussion and Suggestions

This chapter is organised into five parts. The first four parts include an in-depth discussion and explanation of the results derived from both qualitative and quantitative data. Following the discussion, some recommendations for the implementation of metacognition into EFL writing are offered.

### 5. 1. Discussion of the Quantitative Results on Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing

In MKWS, participants of the study were asked to assess the extent of their metacognitive knowledge in three sections: person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge. Inspection of the means for MKWS subscales suggested an average level of person and strategy knowledge, but a high level of task knowledge of the participants. These findings corroborate dthe findings of Xiao (2016) from where the instruments for this study were adapted.

These findings also seem to justify the view that instruction on any component of metacognitive knowledge affects L2 learners' writing performance positively (Kasper, 1997). In their writing classes here, participants of the study were not exposed to any explicit instruction that would contribute to their self-knowledge as writers or their knowledge about appropriate writing strategies. However, they were instructed on conventions and organisational rules of English written discourse and taught about what they were supposed to do while writing in a particular genre. In the light of these findings, it can be argued that without being exposed to any instruction that will raise their knowledge about person and strategy variables, participants' writing practices and experiences as EFL writers could only give them an average level of awareness about themselves as writers and about the self-regulatory strategies available to them.

However, having been instructed on some aspects of task knowledge might have raised their awareness about the task variable.

As is predicted, an inspection of the mean scores of the three subscales for the HP, AP and LP groups individually confirmed slight differences among groups in regard to their metacognitive knowledge. In anology to the conclusions of Harris et al. (2010), HP writers were found to have a higher level of awareness in all three subscales. The correlation analysis, however, revealed a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievements and both person and strategy variables. There was no statistically significant relationship between their task knowledge and writing achievement.

Taken all together, these findings suggest that there is a positive relationship between EFL students' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge, but it is not very strong. These results do not support the findings of some studies suggesting a strong relationship between students' writing performance and metacognitive knowledge (with its three components) (Devine et al., 1993; Kasper, 1997; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). This might have stemmed from measuring participants' writing achievement based on only one task, their argumentative essays, within limited time. Previous research reveals that since writing skills may vary depending upon the genre, one form of writing may not be representative of how a writer performs on all forms of writing. Therefore, judging students' writing ability based on one writing sample in a single genre or form may have failed to reflect their actual writing performances, so to identify skilled and unskilled writers (Olinghouse & Wilson, 2012), which may have caused this to end up in false assumptions about the participants' writing proficiency, so about the strength of the relationship between metacognitive knowledge and writing achievement.

**5. 2.   Discussion of the Qualitative Results on Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing**

Themes derived from interview discussions for each component of metacognitive knowledge correspond to the descriptions of previous scholars and researchers for person, task and the strategy knowledge (Ruan, 2005; You & Joe, 2001). Findings of the revealed that interviewees' person knowledge includes their awareness about person-related factors affecting their writing performance positively or negatively, their self-efficacy beliefs and self-concepts, and their goals and endeavours to improve English writing skills. Their task knowledge consists of their awareness about task-related factors affecting their writing performance, challenges they face while writing, and the requirements and features of a well-written text.  Finally, their strategy knowledge involves their awareness about their goal objects, planning, monitoring, revising, and editing strategies and the criteria they set for self-evaluation.

**5. 2.1. Discussion of the results on person knowledge.** Previous studies reported inconclusive results about skilful and struggling writers about their person knowledge (Roca De Larios et al., 2002). Findings of Victori (1995) demonstrated that regardless of their expertise and skills in writing, L2 writers had similar writing motivation, experiences and self-concepts as writers. Contrarily, other studies revealed that skilful writers were more aware of themselves as writers, and took advantage of it while writing (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994). Unlike struggling writers who generally took a negative attitude towards composing in L2 and felt more anxious and frustrated, skilful writers could achieve personal satisfaction through writing (Brooks, 1985; Roca De Larios et al., 2002).

Findings of the content analysis of the present study supported the latter view revealing some differences among the participants in three groups concerning their person knowledge. As Tables 16, 17 and 18 show, the codes emerged in the HP and AP groups' data regarding person knowledge outnumbered the ones in the LP group's data. These findings also confirmed the

quantitative data findings that there was a reciprocal link between students' writing achievement and person knowledge.

First of all, writers in the LP group were more inclined to complain about their inability in English writing. Whereas their HP and AP counterparts commented on some personal factors affecting their writing performances both negatively and positively, they focused mainly on factors affecting their performance negatively during the interview sessions. As a result of this tendency, they were more pessimistic in their self-efficacy beliefs.

Secondly, differently from the other two groups, HP group writers underlined 'text-type familiarity' as an important factor affecting English writing performance positively. This proved that HP writers had more profound background knowledge about how to write in different genres, and so they succeeded in using it to a good account.

Another significant difference was noticed in participants' perceptions of their weaknesses and strengths in EFL writing. Whereas writers in the HP and AP groups talked over their weaknesses and strengths evenly, LP writers were inclined to refer mostly to their weaknesses while describing themselves as writers.

When asked about their strengths as EFL writers, 'generating ideas' in the HP and AP groups and 'grammatical competence' in the LP group stood out as common responses. Considering their weaknesses, 'limited repertoire of English vocabulary', 'lack of ideas', and 'mental translation' were the three major weaknesses expressed in all groups commonly. In the majority of cognitive models of writing, idea generation is considered as an essential aspect of writing (Hayes, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980; Kellogg, 1994). Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) and Flower and Hayes (1980; 1981) describe it as an explicit, effortful and recursive process that emerges in the planning phase and consists of writers' strategic and deliberate search for ideas. That is why idea generation is a difficult skill for many writers. However, because less skilled

writers generally direct their attention to lower-level processes (i.e. vocabulary retrieval, grammar, punctuation) at the expense of higher-level processes, it is especially difficult for them to produce ideas (Crossley, Muldner, & McNamara, 2016). The general opinion is that in skilled writers, these lower-level processes are automated; thus, they can dedicate working memory resources to the higher-level processes. Consistent with much previous evidence, idea generation was a significant weakness expressed in all groups in the present study, but it seemed that it mostly affected the writing process of poor writers.

In accordance with the studies of Ashwell (2000) and Chen (2002), students in all groups also suffered from lack of lexical knowledge in English writing regardless of their skilfulness. As in Maftoon, Birjandi, and Farahian's (2014) study, results of both MKWS and the content analysis revealed that participants in this study were preoccupied with vocabulary and overvalued its role in writing.

It was, however, unexpected that while HP and AP writers regarded themselves weak in grammar, poor writers highlighted 'grammatical competence' as their greatest strength with a relatively high frequency (n=6, 66.67%). When the scores that LP writers got for their grammar use in their argumentative essays were examined, it was clearly seen that they did not do any better than HP and AP writers. Although they were aware of their poor lexical knowledge and lack of ideas, they seemed to overrate their grammatical competence. This may be explained by their misconception that putting some English words together was sufficient to form understandable or grammatically acceptable sentences. This was most probably because they were not aware that English and Turkish had different characteristics in respects of structure. They wrote something in Turkish and then translated into English, but the sentence structures reflected those of their native language, and they failed to realise it.

Apart from 'lack of ideas' and 'limited repertoire of English vocabulary', a considerable number of students, especially in the AP group, complained about mental translation as a barrier to native-like writing. In their study Maftoon et al. (2014) described mental translation as an inevitable process for EFL writing. APS-112 explained this problem with his following statements:

> Thinking in Turkish is unavoidable while writing in English. It is not only my problem, I guess. I see that most of my friends suffer from it. I always outline in Turkish because I can generate ideas in my mother tongue more easily. However, when I translate my ideas into English, problems emerge. My readers can easily understand that I think in Turkish. I think it is normal. I live in Turkey, and I have never been abroad. I find my classes helpful here, but it is not possible to think like an English man with the classes I take here. I need to live abroad and be exposed to English out of the class.

Considering the theme *endeavours to improve writing*, although the AP group seemed to engage in more diverse activities to improve their English writing, the most common response in all groups was 'studying the structures and vocabulary in the thesis statements of model texts to write an appropriate thesis statement'. It might be attributed to the fact that conventions for writing change depending on the language that writers write in. Mastering FL vocabulary and grammar is undoubtedly a great gain for L2 writers on the road to becoming a better writer, but it is not sufficient alone if students are not aware of the accepted patterns of organisation. Writing a topic sentence that controls the information for a paragraph or a thesis statement that controls the information for an essay is quite challenging for Turkish EFL learners because it is something they do not do when they write in their native language. As a result, it takes much time for them to internalise their function in the text and even when they can do it, they are unable to go beyond copying the patterns in model texts they studied previously.

Finally, participants in the three groups differed slightly in their goals to learn English writing. While 'learning writing to pass exams' was the most popular answer in the HP and AP groups, the most common goal uttered by poor writers was 'learning writing to transfer ideas'. Only two students in the LP group mentioned getting high scores or passing their English exams as their primary goal to learn English writing. These findings show that since they reached a certain level of proficiency in English writing and in conveying their ideas through writing, HP and AP writers were more pragmatic and result-oriented in their goals than LP writers were.

**5. 2.2. Discussion of the results on task knowledge.** In concordance with previous literature, participants' task knowledge involved *task-related factors affecting writing performance, challenges in completing a writing task, awareness of task requirements,* and *features of a good writing*. Furthermore, the codes under the themes in each group were numerically close to each other. These findings corroborated the findings of the descriptive statistics of mean scores of MKWS subscales in that although students in three groups differed in the extent of their person and strategy knowledge, they were quite similar in the extent of their task knowledge. This, again, may well be attributed to the content of their writing course, which provided the students with some knowledge about certain aspects of task variable but failed to give them any awareness about person and strategy variables.

As Tables 19, 20 and 21 illustrate, concerning the theme *task-related factors affecting writing performance,* both 'writing topic' and 'genre' were mentioned as important factors to influence effective writing by HP and AP writers. LP writers, on the other hand, referred to 'genre' as the primary determinant of their performance. Both the topics assigned to students and their familiarity to and background knowledge about them seemed to affect the quality of their writing considerably (Bacha, 2010; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008). While topics relied on students' personal experiences produced favourable results, topics that were cognitively demanding (i.e.

required special knowledge, abstract reasoning or critical thinking) were difficult to write for students. Whether students or teachers chose the writing topic was another important point highlighted by students. Previous studies suggest that self-selected topics make fewer demands on students' processing capacity and help them get involved in the writing process. Thus, self-selection helps writers cope with complex problems that occur while writing (Atwell, 1998) and has a positive effect on their overall fluency and lexical variety (Bonzo, 2008). Conforming to Bonyadi and Zeinalpur (2014), interview discussions revealed that participants of this study were more motivated and encouraged to write when they were given the right to select their own topics.

Interview discussions also supported the view that writing 'genre' has an impact on students' writing outputs, and the same students may perform differently in different genres (Camp, 1993; Graham, Harris, & Hebert, 2011; Olinghouse & Wilson, 2013). Majority of the participants in the study described argumentative as the most challenging genre in the ones they studied. However, in parallel to Olinghouse and Santangelo's (2010) findings, LP writers had extra difficulty changing the structure of their writing for argumentative essays.

'Time-limit on a specific task' was another serious non-linguistic variable expressed by a considerable number of students in all groups to influence the quality of their writing. Although more students in the HP and AP groups complained about time constraints, interview discussions revealed that time pressure had a negative effect, especially on LP students' planning and revising strategies. Referring to its negative effects, Kenworthy (2006) argues against the tendency of assessing writing performance with timed tasks He claims that an artificial environment with time limitations are not reliable criteria to judge students' real performances, and when given additional time, students can enhance their grammar use and make fewer grammatical errors within higher quality outputs.

Having a greater insight about the basics and typical features of a high-quality text is viewed as a common characteristic of skilled writers (Harris et al., 2010). Language, whether written or spoken, reflects the thought patterns of its speakers. In order to write well in a foreign language, L2 learners need to have some awareness about the different ways that native speakers organise their thoughts. When interviewees' awareness about the task requirements was examined, regardless of their writing levels, students in all groups showed a heightened awareness of audience and English discourse and organisational rules. Moreover, what was more striking was that poor writers seemed more concerned about their audience while writing. However, as was expected, HP and AP writers had a much greater awareness of genre conventions than the LP writers did. This finding corroborated Graham (2006) and Lu's (2010) suggestion that genre knowledge predicts writing performance and contributed to the quality of writing.

The results indicating a sense of audience on the part of the LP writers conflict with Raimes (1985, 1987) and Roca De Larios et al. (2002) who claim that unskilled writers do not have an acute sense of audience. It is noteworthy that LP writers in the present study might have misconceived the notion of audience or might have identified the audience with their writing teacher who was the only person reading their writings. As poor writers had more difficulty in communicating their messages through writing and expressing themselves persuasively when compared to the AP and HP writers, they could have been more concerned about their intended audience, verily their teacher.

Finally, in all groups, interviewees highlighted 'a profound content', 'accurate use of mechanical aspects' and 'organisation' as the three major features of a good writing. Apart from these, 'lexical diversity' was referred to as another common characteristic of good texts by more students in the AP group. Results of the present study on task knowledge also corroborated the informed view that skilled writers had a broader understanding of the requirements of an

effective composition (Roca De Larios et al., 2002). For instance, differently from LP writers, some participants in HP and AP groups referred to 'fluency', 'appropriate tone', and 'appropriate use of discourse markers' as characteristics of an effective essay.

**5. 2.3. Discussion of the results on strategy knowledge.** Awareness about and implementation of self-regulatory writing strategies are considered to be a significant characteristic of skilful writers (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Harris et al., 2010). Concerning strategy knowledge, emerging codes were quite similar among the three groups of writers, so the themes created were utterly the same. However, the frequency of occurrence of each code varied notably, revealing different tendencies of writers with different writing competencies.

When they were asked about how they dealt with the essay writing process, participants in all groups touched upon *objectives of writing goals, planning ahead of writing, monitoring while writing, revising* and *editing*. Regarding *objectives of writing goals,* most notably, no students in the HP group had 'language-related goals' although many students in the AP and LP groups set themselves a goal of accurate and effective use of English. This can be explained by the view that struggling writers are more concerned about linguistic competence and prioritise lower-level processes (i.e. vocabulary retrieval, grammar, punctuation) at the expense of higher-level processes (i.e. organisation, coherence, unity ) (Crossley et al., 2016). However, it was promising to find that participants in all groups attached priority to organisation and genre, content and transfer of learning into performance in their goals. What was even more impressive was that LP writers set more goals for their writing tasks than their HP and AP writers did.

Regarding *planning ahead of writing*, 'brainstorming for ideas', 'mental planning', 'taking sporadic notes', and 'relying on the mother tongue to generate ideas' were the strategies that participants in all groups commonly addressed to. 'Taking sporadic notes' was the most frequent planning strategy in the HP and AP groups followed by 'relying on the mother tongue to

generate ideas' and 'brainstorming for ideas'. LP group writers, on the other hand, depended mainly on 'brainstorming for ideas' and 'taking sporadic notes' to plan their tasks before they started writing. The results also showed that although mental translation was cited as a serious problem by a considerable number of students in three groups, in line with Maftoon et al.'s (2014) study, some participants in this study, especially in the HP and AP groups, could use mental translation as a useful strategy for planning and idea generation. These students argued that appealing to Turkish during idea generation enabled them to produce more ideas, organise them more quickly and plan in a shorter time.

Schraw and Dennison (1994) define monitoring as the ongoing evaluation of "one's learning and strategy use" (p.475). Findings of this study revealed that monitoring was one of the most critical indicators to distinguish skilful and less skilful writers. Although very similar codes emerged in all groups for *monitoring while writing,* their frequency of use differed considerably among groups. HP writers relied on a variety of monitoring strategies such as 'replanning', 'rereading the text at intervals' 'developing initial planning while writing' 'skimming the text at intervals to check cohesion and coherence', 'using remedial strategies' and 'writing nonstop and going back when coming up with an idea'. To monitor their composing process, for the most part, AP writers reread their texts at intervals, developed their initial planning while writing and wrote nonstop and went back when they came up with an idea. LP writers, however, mostly depended on 'replanning' and 'rereading the text at intervals'.

A close examination of interview discussions for revising strategy demonstrated that students in all groups appealed to the strategies 'rereading the entire text at the end for revision', 'checking for mistakes at intervals' and 'checking the entire text for mistakes at the end'. While most students in the HP group were inclined to reread their entire text at the end to have a general idea about the content and essay organisation (72.73%), AP writers mostly tended to check their

entire texts at the end prioritising their mechanical errors (66.67%). In the LP group, students mostly reread their entire texts at the end or checked it at intervals for their technical mistakes.

Considering editing, for most students in the HP and AP groups, editing was limited to correcting grammar errors. Besides, 'making content-related changes or corrections' in the HP group and 'editing for vocabulary mistakes' in the AP group were the other running codes. LP writers, in general, lacked a vivid understanding and awareness of the purpose and utility of editing and failed to implement it effectively. A few students in this group mentioned editing the technical errors in their writings such as grammar and capitalisation, spelling and punctuation mistakes.

In all groups, students, regardless of their writing competence levels, evaluated their task performance according to their level of effective and correct use of language and the adequacy of the content they presented. Differently from the AP and LP groups, more students in the HP group set 'pertinence to organisational rules and genre conventions' as a criterion for self-evaluation. While some HP and AP writers embarked upon comparison (with prior writing tasks, peers' tasks or model essays) to evaluate their writing performance, LP writers either depended on assessment rubrics that their teacher used to grade their tasks or considered how successfully they could transfer what they had learned in the class into the writing task in hand.

## 5. 3. Discussion of the Quantitative Results on Metacognitive Strategies of Writing

Participants were asked to respond to some statements in MSWS concerning their implementation of planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies to measure the extent of their self-regulation specific to EFL writing. As shown in Table 9, descriptive statistics of mean scores of three subscales demonstrated that the participants of the present study had an average level of self-regulation. Among the three variables of metacognitive control, planning ranked the highest; monitoring ranked the second, and evaluating fell behind. Taking into account these results, one

could state that students seemed to employ some strategies to monitor and control their writing processes, but the extent of their self-regulation in writing process was, however, not very strong.

When participants' English learning history and past L1 and L2 writing experiences are considered, these findings are not surprising. It is pretty clear that the English classes focusing basically on grammar and reading (Tokdemir, 2017) did not help Turkish EFL learners much to be self-regulated learners. Until their tertiary education, they rarely or almost never produced something in English, and their language learning journey was planned and directed by their teachers, rote-learning based language teaching programs and assessment and evaluation systems.

Moreover, it is a common view among scholars that L2 writers have a tendency to carry out their L1 writing behaviours, skills and strategies to L2 writing situations. Therefore, the quality and quantity of their previous experiences regarding L1 writing or their hidden assumptions about L1 literacy have a significant impact on their L2 writing achievement (Akyel (1994; Cumming, 1990; 2001; Myles, 2002; Victori & Lockart, 1995). It was, however, surprising that the participants of the present study, except for a few students, did not address to their L1 writing experiences or skills while describing their English writing processes during the interviews. This can be well explained with the content, focus and objectives of the Turkish classes they took before tertiary level. In most Turkish classes, receptive skills and language mechanics receive greater attention than productive skills. The writing instruction that students are exposed to and the opportunities they have to engage in meaningful production are very limited (Guven, 2011). In official exams, their competence in their mother tongue is assessed through some reading comprehension questions or some questions on mechanics of language such a grammar, spelling and punctuation.

Furthermore, depending on the evidence that certain high-level writing processes such as planning, monitoring and revising are similar across languages (Akyel, 1994; Cumming, 1990,

2001; Roca De Larios, et al., 2002; Myles, 2002; Victori & Lockhart, 1995),   it can be argued that students' lack of these strategies in their mother tongue might have prevented them from transferring them to or activating and using them in the L2 writing situations (Ransdell & Barbier, 2002; Roca De Larios et. al., 2002).

As is expected, the inspection of the mean scores of the three subscales of MSWS for the HP, AP and LP groups separately confirmed slight differences among groups concerning their self-regulation in EFL writing. Parallel with their writing performances, HP writers scored highest in all subscales. Following HP writers, AP writers came second in their implementation of metacognitive strategies. LP writers, on the other hand, fell behind in all three subscales.

These results also corroborate slightly with the findings of the correlation analysis which indicates a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievement and their use of planning, monitoring and evaluating strategies. They also lead us to the conclusion that although not very strong, there is a relationship between self-regulation and writing success. Contrary to the findings of the present study, numerous studies note a strong relationship between EFL learners' implementation of self-regulatory writing strategies and their writing performances (Flower & Hayes, 1981; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) They reveal certain benefits regarding more effective and extensive use of macro-level strategies (such as planning, revising and editing) in favour of skilled writers both in L1 and L2 (Akyel, 1994; Cumming, 1989; Zamel, 1983; Zimmerman, 2000). Unskilled writers, on the other hand, fail in macro-level strategies (Cumming, 2001; Raimes, 1987; Victori, 1999; Zimmerman, 2000).  Although not clear why this study yielded such divergent findings, again it might have stemmed from having measured the students' writing achievement with a single task and the fact that the task was an argumentative essay.

**5. 4.  Discussion of the Qualitative Results on Metacognitive Strategies of Writing**

When the interviewees were asked about the whole processes that they took to write their argumentative essays, their descriptions of how they handled the compositional process demonstrated considerable differences in terms of their use of self-regulatory writing strategies as well the time they devoted for each phase of writing. This part of the study includes an in-depth discussion and explanation of the codes with relatively higher frequencies in all groups.

**5.4.1.  Discussion of the results on planning strategy.** Preliminary studies reveal that struggling and skilful writers differ significantly in their approach to planning (Cumming, 1989; Harris et al., 2010; Raimes, 1987; Victori, 1995). In accord with findings of these studies, Tables 26, 27 and 28 demonstrate that in parallel with their writing achievements, participants in three groups differed significantly in their implementation of planning strategy.

The findings of the present study corroborate Harris et al. (2010) who suggested that skilful writers were more planful, and they spared relatively longer time to overarching planning. Considering goal setting, contrary to the LP writers, some students in the HP and AP groups identified some goals for their argumentative essays such as giving counter-arguments in the introductory paragraph and defending their arguments and rebutting opponents' arguments all through their essays. Besides, they were more skilful at integrating their prior knowledge about the structural or organisational patterns with the argumentative essay to achieve their pre-determined goals. Poor writers, on the other hand, did not define any specific goals for their argumentative tasks, although they mentioned a variety of goal objects for their writings in general.

When they were asked to give details about their planning strategies, high achievers mentioned having found three main points for their body paragraphs, having listed ideas and examples in small notes, and having brainstormed for ideas for the each writing topic given to

choose the most appropriate one. On the other hand, for the majority of interviewees in the AP group, planning just consisted of finding three main points to be discussed in the body paragraphs. Finally, poor writers tended to start writing without a grand plan and precise goals. Some stated having planned only in their mind. This was astonishing since when AP and LP writers had been asked about if they were aware of the available strategies for planning, majority of them valued planning as a useful strategy and provided multiple answers on how they planned their tasks. These findings also demonstrated that students' awareness of certain strategies did not guarantee that they could use them effectively while writing.

      **5.4.2.  Discussion of the results on monitoring strategy.** According to Harris et al. (2010), skilled writers differ from less able ones greatly in their perceptions about the crucial role of revising. "For skilled writers, revision is an integral, extensive, and ongoing activity that involves the coordination and management of several cognitive skills" (p.233). In the present study, one of the most notable differences among HP, AP, and LP writers were found in their implementation of revising strategy.

      About the theme 'revising the argumentative task', findings led to the conclusion that high achievers appealed to more diverse strategies to see whether they were accomplishing their intended goals and meeting the requirements of the assigned task. They were more flexible to take remedial actions and to achieve substantial improvements. They aimed to improve both micro- and macro-level structure of their compositions to write high-quality texts. Unlike LP and AP writers, they revised content and coherence in their texts to overcome the flaws in logic or coherence. Supporting the findings of previous research (see Brooks, 1985; Porte, 1996; Roca De Larios et al., 2002; Zamel, 1983), AP and LP writers, on the other hand, failed in distinguishing between revising and editing as two different procedures. For most students in these groups, revising was mainly for detecting linguistic mistakes, and they were inclined to improve the

surface-level features of their argumentative texts rather than improving conceptual aspects or global structure. As a result, their revision was usually superficial and inefficient. They failed to improve paragraph development, logic and coherence, which were inevitable to make a text powerful and successful.

From their comments about editing, it was seen that the majority of the study participants, regardless of their writing achievement, would rather postpone editing until the final phase of their writing process. Students in all groups focused mainly on mechanics, specifically on grammatical or lexical errors, in the editing process of their argumentative tasks. What was more striking was that HP writers devoted less time and attention to editing when compared to AP and LP writers, and the time limit on the task accounted for their lack of editing.

**5.4.3. Discussion of the results on evaluating strategy.** Evaluating is also a critical self-regulatory mechanism which is evident in skilled writers' writing processes. Participants' statements concerning their evaluation of argumentative task performances were treated and discussed under three themes: *students' evaluation of their argumentative task performance*, *attribution for success*, and *attribution for failure*. Students' responses revealed that while HP students were mostly pleased about their task performances, AP and LP writers found them inadequate.

Participants' attributions for both success and failure are worth pondering because, as Cleary, Callan, Zimmerman (2012) suggest, individuals' attributions to their performances strongly affect the type and quality of the adaptive inferences they make to maximise their future performances. In the case of this study, writers in all groups were inclined to attribute both their success and failure mostly to personal reasons. HP and AP writers mentioned numerous reasons for their success, but each reason was cited by a single student or a couple of students; thus, they did not permit the generalisation of the results. On the other hand, members of these groups

attributed their failure commonly to an external reason: 'time limit on the task'. Management of time is considered to be an important part of self-regulation which affects the application of writing strategies (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997), and though their higher proficiency in EFL writing and higher awareness on components of metacognitive knowledge, HP and AP students seemed to fail in managing their time. It was evident from their responses that they could not employ some strategies, especially planning, revising, and editing because they ran out of time. Other than the time limit, while HP writers considered the abundance of their grammar mistakes as an important reason for their failure, AP writers mostly referred to their inability to find ideas, facts and examples when explaining the reasons behind their failure.

'Coming up with good ideas and examples' and 'following the organisational rules and conventions of argumentative essays' were the two reasons cited by a couple of poor writers for success. Students in this group, on the other hand, addressed to a variety of reasons for their inefficacy in EFL writing such as their lack of knowledge about how to write an argumentative essay or their lack of experience in writing it, their inability to find ideas, facts and examples, the difficulty of writing an argumentative essay, having to write about a difficult / unfamiliar topic, and time limit.

## 5.5. Suggestions to Integrate Metacognition into EFL Writing Instruction

Theoretical and empirical research on skilful and less skilful writers is valuable as it provides us with some important insights regarding the ways to approach the EFL writing process and its teaching and learning. Above all, in the lights of the previous research, we can confidently argue that metacognition is a characteristic of skilful writers. Fortunately, it is not an inborn skill but a teachable and learnable phenomenon (Cross & Paris, 1988; Gama, 2001; Kramarsky & Maverech, 2003).

Livingston (2003) states that as individuals get cognitively more mature and interact with their environment, their metacognitive knowledge improves. As they encounter cognitively challenging situations or tasks, they join in metacognitive regulation, as well. However, some self-regulatory skills (i.e. self-monitoring and self-evaluation) that EFL writers especially need are claimed to develop rather slowly, or even may remain incomplete in some adults. Considering the writing skill, as Harris et al. (2010) claim, with age and schooling struggling writers may become more self-regulated, and the level of self-regulation they bring to the writing tasks has a considerable impact on their writing performance and task achievement. Considering the fact that most Turkish EFL students are accustomed to being filled with a massive amount of information provided by an external source (usually the teacher or the textbooks) and tested through multiple choice standardised tests all through their school life, it may be quite demanding for them to think metacognitively and be self-regulated learners. Considering the findings drawn from the study, it is possible to provide several pedagogical implications for EFL writing instruction and offer some suggestions for the integration of metacognition into EFL writing courses.

Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) suggest two instructional methods for the teaching of writing: substantive facilitation and procedural facilitation. In substantive facilitation, the teachers directly assist students with the content of a task.  They take over the full responsibility to plan, monitor, evaluate and revise the writing process on behalf of the learners. Although substantive facilitation is a more common and traditional form of scaffolding for teachers in writing instruction, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) strongly favour the procedural facilitation in which "help consists of supports intended to enable students to carry out more complex composing processes by themselves" (p. 796). In classrooms where they are instructed with procedural facilitation, students have a better chance to engage in the whole process of writing and get prepared to take its responsibility using their metacognition.  The negative influence of

external factors (i.e. limited hours of instruction, un-qualified writing instructors, examination system, and curriculum) can also be minimised.

Secondly, the related literature is full of suggestions on the benefits of a writing instruction enriched with metacognitive writing knowledge including person, task and strategy and with meaningful practices of the self-regulatory processes such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Pintrich, 2002). According to Harris et al., (2010), such a writing instruction help students monitor and control their own writing process. Additionally, if students are exposed to a diversity of purposeful activities, they may feel more motivated to make use of their metacognition for their writing improvement.

Blakey and Spence (1990) suggest that metacognition can be taught to students either through direct instruction or integrating it into the course curriculum through a variety of techniques and activities. Direct metacognitive instruction involves a detailed explanation of metacognitive knowledge and certain self-regulatory strategies to students by teachers (Cross & Paris, 1988). Instruction at the meta-level rather than performance level is considered to enhance learners' awareness of and control over the process of task accomplishment (Kuhn, 2000). Therefore, in this approach, metacognition is taught independently as a subject. However, research on metacognitive instruction reveals that integrating metacognition into course curriculum and instructing students on metacognitive knowledge and self-regulatory strategies specific to a certain subject or domain is more common (Gama, 2001) and effective than teaching it independently as a subject.

*Teacher modelling* is one way to integrate metacognition into course curriculum and to develop students' cognitive and metacognitive skills (Butler & Winne, 1995; Costa, 1984). Teachers, as more proficient thinkers, can model the strategies that are available and useful in certain contexts by showing their mental activities to their students (Chamot, 1995; Schraw,

1998; Wenden, 1998). Modelling can be accomplished through think-aloud protocols in which teachers think about when and how to use strategies (Schraw, 1998). They say their thinking processes out loud while carrying out a writing task and provide detailed information about what is going on in their heads. This information may involve plans, aims and purposes, the logic behind their actions, common mistakes and some ways to correct them, self-evaluation, defining strengths and weaknesses, developing empathy and strategies for handling a difficult task or solving a problem.

Another way to help learners to control and regulate their writing process is by encouraging them to reflect on it. When students are encouraged to think over and reflect on their writing process as a whole, they may have more accurate views of themselves as writers, the writing tasks at hand and the available strategies (Kasper, 1997). Blakey and Spence (1990) list a group of metacognitive strategies which can be effectively used to develop metacognitive behaviours in learners. These strategies involve (1) identifying "what you know" and "what you don't know"; (2) think-aloud and talking about thinking, (3) keeping a thinking journal, (4) planning and self-regulation, (5) debriefing the thinking processes, and (6) self-evaluation (Blakey & Spence , 1990, p 2-3.)

*Identifying what they know or what they do not know* raises learners' awareness of their thinking, so they can make informed decisions. To encourage learners' reflections, the teacher may work as a facilitator guiding his or her students to ask questions that trigger metacognition (i.e. What do I know about this topic?, What do I want to achieve in this task?). "As students research the topic, they will verify clarify, and expand, or replace with more accurate information" (Blakey and Spence, 1990, p. 2).

Secondly*, thinking aloud or thinking about thinking* requires the detailed verbal explanation of one's thinking processes while working on a task at the same time. It promotes

learners' metacognitive growth and provides them with tangible ways to manage certain mental processes required for effective writing. Thinking aloud also makes learners' reasoning, concepts, and beliefs visible for their teachers and classmates (Hennessey, 1999). By encouraging learners to think aloud, teachers may also help learners organise and develop their thoughts and solve problems.

Another useful way to lead learners to reflect on their learning process or experiences is *keeping reflective journals*. Wong and Storey (2006) recommend the use of reflective journals to build and heighten L2 writers' awareness and knowledge of effective writing skills and strategies. It is an effective way for EFL writers to think over their writing skills and habits, reflect on how they write and assess their writing performance. While keeping journals regularly, they can use the concepts they have already learned, analyse their previous thoughts and the reasons why they were thinking so, gain a different point of view, notice their shortcomings and see the consistency between their previous and current thoughts. Furthermore, the benefits of reflection activities are not limited to students, yet they are also a great source of information, which gives teachers valuable insights about their students' attitudes, strategies, and perceptions of L2 writing.

*Planning and self-regulation* allow learners to be aware of their responsibilities for planning and regulating their writing processes. Blakey and Spence (1990) think that when students plan and monitor their learning process, it is easier for them to be self-directed. They further mention that "students can be taught to make plans for learning activities, including estimating time requirements, organising materials, and scheduling procedures necessary to complete an activity" (p.3).

*Debriefing the thinking process* can be used as an effective strategy at the end of a writing activity to develop students' awareness about the strategies that can be transferred to other writing situations. Blakey and Spence (1990) also suggest a three-step method for this strategy:

First, the teacher guides students to review the activity, gathering data on thinking processes and feelings. Then, the group classifies related ideas, identifying thinking strategies used. Finally, they evaluate their success, discarding inappropriate strategies, identifying those valuable for future use, and seeking promising alternative approaches. (Blakey & Spence, 1990, p.3)

Lastly*, self-evaluation* refers to one's evaluation of his or her performance based on certain predetermined criteria.  These criteria for evaluation can be established by students under the guidance of their teacher. When students are involved actively in the process of evaluation, they gradually apply it more independently. Individual conferences and checklists are useful to provide learners with guided self-evaluation experiences (Blakey & Spence, 1990).

In addition to the strategies that Blakey and Spence (1990) suggested, other scholars came up with some useful strategies to develop learners' metacognition. Among these, *asking reflective questions* or *self- questioning* is considered to help students to monitor and control the writing process skilfully (Hartman, 2001b, Ifenthaler, 2012; Mayer, 1998). Hartman (2001b) describes *self-questioning* as an effective way of encouraging self-regulation in the writing process. To self-direct their writing process, students can be encouraged to generate questions in regard to planning (*"What is the purpose of this essay?; What should be in the introductory paragraph?; How should I put these ideas in the best order?"*), monitoring *("Am I elaborating on all of my main points?; How clearly am I expressing my ideas?; Am I making any spelling or grammar mistakes?"*) and evaluating ("*What was the best about my paper?; Why did I make those spelling and grammar errors?; How can I best prevent those mistakes next time?"*) (p. 54)

Further to that, Schraw (1998) highlights the essential role of cooperative learning facilities (i.e. peer interaction, peer consultation, group work and discussions) in the construction of metacognition. Interaction among students encourages learners to "shape their regulatory

learning activities in terms of metacognition" (Gilette, 1994 as cited in Li & Larkin, 2017, p. 13).

It helps students gain a deep understanding of themselves and others as writers, notice different

ways of approaching a writing task, and construct their own metacognitive theories (Cross &

Paris, 1988; Kuhn & Dean, 2004; Paris & Winograd, 1990; Schraw & Moshman, 1995).

Classroom discussions and collaborative activities with peers increase writers' motivation and

positive self-efficacy beliefs by offering much-needed scaffolding. They make the implicit

strategies which are commonly and easily used by skilful writers explicit to the novice ones.

Finally, Ruan (2005) suggests some useful strategies that teachers can use to teach certain

self-regulatory strategies systematically to their students and to place responsibility on students

themselves for their writing development or achievement. Regarding planning, *identifying*

*purpose and audience, narrowing down a writing subject, timed-free writing* and *loop writing*

may be useful strategies. To provide EFL writers with an awareness of self-monitoring and

develop their autonomy, teachers may encourage them to produce *marginal annotations* about

the problems they face while composing. In this way, students are expected to have control over

the initiation of feedback (Charles, 1990; Cresswell, 2000, as cited in Ruan, 2005). Evaluating

and revising strategies may involve *reading aloud own compositions, self-annotation, selective*

*self-editing, reverse editing* and *peer feedback.*  Teachers may also give their students the

responsibility to reformulate their texts. Such strategies that require students' efforts to monitor,

edit, or correct their written products help them become more skilful and independent writers and

appraise their writing performances (Allwright, 1988, as cited in Ruan, 2005).

To conclude, there is a robust pedagogical implication that applying an approach that

blends a variety of activities work better to address a broader range of learner needs and styles in

different learning context.  To encourage learners to become more self-regulated and autonomous

in their writing process, teachers need to help them acquire new metacognitive skills and engage them in a wide variety of metacognitive activities.

**CHAPTER SIX**

**Conclusion**

This chapter presents an overview of the present study, including a summary of its scope, research questions, and findings.  In addition, depending on the limitations of the study, some implications for the further research are put forward. Finally, the role of metacognition in EFL writing, and the contributions of this study to the field are discussed.

**6.1. An Overview of the Study**

Drawing on Flavell's Model of Cognitive Monitoring (1981), Brown's Model of Metacognition (1987) and Schraw and Moshman's Model of Metacognition (1995), the present study intends to explore the extent of Turkish tertiary-level EFL writer's writing metacognition and its role on their writing achievement. For this purpose, it addresses the following research questions:

1. What is the extent of Turkish EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge about writing regarding person, task and strategy variables?

2. While writing, to what extent do Turkish EFL learners use metacognitive strategies of writing regarding planning, monitoring and evaluating?

3. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

4. Is there a significant correlation between EFL learners' writing achievement and their use of metacognitive strategies of writing?

5. What do Turkish EFL learners think about their metacognitive knowledge about writing?

6.  What do Turkish EFL learners think about the metacognitive strategies they used in a given writing task?

The study was conducted with 120 Turkish EFL learners studying B2 level at a state university in Turkey. Data were collected through questionnaires (MKWS and MSWS), retrospective interviews and argumentative writing tasks. Interviews were conducted with 35 volunteers who represented nearly 30% of the total survey respondents. The quantitative data were analysed by means of SPSS program.  For the analysis of qualitative data, a content analysis was employed.

Concerning the extent of participants' metacognitive knowledge and its three components, it was found that they had an average level of person and strategy knowledge but a high level of task knowledge. Descriptive statistics of MKWS also revealed that HP writers had a higher level of metacognitive knowledge in all three subscales.  The AP and LP groups' mean scores for person, task and strategy variables were quite close together. It was also seen that participants' awareness of task knowledge was higher than their awareness of person and strategy knowledge in all groups.

The findings of the content analysis corroborated with quantitative results, revealing differences in the extent of participants' person and knowledge, but similarities in the extent of their task knowledge. To be more specific, the codes emerged in the HP and AP groups' data regarding person knowledge outnumbered the codes emerged in the LP group's data, confirming a reciprocal link between students' writing achievement and person knowledge. About the strategy knowledge, although emerging codes were quite similar among the three groups of writers, their frequency of occurrence varied notably, revealing different tendencies of writers with varying writing competencies. However, regardless of their writing achievement scores, participants in all groups mentioned very similar aspects of task knowledge.

An analysis of the quantitative data for participants' metacognitive strategies of writing (based on the results of MSWS) pointed to the conclusion that the participants had an average

level of self-regulation. Among the three variables of metacognitive control, students showed the best performance in planning and the second best performance in monitoring, while they fell behind in evaluating. The inspection of the mean scores of the three components of metacognitive control for the HP, AP and LP groups individually confirmed slight differences in their implementation of metacognitive strategies in EFL writing. In parallel with their writing performances, HP writers performed better in all subscales. Following HP writers, AP writers came in second, and LP writers came last.

The content analysis of qualitative data consolidated the results of quantitative data mostly in the HP group's favour. Findings showed that HP and AP writers were more planful, and they spared longer time to planning. They set certain goals for their tasks, and they were more skillful at integrating their prior knowledge about the structural or organisational patterns to achieve these goals. What is more, when compared to AP and LP writers, high achievers resorted to more diverse planning strategies. Another notable difference among HP, AP, and LP writers was in their revising behaviours. HP writers appealed to more diverse strategies to see whether they could accomplish their goals and meet the requirements of the task. They were more flexible to take remedial actions and to achieve substantial improvements. They improved both micro- and macro-level structure of their compositions to write high-quality texts. Unlike LP and AP writers, they revised content and coherence in their texts to overcome the flaws in logic or coherence. However, just like their LP and AP counterparts, they focused mainly on mechanics, specifically on grammatical or lexical errors in their editing process. The results of the content analysis also revealed significant differences among HP, AP and LP writers in their evaluation of their task performance and attributions for success and failure. One conclusion that could be drawn was that HP writers were mostly pleased about their task performances, while AP and LP writers found them inadequate. Besides, whereas HP and AP writers mentioned numerous

reasons for both their success and failure, LP writers tended to address mostly causes of their inefficacy in EFL writing.

The results also indicated that although students in three groups, especially LP writers, seemed to be aware of the certain strategies for planning, monitoring and evaluating, they failed notably in using them in the assigned tasks. This finding brings about the conclusion that although EFL students have an awareness of available self-regulatory strategies, this does not mean that they can use them efficaciously.

Finally, as regards to the effect size of the association between students' writing achievement and metacognitive knowledge about writing, the correlation analysis revealed a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievements and both person and strategy variables but no statistically significant relationship between their task knowledge and writing achievement. Considering metacognitive strategies, the results of the correlation analysis also indicated a weak positive correlation between students' writing achievement and their use of planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies.

## 6.2. Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

Several limitations of the study will be discussed, and suggestions for further studies will be put forward in this section of the study. First of all, participants of the study were 120 B2 level EFL students whose L1 was Turkish. Turkish being the only mother tongue imposed limitations on the generalisation of findings to EFL groups with many different first languages; therefore, a similar study can be conducted with EFL students in different contexts.

Secondly, data collection tools used in the study were limited to questionnaires and retrospective interviews. Both questionnaires and interviews are 'self-reports', in Veenman' (2005) words 'off-line methods', which may be insufficient alone to investigate the participants' complete metacognitive knowledge and behaviours. In future studies, researchers may also

consider measuring their participants' metacognition through on-line methods (i.e. think-aloud protocols and teacher observations) in which participants tell about their thoughts while they are working on a task (Banner & Mengelkamp, 2008; Veenman, 2005). These methods can work better to predict an individual's performance and cognitive processes during a task as they are more appropriate methods to record actual verbal and nonverbal behaviours of participants in a social environment.

Next, measuring students' writing performances only through one task (argumentative essay in the present study) may be unrealistic to make an accurate judgement about their actual writing performances. One form of writing may not be representative of how a writer performs in all forms of writing. For the identification of skilled and unskilled writers, future studies may judge their participants' writing ability based on different tasks in a variety of genres.

Exhaustion may be a factor having affected the participants' performances on the surveys negatively. Students who participated in the surveys had classes in the morning and a writing task in the afternoon immediately before they responded to the questionnaire items. For further research, data collection procedures need to be better planned to eliminate physical and affective factors.

In the present study, interviewees were selected randomly among the volunteers, who were more motivated and interested to take part in the interview sessions. This may have caused selection bias in the sample. To avoid this possibility, researchers in further studies may select their interviewees after collecting the quantitative data, scoring student tasks and analysing them to form heterogeneous groups.

Finally, although participants of the study used a specific textbook, followed a specific syllabus and were tested at the same exams, due to scheduling difficulties, each writing class was taught by a different instructor. Therefore, it was quite difficult for all instructors to go through

an identical teaching process because of their unique characteristics and priorities, pedagogical content knowledge and goals and the dynamics of the class they teach. This situation may have unintentionally affected the results of the study. To avoid the negative effects that this may cause, in future studies, data should be collected form participants instructed by the same teacher.

## 6.3. Concluding Remarks

Writing is an essential skill in EFL instruction, and it provides a variety of benefits for individuals in their academic and business life. However, it is a complex cognitive activity that requires highly specialised skills (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Nunan, 1989), and possibly that is why it is the most difficult skill for teachers to teach and for students to acquire (Richards & Renandya, 2003).

With the shift of focus from product-oriented to process-oriented approach, scholars have urged upon the significant role of higher order processes in the control and regulation of the writing process, and many of them have addressed to the critical role of metacognition in writing. Even, writing is defined as applied metacognition by some scholars (Hacker, Keener & Kircher, 2009). Moreover, previous research has revealed that skilled writers go through processes that involve great self-regulation and metacognitive control (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower, 1990; Flower and Hayes, 1980; Harris et al., 2010; Kellogg, 1996; Ruan, 2005). Regarding the writing skill, metacognition involves the knowledge students have about their own writing processes, the actual activities they engage in and the means they use to regulate these processes. According to Kasper (1997), L2 learners fail in writing because they are unaware of these aspects of writing.

The research examining metacognition in the domain of language learning and teaching has still mainly focused on receptive skills (reading and listening) and has reported on its considerable benefits for reading and listening development (Devine, 1993; Vandergrift, 2002,

2007; Vandergrift & Goh, 2011). The role of metacognition on productive language skills, namely speaking and writing, seems to escape the attention of scholars, and thus, more elaborate research is required to address this issue.

There are two major reasons for the selection of writing as the research area in this study. First, there is growing attention among tertiary-level Turkish EFL students to improve writing proficiency. However, many of them never feel competent enough in the field of academic writing, and they regard it as a core that one has to get on with. They have little or no motivation to participate in given writing tasks other than avoiding probable failure or improving their chances of passing their English exams. Second, the prior research points at various benefits of metacognitive knowledge and strategies to EFL writing achievement, but there is still scarcely any study in Turkey examining metacognition in relation to EFL writing. Considering these, the current study is an attempt to fill this gap and to contribute to the body of literature about EFL writing and metacognition in Turkish context. Besides, it may be a starting point for further educational studies that will aim to examine the extent of Turkish EFL students' writing metacognitive knowledge and strategy use or their influence on their EFL writing achievement.

# REFERENCES

Adiguzel, A., & Orhan, A. (2017). Öğrencilerin üstbiliş beceri düzeyleri ile İngilizce dersine ilişkin akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki **[**The relations between levels of students' metacognitive skills and their English academic success**]**. *Ihlara Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(1), 5-14.

Akbari, Z. (2015). Current challenges in teaching/learning English for EFL learners: The case of junior high school and high school. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*(3), 394–401.

Akturk, A. O., & Sahin, I. (2011). Literature review on metacognition and its measurement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 3731–3736.

Akyel, A. (1994). First language use in EFL writing: Planning in Turkish vs. planning in English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 169-196.

Akyel, A. & Kamisli, S. (1997). Composing in first and second languages: Possible effects of EFL writing instruction. In K. Pogner, (Ed.), *Writing: Text and interaction (pp.*69–105). Odense, Denmark: Odense University.

Alci, B., & Yuksel, G. (2012). An examination into self-efficacy, metacognition and academic performance of preservice ELT students: Prediction and difference. *Pen Journal of Education and Human Sciences, 2*(1), 143-165.

Alptekin, C., & Tatar, S. (2011). Research on foreign language teaching and learning in Turkey (2005-2009). *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 328−353. http://doi.org/ccr362

Ammon, P. (1985). Helping children learn to write in English as a second language: Some observations and some hypotheses. In S. W. Freedman (Ed.), *The acquisition of written language* (pp. 65-84). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). *The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning.* ERIC Digest, EDO. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Anderson, N. J. (2012). Metacognition: Awareness of language learning. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory and practice* (pp. 169-187). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Applebee, A. N. (1984). Writing and reasoning. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(4), 577-596. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1170176.

Artzt, A., & Armour-Thomas, E. (1992) Development of a cognitive - metacognitive framework for protocol analysis of mathematical problem solving in small groups. *Cognition and Instruction 9*(2), 137-175.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multipledraft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227- 257.

Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). Chapter: Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In Spence, K. W., & Spence, J. T. *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol.2) (pp. 89–195). New York: Academic Press.

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understanding about writing, reading, and learning.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Aykac, N. (2007a). The teachers' opinions about the elementary social science lesson programme. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(22) 46-73. Retrieved from http://www.esosder.org

Aykac, N. (2007b). Evaluation of activities in primary education programme with the teachers' views (sample of Sinop province). *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD), 8*(2), 19-35.

Aykac, N., & Ulubey, O. (2012). Pre-service teachers' opinions about the application level of elementary school program. *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences, 45*(1), 63-82.

Bacha, N. (2010). Teaching the academic argument in a university EFL environment. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(3), 229–241.

Baker, L., & Brown A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 353-394). New York, USA: Longman.

Balaban, S., & Camlıbel-Acar, Z. (2017). Metacognitive awareness in second language listening and the role of strategy training. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences, 7*, 93-97. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/epess/issue/30770/332661

Banner, M., & Mengelkamp, C. (2008). Assessment of metacognitive skills by means of instruction to think aloud and reflect when prompted: Does the verbalisation method affect learning?. *Metacognition Learning, 3*, 39-58. doi:10.1007/s11409-007-9009-6

Bas, F., & Ozturan Sagirli M. (2017). A content analysis of the articles on metacognition in education in Turkey. *Education and Science, 42,* 1-33.

Bereiter, C. (1980). Development in writing. In L.W. Gregg, & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 73-93). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bhowmik, S. K. (2009). L2 writing pedagogy in EFL contexts: An exploration of salient practices in teaching and learning. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 6*(3), 351-373.

Blakey, E., & Spence, S. (1990). *Developing metacognition.* Eric Reproduction Services No. ED327218. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED327218.pdf

Bonyadi, A., & Zeinalpur, Sh. (2014). Perceptions of students towards self-selected and teacher-assigned topics in EFL writing. *Procidia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 385-391.

Bonzo, J. D. (2008). To assign a topic or not: observing fluency in intermediate foreign language writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*, 722-735.

Bozdogan, D., & Karlidag, B. (2013) . A case of CLIL practice in Turkish context: Lending an ear to students. *Asian EFL Journal, 15*(4), 1-22.

British Council & TEPAV. (2013). *Turkey national needs assessment of state school English language teaching.* Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/sites/default/files/turkey_national_needs_assessment_of_state_school_english_language_teaching.pdf.

Brooks, E. (1985). *Case studies of the composing processes of five "unskilled" English-as-a-second language writers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1999). *In search for understanding: The case for constructivist classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, A. L. (1978). Knowing when, where and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology* (pp.77-165). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation, and other more mysterious mechanisms. In F. E. Weinert & R. H. Kluwe, (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding* (pp. 65-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, A. L., Bransford, J.D., Ferrara, R.A., & Campione, J.C. (1983). Learning, remembering and understanding. In J.H. Flavell & E.M. Markman (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Cognitive development*, (4th ed.). New York, USA: Wiley.

Brown, A. L., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 393–451). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, Mass.,: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, *65*(3), 245 -281. doi:10.3102/00346543065003245.

Buyukkantarcioglu, N. (2004). A sociolinguistic analysis of the present dimensions of English as a foreign language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 164,* 33-58.

Camp, R. (1993). Changing the model for the direct assessment of writing. In M.M. Williamson, & B. A. Huot (Eds.), *Validating holistic scoring for writing assessment: Theoretical and empirical foundations* (pp. 45-78). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Capa, Y., Cakiroglu, J., & Sarikaya, H. (2005). The development and validation of a Turkish version of teachers' sense of efficacy scale. *Egitim ve Bilim (Education and Science), 30*(137), 74-81.

Cetinkaya, P., & Ertekin, E. (2002). Assessment of metacognition and its relationship with reading comprehension, achievement, and aptitude. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi, 19*(1), 1-11.

Chamot, A. (1995). Learning strategies and listening comprehension. In D. Mendelsohn, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A Guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 13-30). San Diego, CA: Dominie Press.

Chen, Y. (2002). The problems of university EFL writing in Taiwan. *The Korean TESOL Journal Online, 5*(1), 59-79.

Chinn, C. A. (2006). Learning to argue. In A. M. O'Donnell, C. E. Hmelo-Silver, & G. Erkens (Eds.), *Collaborative learning, reasoning, and technology* (pp. 355-383). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chomsky N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin and use.* New York, NY: Praeger.

Cleary, T.J., Callan, G. L. & Zimmerman, B. J. (2012). Assessing self-regulation as a cyclical, context-specific phenomenon: Overview and analysis of SRL microanalytic protocols. *Education Research International, 2012,* 1-19.

Cognition (n.d.) In *Encyclopaedia Britannica online.* Website. (2019). Retrieved on June 25, 2019, from  https://www.britannica.com/topic/cognition-thought-process

Costa, A. L. (1984). Mediating the metacognitive. *Educational Leadership*, *11*, 57-62.

Coskun, A. (2010). The effect of metacognitive strategy training on the listening performance of beginner students. *Research on Youth and Language, 4*(1), 35–50.

Council of Europe (COE). (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, D. R., & Paris, S. G. (1988). Developmental and instructional analyses of children's metacognition and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*(2), 131–142.

Crossley, S. A., Muldner, K., & McNamara, D. (2016). Idea Generation in student writing: Computational assessments and links to successful writing. *Written Communication*, *33*(3), 328-354. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316650178

Crystal, D. (1997*). English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, *39*(1), 81-141.

Cumming, A. (1990). Metalinguistic and ideational thinking in second language composing. *Written Communicarion, 7*(4), 482-511.

Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies*, *1*(2), 1-23. Retrieved from http://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/48331

Cumming, A., Rebuffot, J., & Ledwell, M. (1989). Reading and summarizing challenging texts in first and second languages. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 2*, 201-219.

Cubukcu, F. (2008). Enhancing vocabulary development and reading comprehension through metacognitive strategies. *Issues in Educational Research*, *18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.iier.org.au/iier18/cubukcu.html

Davidson, J. E., & Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Smart problem solving: How metacognition helps. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice* (pp. 47-68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Devine, J. (1993). The role of metacognition in second language reading and writing. In J. G. Carson, & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp.105-127). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Devine, J., Railey, K, & Boshoff, P. (1993). The implications of cognitive models in L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*, 203-225.

Diaz, D. (1985). The process classroom and the adult L2 writer. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Kiziltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes, 24*(2), 253-265.

Duman, B. (2013). *The effect of an ınstructional practice based on metacognition upon teacher trainees academic achievement, metacognitive awareness, achievement motivation and critical thinking* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fırat University, Elazıg.

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

Education First. (2017). *EF EPI- EF English Proficiency Index.* Retrieved form http://www.ef.com/epic

Efklides, A., & Misailidi, P. (2010). Introduction: The present and the future in metacognition. In A. Efklides, & P. Misailidi (Eds.), *Trends and prospects in metacognition research* (pp. 1-18). New York: Springer.

Evans, J. D. (1996). *Straightforward statistics for the behavioral sciences.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 4*(2): 1, 81-92.

Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The nature of intelligence* (pp. 231-235*).* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906-911.

Flavell, J. H. (1981). Cognitive monitoring. In W. P. Dickson (Ed.), *Children's oral communication skills* (pp.35-60). New York: Academic Press.

Flavell, J. H. (1985). *Cognitive development* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Flower, L. (1990). The role of task representation in reading to write. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, & M. Kantz (Eds.), *Reading to write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp. 35–75). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1980). The dynamics of composing: making plans and juggling constraints. In L. Gregg, & E. Sternberg (Eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J.R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 365-387.

Fox, E., & Riconscente, M. (2008). Metacognition and self-regulation in James, Piaget, and Vygotsky. *Educational Psychology Review*, *20*(4), 373-389.

Gabrielatos, C. (2002). EFL writing: product and process. Retrieved from http://www.gabrielatos.com/Writing.pdf

Gama, C. (2001, July). *Helping Students to Help Themselves: A Pilot Experiment on the Ways of Increasing Metacognitive Awareness in Problem Solving.* Paper presented at the CINTEC International Conference. Aveiro, Portugal.

Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Garner, R. (1990). When children and adults do not use learning strategies: Toward a theory of settings. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(4), 517–529. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543060004517

Genc, B., & Bada, E. (2010). English as a world language in academic writing. *Reading, 10*(2), 142-151. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/sept_2010/bilal_genc.pdf

Glaser, R., Schauble, L., Raghavan, K., & Zeitz, C. (1992). Scientific reasoning across different domains. In E. de Corte, M. C. Linn, H. Mandl, & L. Verschaffel (Eds.), *Computer-based learning environments and problem solving* (pp. 345–371). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal*, *39*(2), 188-213.

Gourgey, A. F. (1998). Metacognition in basic skills instruction. *Instructional Science*, *26*, 81-96.

Graham, S. (1997). *Effective language learning: Positive strategies for advanced level language learning*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Graham, S. (2006). Strategy ınstruction and the teaching of writing: A meta-analysis. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 187-207). New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Hebert, M. (2011). *Informing writ- ing: The benefits of formative assessment.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellence in Education.

Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Gregg, L. W., & Steinberg, E. (Eds.). (1980). *Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guven, A. (2011). İlköğretim II. kademe Türkçe Dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri [Teachers' opinions about the Turkish Language Education Programme at second stage of primary school]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*, 121- 132.

Hacker, D. J. (1998). Definitions and empirical foundations. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice* (pp. 1-23). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hacker, D. J., Keener, M. C., & Kircher, J. C. (2009). Writing is applied metacognition. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Handbook of Metacognition in Education* (pp. 154-172). New York and London: Routledge.

Halman, T. (1993). *Yunus Emre Selected Poems*. Ministry of Culture, Ankara.

Harputlu, L., & E. Ceylan. (2014). The effects of motivation and metacognitive strategy use on EFL listening proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 158*, 124–131.

Harris, K. R., Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2010). Metacognition and strategies instruction in writing. In H. S. Waters, & W. Schneider (Eds.), *Metacognition, strategy use, and instruction* (pp. 226-256). New York: London: The Guilford Press.

Hartman, H.J. (2001a). Metacognition in Science teaching and learning. In H.J. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and ınstruction: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 173–201). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Hartman, H.J. (2001b). Teaching metacognitively. In H. J. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and instruction: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 149-172). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy, & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg, & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing: An ınterdisciplinary approach* (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hennessey, M. G. (1999). Probing the dimensions of metacognition: Implications for conceptual change teaching-learning. In *Paper presented at the National Association for Research in Science Technology (NARST).* Boston, MA.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ifenthaler, D. (2012). Determining the effectiveness of prompts for self-regulated learning problem-solving scenarios. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 15*(1), 38-52.

Incecay, G. (2013). Metacognitive online reading strategies applied by EFL students. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 9*(4), 390-407.

Jacobs, J.E., & Paris, S.G. (1987). Children's metacognition about reading: Issues in definition, measurement, and instruction. *Educational Psychologist, 22*(3 & 4), 255-278.

James, W. (1890/91). *The principles of psychology*. New York: Holt.

James, W. (1992). *Writings 1878 – 1899*. New York: The Library of America.

Kantor, K.J. (1984). Classroom contexts and the development of writing intuitions: An ethnographic case study. In R. Beach, & L.S. Bridwell (Eds.), *New directions in composition research* (pp. 72-94). New York: Guilford Press.

Kasper, L.F. (1997). Assessing the metacognitive growth of ESL student writers. *TESL-EJ, 3*(1).

Kelemen, W., Frost, P., & Weawer, C. (2000). Individual differences in metacognition: Evidence against a general metacognitive ability. *Memory and Cognition, 28*, 92–107

Kellogg, R. T. (1994). *The psychology of writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kellogg, R. (1996). A model of working memory in writing. In C. Levy, & S. Ransdell, (Eds.), *The science of writing: theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp.57-72). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kenworthy, R. (2006). Time versus at–home assessment tests: Does time affect quality of second langueage learners' written compositions?. *TESL-EJ, 10*(1), 1-7.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning 42*(2), 183-215.

Kocaman, O., & Beskardesler, S. (2016). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use by English language teaching students in Turkish context: Sakarya University sample. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 6*(2), 254-269.

Kramarski, B. (2004). Making sense of graphs: Does metacognitive instruction make a difference on students' mathematical conceptions and alternative conceptions. *Learning and Instruction*, *14*, 593-619.

Kramarski, B., & Mevarech, Z. R. (2003). Enhancing mathematical reasoning in the classroom: The effects of cooperative learning and metacognitive training. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*, 281–310.

Kramarski, B., Mevarech, Z. R., & Arami, M. (2002). The effects of metacognitive training on solving mathematical authentic tasks. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *49*, 225-250.

Kramarski, B., Mevarech, Z. R., & Liberman, A. (2001). The effects of multilevel versus unilevel metacognitive training on mathematical reasoning. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *94*(5), 292-300.

Krashen, S. (1977). Some issues relating to the monitor model. In H. Brown, C.Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '77: *Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice* (pp. 144-158). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Kuhn, D. (2000). Metacognitive Development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*, 178–181.

Kuhn, D., & Dean, D. (2004). Metacognition: A bridge between cognitive psychology and educational practice. *Theory into Practice, 43*, 268-273. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4304_4

Lai, E. R. (2011). Metacognition: A literature review. *Pearson Research Reports*. Retrieved from http://www.pearsonassessments.com/

Leki, I. (2001). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies,1*, 197–209.

Li, L., & Larkin, S. (2017). The role of metacognition in the success of reading and writing tasks across cultures. Retrieved from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/Pub_ELTRA_H094_Role_of_Metacognition.pdf.

Liu, X.L., & Goh C. (2006). Improving second language listening: awareness and involvement. In T.S.C. Farrell (Ed.), *Language teacher research in Asia* (pp. 91-106). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Livingston, J.A. (2003). Metacognition: An overview. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED474273).

Lu, Y. L. (2010). Inner city children's graphics call for social justice. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 3*(3), 11-19.

Maftoon, P., Birjandi, P., & Farahian, M. (2014). Investigating Iranian EFL learners' writing metacognitive awareness. *Journal of Research Studies in Education, 3*(5), 37-51.

Mareschal, C. (2007). *Students' perception of a self- regulatory approach to second language listening comprehension development.* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Ottawa, CAN.

Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American teacher in China. *College English, 47*(8), 789-808.

Mayer, E. R. (1998). Cognitive, metacognitive and motivational aspects of problem solving. *Instructional Science*, *26*, 49-63.

McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation and standards. In McKay, S. & Hornberger, N. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 3-46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mevarech, Z. R., & Karmarski, B. (1997). Improve: A multidimensional method for teaching Mathematics in heterogeneous classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(2), 365-394.

Mohan, B.A., & Lo, W.A. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 515-534.

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

MoNE (MEB) Website. (2018). English Language Curriculum (2-8 grades). Retrieved on October 8, 2018, from  http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=327

MoNE (MEB) Website. (2018). English Language Curriculum (9-12 grades). Retrieved on October 8, 2018, from http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=342

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ, 6 (2)*, 1-20.

Nelson, T. O. (1999). Cognition versus metacognition, In: P. J. Sternberg (Ed.),  *The nature of cognition* (pp. 625–641).  Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nelson, T. O., & Narens, L. (1994). Why investigate metacognition? In J. Metcalfe, & A. P. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing* (pp. 1–25). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nunan, D. (1989*). Understanding language classroom*. U.K.: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (2000). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers.* Open University of Hong Kong Press.

Oktay, A. (2015). Foreign language teaching: A problem in Turkish education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174*, 584-593.

Olinghouse, N. G., & Santangelo,  T.  (2010). Assessing the writing of struggling learners. *Focus On Exceptional Children, 43*(4), 1-27.

Olinghouse, N. G., & Wilson, J. (2013). The relationship between vocabulary and writing quality in three genres. *Reading and Writing, 26*, 45-65

O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2013). *Longman Academic Writing Series, Level 4: Essays* (5th ed). Hoboken, NJ: Pearson Education.

Panahandeh E., & Esfandiari Asl S. (2014). The effect of planning and monitoring as metacognitive strategies on Iranian EFL learners' argumentative writing accuracy. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1409 – 1416.

Paris, S.G., & Winograd, P. (1990). How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. In B.F. Jones, & L. Idol (Eds.), *Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction* (pp. 15- 51). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Piaget, J. (1969). *The child's conception of time*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Piaget, J. (1970). *Structuralism*. New York: Basic Books.

Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent. The future of education*. New York: Grossman Publishers.

Piaget, J. (1976). *The grasp of consciousness: Action and concept in the young child.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pintrich, P.R. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory into Practice, 41*(4), 219-225.

Porte, G. (1996). When writing fails: How academic context and past learning experiences shape revision. *System, 24*,107-116.

Pressley, M., & Gaskins, I. (2006). Metacognitively competent reading comprehension is constructively responsive reading: How can such reading be developed in students? *Metacognition and Learning*, *1*, 99-113.

Pressley, M., & Harris, K. R. (2006) Cognitive strategies instruction: From basic research to classroom instruction. In P. A. Alexander, & P. Winnie (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 54-66). New York: Guilford Press.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly 19* (2), 229-258.

Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning, 37*(3), 439-468.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25* (3), 407-430.

Ransdell, S., & Barbier, M.-L. (2002). An introduction to new directions for research in L2 writing. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 1–10). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Razi, S. (2014). Metacognitive reading strategy training of advanced level EFL learners in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix,14*(2), 337-358.

Reinfried, M. (2000). Can radical constructivism achieve a viable basis for foreign language teaching?—A refutation of the "Wolff-Wendt" theorem. Retrieved from http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic20/marcus/8_2000.html

Resnick, L. (1989). *Knowing, learning and instruction: Essays in honor of R. Glaser.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reynolds, R. E. (1992). Selective attention and prose learning: Theoretical and empirical research. *Educational Psychology Review*, *4*, 345-391.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2003). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. (3rd ed.).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roca De Larios, J. , Murphy, L. ,& Marin, J. (2002). A critical examination of L2 writing process research. In S. Ransdell, & M. L. Barbier (Eds.), New *Directions for Research in L2 Writing*, (pp. 11 -47). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Rose, M. (1985). *When a writer can't write*. New York: Guilford Press.

Ruan, Z. (2005). A metacognitive perspective on the growth of self-regulated EFL student writers. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics*, *8*, 175-202.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning, 46*(1), 137-174.

Saricoban, A., & Behjoo, B.M. (2017). Metacognitive awareness of Turkish EFL learners on reading strategies. *Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences, 21*(1), 159-172.

Schoenfeld, A. H. (1992). Learning to think mathematically: Problem solving, metacognition, and sense-making in mathematics. In D. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook for research on Mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 334-370). New York: MacMillan.

Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. *Instructional Science*, *26*, 113–125.

Schraw, G. (2001). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. In H.J. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and instruction* (pp. 3-16). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *19*, 460-475.

Schraw, G., Dunkle, M. E., Bendixen, L. D., & Roedel, T. D. (1995). Does a general monitoring skill exist? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *87*, 433–444.

Schraw, G., & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review, 7*(4), 351- 371.

Schraw, G., & Nietfeld, J. (1998). A further test of the general monitoring skill hypothesis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *90*, 236-248.

Scott, B. M., & Levy, M. G. (2013). Metacognition: Examining the components of a fuzzy concept. *Educational Research, 2*(2), 120–131.

Selfe, C. (1985). An apprehensive writer composes. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write* (pp. 83-95). New York: Guilford Press.

Silva, T. (1992). L1 vs L2 writing: ESL graduate students' perceptions. *TESL Canada Journal*, *10*(1), 27-47. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v10i1.610

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 657-677.

Steele, V. (2004). Product and process writing. Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.english.org.uk/think/write/ approaches.html.

Taber, K.S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha When developing and reporting research instruments in Science education. *Research in Science Education, 48*(6), 1273–1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2

Temur, T., & Bahar, Ö. (2011). Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies of Turkish learners who learn English as a foreign language. *European Journal of Educational Studies, 3*(2), 421-427.

Tokdemir Demirel, E. (2017). Detection of common errors in Turkish EFL students' writing through a corpus analytic approach. *English Language Teaching, 10*(10), 159-178. Retrieved from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/70748.

Turan, S. (2009). *Relationships among problem-based learning related attitudes, learning skills and achievement* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Vandergrift, L. (2002). It is nice to see that our predictions were right: Developing metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, 555-575.

Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching*, *40*, 191-210.

Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. M. (2011). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Clifton, NJ: Routledge.

Vann, R. J., & Abraham, R. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(2), 177-198.

Veenman, M. V. J. (2005). The assessment of metacognitive skills: What can be learned from multi method designs? In C. Artelt, & B. Moschner (Eds), *Lernstrategien und Metakognition: Implikationen fu¨r Forschung und Praxis* (pp. 75–97). Berlin: Waxmann.

Veenman, M. V. J., Elshout, J. J., & Busato, V. V. (1994). Metacognitive mediation in learning with computer-based simulations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *10*, 93–106.

Veenman, M. V. J., Elshout, J. J., & Meijer, J. (1997). The generality vs. domain-specificity of metacognitive skills in novice learning across domains. *Learning and Instruction*, *7*, 187–209.

Veenman, M. V. J., Hout-Wolters, B.H.A.M. & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning*, *1*, 3–14.

Veenman, M. V. J., Kok, R. & Kuilenburg, J. (2001). Intelligence and metacognitive skillfulness in secondary education. In F. Oser, & U. Baets (Eds.), *9th European Conference on Learning and Instruction, Abstract Volume* (pp. 166). Aachen: Mainz.

Veenman, M. V. J., Prins, F. J., & Verheij, J. (2003). Learning styles: Self-reports versus thinking aloud measures. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *73*, 357–372.

Veenman, M. V. J., & Spaans, M. A. (2005). Relation between intellectual and metacognitive skills: Age and task differences. *Learning and Individual Differences, 15*, 159–176.

Veenman, M. V. J., & Verheij, J. (2003). Identifying technical students at risk: Relating general versus specific metacognitive skills to study success. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *13*, 259–272.

Veenman, M. V. J., Wilhelm, P., & Beishuizen, J. J. (2004). The relation between intellectual and metacognitive skills from a developmental perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, *14*, 89–109.

Victori, M. (1995). *EFL writing knowledge and strategies: An integrative study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Departamento de Filologia Inglesa, Universitat Aut6noma de Barcelona.

Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, *27*, 537-555.

Victori, M., & Lockhart. W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System 23*, 2, 223–234.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1990). What influences learning? A content analysis of review literature. *Journal of Educational Research, 84,* 30–43.

Wenden, A. (1987). Metacognition: An expanded view on the cognitive abilities of L2 learners. *Language learning, 37*(4), 573-597.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. London: Prentice-Hall International.

Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(4), 515–537.

Wong, H., & Storey, P. (2006). Knowing and doing in the ESL writing class. *Language Awareness*, *15*, 283-301.

Wu, H. (2008). A longitudinal study of metacognition in EFL writing of Chinese university students. *CELEA Journal, 31*. Retrieved from http://www.celea.org.cn/teic/78/08070225.pdf

Wu, Y. (2008). A comparison of metacognitive knowledge between successful and unsuccessful EFL writers in China. *Journal of Huainan Normal University, 10*(52), 115-120.

Wu, Y., Li, Y., & Xie, B. (2008). On the comparison and development of metacognitive strategies between EFL writers of university freshmen and senior high school students. *Journal of West Anhui University, 24*(6), 99-102.

Xiao, Y. (2016). *An exploratory investigation into the metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive strategies of university EFL writers in China* (Published doctoral dissertation).  New York University, New York.

Yang, X. H., & Zhang, W.P. (2002). The correlation between metacognition and EFL reading comprehension of Chinese college students. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 34*(3), 213-218.

Yıldırım, A. & Simsek, H. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

You, Y. L., & Joe, S. G. (2001). Investigating the metacognitive awareness and strategies of English-majored university student writers. *The Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on English Teaching,* 106-119. Taipei: Crane Publishing.

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

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(2), 165-187.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(4), 697-715.

Zhang, L. J. (2010). A dynamic metacognitive systems account of Chinese university students' knowledge about EFL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44*, 320-353.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13–39). San Diego: Academic Press.a

Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*, 845-62.

Zimmerman, B.J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22*, 73-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919

**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Ethics Approval Document**

<div align="center">

ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN ETİK KURULLARI
(Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma ve Yayın Etik Kurulu)
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

</div>

**OTURUM TARİHİ**
27 Nisan 2018

**OTURUM SAYISI**
2018-04

**KARAR NO 12:** Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'nden alınan Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Esra ÇAM'ın "Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında uygulanacak anket sorularının değerlendirilmesine geçildi.

Yapılan görüşmeler sonunda; Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Esra ÇAM'ın "Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında uygulanacak anket sorularının, fikri, hukuki ve telif hakları bakımından metot ve ölçeğine ilişkin sorumluluğu başvurucuya ait olmak üzere uygun olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verildi.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet YÜCE
Kurul Başkanı

**Appendix B: Survey Application Permit Document**

T.C.
YALOVA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

Sayı : 47657700-000-E.1800016390                    05/06/2018
Konu : Uygulama İzni hk.

REKTÖRLÜK MAKAMINA

İlgi : Uludağ Üniversitesi Rektörlüğünün 30.05.2018 tarihli ve 26468960-044/19763 sayılı yazısı.

İlgi yazıya istinaden Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Esra ÇAM'ın tez çalışmasını Yüksekokulumuzda yapması uygun bulunmuştur.

Gereğini bilgilerinize arz ederim.

*e-imzalıdır*

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mehmet Ali UĞUR
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Müdürü

Belge Doğrulamak İçin: http://ubs.yalova.edu.tr/ERMS/Record/ConfirmationPage/Index adresinden 4MC4EFT kodu girerek belgeyi doğrulayabilirsiniz.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adres : Bahçelievler Mahallesi Çınarcık Yolu Caddesi 77100 YALOVA | Bilgi İçin İrtibat : | Teslime Çınar - Yüksekokul Sekreteri V. |
| | Telefon : | (0 226) 8150000 |
| | Belgegeçer No : | |
| e-posta : teslime.ekici@yalova.edu.tr | İnternet Adresi : | |

1800016390 numaralı belge, 5070 sayili Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. maddesi geregince Mehmet Ali Uur tarafından 05.06.2018 tarihinde güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

**Appendix C: Informed Consent Form**

<div align="center">BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ GÖNÜLLÜ ONAM FORMU</div>

**1.** Araştırmayla İlgili Bilgiler

Sizi *Öğr. Gör. Esra ÇAM* tarafından yürütülen *"Üstbilişsel Bilgi ve Stratejilerin İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerin Yazma Başarılarındaki Rolü"* başlıklı araştırmaya davet ediyoruz. Söz konusu çalışma İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen üst orta seviye (upper-intermediate / B2) Türk öğrencilerin halihazırdaki üsbilişsel bilgi ve strateji kullanımı ile yabancı dilde yazma başarıları arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma yüksek lisans tez çalışmasıdır. Araştırmaya sizin dışınızda tahminen 150 kişi katılacaktır. Anketlerin cevaplanması yaklaşık olarak 40 dakika sürmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen **gönüllülük** esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı veya telkini altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir. Ancak, çalışmaya **katılmama** veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir **anda çalışmayı bırakma** hakkına da sahipsiniz. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup kişisel bilgileriniz **gizli tutulacaktır**; ancak verileriniz yayın amacı ile kullanılabilir. Eğer araştırmanın amacı ile ilgili verilen bu bilgiler dışında şimdi veya sonra daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyaç duyarsanız araştırmacıya şimdi sorabilir veya *esra.cam@yalova.edu.tr* e-posta adresi ve *0226 815 56 70* numaralı telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.

**2.** Çalışmaya Katılım Onayı

Yukarıda yer alan ve araştırmadan önce araştırmacının kendisi tarafından sözlü olarak yapılan açıklamaları, katılmam istenen çalışmanın kapsamını ve amacını, gönüllü olarak üzerime düşen sorumlulukları anladım. Çalışma hakkında yazılı ve sözlü açıklama araştırmacı tarafından yapıldı. Bana, çalışmanın muhtemel riskleri ve faydaları sözlü olarak da anlatıldı. Kişisel bilgilerimin özenle korunacağı konusunda yeterli güven verildi.

Bu koşullarda söz konusu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve telkin olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

| Katılımcının Adı-Soyadı | İmza | Anketlerden sonra gerçekleştirilecek mülakata katılım durumu |
|---|---|---|
| | | Evet □   Hayır □ |

<div align="right">Araştırmacının</div>

<div align="right">Adı-Soyadı: Esra ÇAM</div>
<div align="right">İmzası</div>

# Appendix D: Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing Survey (MKWS) (English Version)

**Name-Surname:**
**Gender:**
**Age:**
**Department:**

1. **I have been learning English for about ___ years.**
2. **When compared with my friends, my writing proficiency in English is considered to be:**

   **a.** very low    **b.** low    **c.** below average    **d.** above average    **e.** high    **f.** very high

3. **My motivation to improve my English writing is:**

   **a.** very low    **b.** low    **c.** below average    **d.** above average    **e.** high    **f.** very high

4. **On average, I spend approximately ___ hours a week on practicing my English writing.**

5. **On average, I spend approximately ___ hours a week on reading English articles and books.**
**Instructions:**

| This survey is designed for learners of English as a foreign language. You are going to read statements about your writing skills. Please describe each of these statements on a scale going from 1. 'Never true of me', 2. 'Usually not true of me', 3.'Somewhat not true of me' 4. 'Somewhat true of me', 5. 'Usually true of me', 6. 'Always true of me'. Your descriptions should be based on what you do while writing not on how you should do or what others do. Please do not think too much about the statements. Give your descriptions as quickly as possible, without spending too much time and carefully. This survey takes around 15-20 minutes to finish. Thank you for attending. | 1= Never true of me | 2= Usually not true of me | 3= Somewhat not true of me | 4= Somewhat true of me | 5= Usually true of me | 6=Always true of me |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### Section I - Learners' self-knowledge as writers or person variables

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I am very interested in English writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. I find English writing very challenging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. My purpose of learning English writing is to pass English exams. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. I am quite aware of my English writing competence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. I am quite aware of how much I know about English writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. I know a lot about English writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. I am well aware of some grading rubrics that my writing instructor uses to grade my English argumentative essays. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. When writing, I am able to use various writing techniques (i.e. using synonyms and transitional words). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. When writing, I am able to use appropriate writing strategies (i.e. outlining and drafting). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. I am able to predict the writing problems that I may have during writing before I start writing an essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. I am well aware of my strengths in English writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. I am well aware of my weaknesses in English writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

### Section II - Knowledge about the nature of the cognitive task at hand or task variables

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. I think it is very important to understand the requirements of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. It is easy for me to understand the requirements of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. I usually set up my writing goals based on the requirements of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. I write according to the genre (i.e. , argumentative, cause-effect, compare-contrast, process) of an essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17. I use my knowledge of English discourse (i.e. , thesis statement, topic sentences, coherence, transitional words) to complete a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. I have a strong awareness of my readers and my communication with them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. I know I need to develop the content of an essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. I know I need to organize my ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. I have difficulty in generating ideas while writing a task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. I have difficulty in finding examples to support my ideas while writing a task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. My challenges in completing a writing task are grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. My challenge in completing a writing task is my lack of writing strategies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Section III - Knowledge about appropriate writing strategies for achieving cognitive goals, or strategy variables**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. I usually come up with ideas in Turkish before I translate them into English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 26. I usually think in English when I write English essays. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27. I tackle the problems that I encounter during the writing process with appropriate remedial strategies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 28. When writing an argumentative essay, I consider the views from both sides of the argument. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 29. My composing process is usually like this: analyzing the writing prompt, generating ideas, planning, outlining, drafting, revising and editing.. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30. Based on the situation, I would repeat one or more of the above writing steps to revise my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 31. When writing, I pay more attention to the content development of my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 32. When writing, I pay more attention to the organization of my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 33. When writing, I pay *more* attention to the grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34. I highly value the planning before writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 35. I think outlining and drafting are very helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. I think after finishing writing, revising is necessary. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. I mainly revise the content of my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. I mainly revise the organization of my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 39. I mainly revise the grammar, vocabulary, and spelling of my essays. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 40. When revising, I check if my viewpoints are convincing enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 41.  When revising, I check if the meaning of the sentences and the whole essay are clear enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 42. When revising, I check if my examples are specific enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 43. When revising, I check if my language is concise enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 44. I think I am able to monitor the whole process of my writing effectively. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 45. To improve my writing, I think the key is to improve my grammar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 46. To improve my writing, I think the key is to memorize more vocabulary. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 47. To improve my writing, I think the key is to read more English essays (including model essays). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 48. To improve my writing, I think the key is to write as many English essays as possible. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 49. Previously, I knew very little about the English writing knowledge mentioned in this survey. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 50. I think the English writing knowledge mentioned in this survey is very helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

# Appendix E: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Bilgi Anketi (Turkish Version)

**Öğrencinin;**
**Adı-Soyadı:**
**Cinsiyeti:**
**Yaşı:**
**Bölümü:**

1. **Yaklaşık ___ yıldır İngilizce eğitimi almaktayım.**
2. **Sınıf arkadaşlarımla kendimi kıyasladığımda, İngilizce dilinde yazma yeterliliğim:**

a. çok düşük     b. düşük     c. ortalamanın altında     d. ortalamanın üstünde     e. yüksek     f. çok yüksek

3. **İngilizce yazma becerimi geliştirmek için motivasyonum:**

a. çok düşük     b. düşük     c. ortalamanın altında     d. ortalamanın üstünde     e. yüksek     f. çok yüksek

4. **İngilizce yazma becerimi geliştirmek için haftada ortalama olarak tahminen ___ saat pratik yapıyorum.**

5. **Bir haftada ortalama olarak tahminen___ saat İngilizce makale ve kitap okumaya ayırıyorum.**

**Yönergeler**:

| Bu anket İngilizce'yi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenenler için hazırlanmıştır. Bu envanterde İngilizce yazma becerinize ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar doğru ya da geçerli olduğunu, derecelendirmeye bakarak, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6' dan birini yazınız. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Maddeler üzerinde çok fazla düşünmeyiniz. Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 15-20 dk. alır. Katılımınız için teşekkürler. | 1= Hiçbir zaman doğru değil | 2= Genellikle doğru değil | 3= Bazen doğru değil | 4= Bazen doğru | 5= Genellikle doğru | 6= Her zaman doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Bölüm I - Öğrencilerin yazar olarak kendini tanıma düzeyleri, ya da kişi değişkenleri**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. İngilizce yazı yazmaya çok ilgim var. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. İngilizce yazı yazmayı çok zorlayıcı bulurum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. İngilizce yazı yazmayı öğrenmedeki amacım İngilizce sınavlarımı geçmektir. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. İngilizce yazı yazma yeterliğimin oldukça farkındayım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. İngilizce yazı yazma konusunda ne kadar bilgi sahibi olduğumun oldukça farkındayım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. İngilizce yazı yazma hakkında çok şey biliyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. İngilizce tartışma yazılarını (argumentative essay) değerlendirmek için kullanılan bazı puanlama yönergelerinden (grading rubrics) haberdarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Yazarken çeşitli yazma tekniklerini kullanabilirim. (ör: eş anlamlı sözcüklerin ve geçiş kelimelerinin kullanımı) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. Yazarken uygun yazma stratejilerini kullanabilirim. (ör: anahat belirleme 'outlining' ve taslak oluşturma 'drafting') | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazma sürecinde karşılaşabileceğim problemleri öngörebilirim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. İngilizce yazı yazma konusunda güçlü yanlarımın oldukça farkındayım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. İngilizce yazı yazma konusunda zayıf yanlarımın oldukça farkındayım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Bölüm II - Söz konusu bilişsel ödevin yapısı hakkında bilgi veya ödev değişkenleri**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Bana göre bir yazma ödevinin gerekliliklerini anlamak çok önemlidir. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. Benim için bir yazma ödevinin gerekliliklerini anlamak kolaydır. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. Yazım hedeflerimi genellikle yazma ödevimin gerekleri doğrultusunda belirlerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. Yazının türüne (tartışma 'argumentative' , neden sonuç 'cause-effect', süreç ' | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| process') uygun olarak yazarım. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. Bir yazma ödevini tamamlamak için İngilizce söylem kurallarına (i.e. , thesis statement 'tez cümlesi, topic sentences 'konu cümlesi', coherence 'tutarlık, bütünlük', transitional words 'geçiş sözcükleri') dair bilgilerimi kullanırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. Okurlarıma ve onlarla olan iletişimime dair güçlü bir farkındalığım var. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. Bir yazının içeriğini geliştirmem gerektiğini biliyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. Fikirlerimi organize etmem gerektiğini biliyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirirken fikir üretmekte zorluk yaşarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirirken fikirlerimi destekleyecek örnekler bulmada sorun yaşarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirirken zorluk yaşadığım alanlar dilbilgisi, kelime bilgisi ve yazım kurallarıdır. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirirken karşılaştığım zorluk yazma stratejilerinden yoksun olmamdır. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Bölüm III - Bilişsel hedefleri gerçekleştirmek için gerekli olan uygun yazma stratejileri bilgisi ya da strateji değişkenleri**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. Genellikle fikirlerimi Türkçe üretip İngilizceye çeviririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 26. İngilizce yazı yazarken genellikle İngilizce düşünürüm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27. Yazma sürecinde karşılaştığım problemleri uygun düzeltici/iyileştirici stratejiler kullanarak çözerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 28. Tartışma yazısı (argumentative essay) yazarken,  konuyu her iki açıdan da ele alırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 29. Yazma sürecim genellikle şöyledir: verilen yazma konusunu analiz etme, fikir üretme, planlama, ana hat oluşturma, taslak hazırlama ve gözden geçirme-düzeltme. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30. Duruma göre, yazımı gözden geçirmek için bir önceki maddede belirtilen yazma aşamalarından bir ya da daha fazlasını tekrar ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 31. Yazarken, yazımın içerik gelişimine daha çok önem veririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 32. Yazarken, yazımın organizasyonuna (tez cümlesi ve konu cümleleri yazma, giriş, gelişme ve sonuç paragrafları yazma, uyum, tutarlık, bağlaç kullanımı vs.) daha çok önem veririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 33. Yazarken, *daha çok* dilbilgisi, kelime bilgisi ve yazım kurallarına önem veririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34. Yazmaya başlamadan önce planlamaya çok önem veririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 35. Bana göre, anahat oluşturma (outlining) ve taslak hazırlama (drafting) çok faydalıdır. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. Bana göre, yazmayı bitirdikten sonra gözden geçirmek gereklidir. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. Ağırlıklı olarak yazımın içeriğini gözden geçiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. Ağırlıklı olarak yazımın organizasyonunu gözden geçiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 39. Ağırlıklı olarak yazımda dilbilgisi, kelime bilgisi ve yazım kurallarını gözden geçiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 40. Gözden geçirme aşamasında, görüşlerimin yeterince ikna edici olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 41.  Gözden geçirme aşamasında, cümlelerimin anlamının ve yazımın tamamının yeterince anlaşılır olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 42. Gözden geçirme aşamasında, örneklerimin yeterince konuya özgü olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 43. Gözden geçirme aşamasında, kullandığım dilin yeterince açık ve net olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 44. Bana göre, tüm yazma sürecimi etkili olarak gözlemleyebilirim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 45. Yazımı geliştirmek için, çözümün dilbilgisi yeterliğimi geliştirmek olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 46. Yazımı geliştirmek için, çözümün daha çok kelime ezberlemek olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 47. Yazımı geliştirmek için, çözümün daha çok İngilizce yazı (örnek yazılar da dahil olmak üzere) okumak olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 48. Yazımı geliştirmek için, çözümün mümkün olduğunca çok sayıda İngilizce yazı yazmak olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 49. Daha önce, bu araştırmada belirtilen İngilizce yazma bilgisine dair çok az şey biliyordum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 50. Bu araştırmada belirtilen İngilizce yazma bilgisinin çok faydalı olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## Appendix F: Metacognitive Strategies of Writing Survey (MSWS) (English Version)

**Instructions:**

| | 1= Never true of me | 2= Usually not true of me | 3= Somewhat not true of me | 4= Somewhat true of me | 5= Usually true of me | 6=Always  true of me |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This survey is designed for learners of English as a foreign language. You are going to read statements about your writing skills. Please describe each of these statements on a scale going from 1. 'Never true of me', 2. 'Usually not true of me', 3.'Somewhat not true of me' 4. 'Somewhat true of me', 5. 'Usually true of me', 6. 'Always true of me'. Your descriptions should be based on what you do while writing not on how you should do or what others do. Please do not think too much about the statements.  Give your descriptions as quickly as possible, without spending too much time and carefully. This survey takes around 15-20 minutes to finish.  Thank you for attending. | | | | | | |

### Section I - Planning

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Before writing, I pay attention to the genre (i.e. , argumentative, cause-effect, compare-contrast, process) of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Before writing, I pay attention to the purpose (i.e. , to express opinion, to inform, etc.) of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. Before writing, I pay attention to the audience (i.e. , my instructor or advisor, my classmates, general public...etc.) of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. Before writing, I pay attention to specific parts of the language (i.e. , the wording and grammar) of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. Before writing, I set up my goals based on the requirement of a writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. Before writing, I make plans for achieving my goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. Before writing, I consciously recall the model essays related to the writing prompt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Before writing, I consciously recall the template pertaining to the writing prompt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. Before writing, I seldom recall the knowledge pertaining to the writing prompt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Before writing, I seldom recall the contexts pertaining to the writing prompt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Before writing, I consciously recall the words and sentences relevant to the writing prompt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. Before writing, I consciously generate new ideas for writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. Before writing, I seldom make plans for organizing and arranging the content of my essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. Before writing an argumentative essay, I first decide upon the thesis statement of the essay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. Before writing, I seldom consider my thesis statement from both sides of an argument (critical thinking). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. Before writing, I outline the topic sentence of each paragraph. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17. Before writing, I come up with examples to support each one of my viewpoints. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

### Section II - Monitoring

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. When writing, I check to see if my essay meets the requirements of the writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. When writing, I monitor my awareness of the audience. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. When writing, I check to see if the content of my essay is relevant to the topic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. When writing, I seldom check to see if the organization of my essay is logical. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. When writing, I seldom check to see if the language of my essay is clear enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. When writing, I check to see if my word usage is accurate enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. When writing, I check to see if my grammar is correct. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 25. When writing, I seldom check to see if my sentence structures vary a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 26. When writing, I seldom adjust my writing plan. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27. When writing, I try to identify my problems and my deficits during the process of writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 28. When writing, I seldom check to see if my writing strategies are effective enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 29. When writing, I seldom think about what writing strategies I should employ. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30. When writing, I seldom think about when or where to employ writing strategies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Section III - Evaluating**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. After finishing writing, I <u>seldom</u> self-evaluate the content of my essay to see if any addition or deletion is needed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 32. After finishing writing, I mainly focus on self-evaluating the accuracy of my grammar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 33. After finishing writing, I self-evaluate my use of words to see if they vary a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34. After finishing writing, I <u>seldom</u> self-evaluate the organization of my essay to see if it is clear enough. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 35. After finishing writing, I self-evaluate my essay holistically to see if it achieves the goals of the writing task. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. Based on the results of self-evaluation, I repeat the recursive composing process of "compose and revise, revise and compose". | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. Previously, I knew <u>very little</u> about the English writing strategies mentioned in this survey. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. I think the English writing strategies mentioned in this survey is very helpful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## Appendix G: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Stratejiler Anketi (Turkish Version)

**Yönergeler:**

| | 1= Hiçbir zaman doğru değil | 2= Genellikle doğru değil | 3= Bazen doğru değil | 4= Bazen doğru | 5= Genellikle doğru | 6= Her zaman doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bu anket İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenenler için hazırlanmıştır. Bu envanterde İngilizce yazma becerinize ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar doğru ya da geçerli olduğunu, derecelendirmeye bakarak, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6' dan birini yazınız. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Maddeler üzerinde çok fazla düşünmeyiniz. Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 15-20 dakika. alır. Katılımınız için teşekkürler. | | | | | | |

### Bölüm I - Planlama

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen yazma ödevinin yazı türüne (tartışma 'argumentative' , neden sonuç 'cause-effect', süreç ' process') dikkat ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen yazma ödevinin amacına (fikir belirtmek, bilgi vermek vs.) dikkat ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazma ödevinin okuyucu kitlesine (öğretmenim, danışmanım, arkadaşlarım, genel halk vs.) dikkat ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazma ödevinin dilinin belirli yapılarına (ifade tarzı, cümle yapısı, dilbilgisi) dikkat ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazma ödevinin gerekliklerine bağlı olarak hedeflerimi belirlerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, hedeflerimi gerçekleştirebilmek için plan yaparım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen ödevle ilgili örnek yazıları bilinçli bir şekilde aklıma getiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen ödevin konusuna özgü şablonu bilinçli bir şekilde hatırlarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen ödevin konusuna özgü bilgiyi <u>nadiren</u> hatırlarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, verilen ödevin konusuna özgü bağlamları/durumları <u>nadiren</u> hatırlarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazma ödevinin konusuyla ilgili sözcükleri ve cümleleri bilinçli bir şekilde hatırlarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, bilinçli bir şekilde yeni fikirler üretirim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, yazımın içeriğini organize etmek ve düzenlemek için <u>nadiren</u> plan yaparım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. "Tartışma yazısı (argumentative essay) yazmadan önce, ilk olarak yazımın tez cümlesine (thesis statement) karar veririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. Yazmaya başlamadan önce, tez cümlemdeki argümanı iki taraflı olarak <u>nadiren</u> düşünürüm (eleştirel düşünme). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. Yazmadan önce, her bir paragrafın konu cümlesini (topic sentences) ana hatlarıyla belirlerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17. Yazmadan önce, her bir görüşümü destekleyecek örnekler bulurum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

### Bölüm II - İzleme

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. Yazarken, yazımın ödevin gerekliliklerini yerine getirip getirmediğini kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. Yazarken, okuyucu kitleme dair farkındalığımı denetlerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. Yazarken, yazımın içeriğinin konuyla ilgili olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. Yazarken, yazımın organizasyonunun mantıklı olup olmadığını <u>nadiren</u> kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. Yazarken, yazımda kullandığım dilin yeterine anlaşılır olup olmadığını <u>nadiren</u> kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. Yazarken, sözcük kullanımımın yeterince doğru olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. Yazarken, dilbilgisi kullanımımın doru olup olmadığını kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| 25. Yazarken, kullandığım cümle yapılarının çok çeşitlilik gösterip göstermediğini <u>nadiren</u> kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. Yazarken, <u>nadiren</u> yazma planıma uygun hareket ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27. Yazarken, yazma sürecimdeki kusur ve eksiklerimi tespit etmeye çalışırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 28. Yazarken, yazma stratejilerimin yeterince etkili olup olmadığını <u>nadiren</u> kontrol ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 29. Yazarken, hangi yazma stratejilerini kullanmam gerektiğiyle ilgili <u>nadiren</u> düşünürüm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30. Yazarken, yazma stratejilerini ne zaman ve nerede kullanacağımı <u>nadiren</u> düşünürüm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**Bölüm III - Öz-değerlendirme**

| 31. Yazmayı bitirdikten sonra, herhangi bir ekleme ya da çıkarmanın gerekli olup olmadığını anlamak için yazımın içeriğini kendim <u>nadiren</u> değerlendiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Yazmayı bitirdikten sonra, ağırlıklı olarak dilbilgisi yapılarının doğruluğunu değerlendirmeye odaklanırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 33. Yazmayı bitirdikten sonra, kullandığım kelimelerimin çok çeşitlilik gösterip göstermediğini kendi kendime değerlendiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34. Yazmayı bitirdikten sonra, yazımın yeterince anlaşılır olup olmadığını görmek için organizasyonu kendim nadiren değerlendiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 35. Yazmayı bitirdikten sonra, yazma ödevinin hedeflerini yerine getirip getirmediğini görmek için yazımı bir bütün olarak kendim değerlendiririm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 36. Öz-değerlendirme sonuçlarına bağlı olarak, tekrar eden yazma sürecini "yazma ve gözden geçirme, gözden geçirme ve yazma" şeklinde tekrarlarım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37. Önceden, bu araştırmada bahsedilen İngilizce yazma stratejileri hakkında <u>çok az</u> şey biliyordum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38. Bu çalışmada belirtilen yazma stratejilerinin çok faydalı olduğunu düşünüyorum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## Appendix H: Retrospective Interview Questions (English Version)

**Set A: Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing**

**Self-Knowledge as a Writer**

1.  Have you ever had an experience that you felt successful as a writer? Describe this experience in as much detail as possible. What were the task, the assignment, and the circumstance? What factors helped you to become a successful writer?

2.  Have you ever had an experience that you felt unsuccessful as a writer? Describe this experience in as much detail as possible. What were the task, the assignment, and the circumstance? What factors caused you to become an unsuccessful writer?

3.  What are your strengths and weaknesses as a writer? What experiences have led you to believe that you have these strengths and weaknesses?

**Metacognitive Awareness of Writing Tasks**

4.  How would you decide the goals of a writing task?

5.  In your opinion, in general, what makes good writing?

6.  How would you decide if your writing is effective or not?

**Metacognitive Awareness of Strategies**

7.  How do you usually go about completing a writing task?

8.  When you are writing, what are the types of difficulties that you encounter?

9.  What do you do when you have trouble writing?

**Set B: Metacognitive Strategies of Writing**

1.  Could you describe in general the whole process that you took to write an argumentative essay from beginning to end?

2.  What did you do in your outline? And, what kind of things did you plan?

3.  How did you develop your thesis statement and specific details for your essay?

4.  Did you encounter any difficulties when you were writing an argumentative essay? What were they?

5.  Did you do anything to monitor your writing? Or did you do anything to make sure that your vocabulary was right, or did you do anything to make sure that you were on topic, that you were holding to the thesis? How?

6.  What did you do after you wrote the whole argumentative essay?

7.  How did you evaluate your own essay? Are you happy with your writing?

*If yes*, what made you happy about your writing?
*If no,* what are the causes of your failure?

## Appendix I: Geriye Dönük Röportaj Soruları (Turkish Version)

**Bölüm I: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Bilgi**

**Yazar Olarak Kendini Tanıma**

1. Bir yazar olarak kendinizi başarılı hissettiğiniz bir deneyiminiz oldu mu? Bu deneyimi mümkün olduğunca detaylı bir şekilde tarif ediniz. Görev, ödev ve durum neydi? Sizce, başarılı olmanızı sağlayan faktörler nelerdi?

2. Bir yazar olarak kendinizi başarısız hissettiğiniz bir deneyiminiz oldu mu? Bu deneyimi mümkün olduğunca detaylı bir şekilde tarif ediniz. Görev, ödev ve durum neydi? Sizce, başarısız olmanıza sebep olan faktörler nelerdi?

3. Bir yazar olarak güçlü ve zayıf yönleriniz nelerdir? Size bu zayıf ve güçlü yönlere sahip olduğunuzu düşündüren deneyimler nelerdir?

**Yazma Ödevlerinin Üstbilişsel Farkındalığı**

4. Bir yazma ödevinin hedeflerine nasıl karar verirsiniz?

5. Size göre, bir yazıyı iyi yapan etmenler genel olarak nelerdir?

6. Yazınızın etkili olup olmadığına nasıl karar veririsiniz?

**Yazma Stratejilerinin Üstbilişsel Farkındalığı**

7. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirme sürecini genellikle nasıl ele alırsınız?

8. Yazarken karşılaştığınız zorlukların türleri nelerdir?

9. Yazmada sorun yaşadığınızda ne yaparsınız?

**Bölüm II: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Stratejiler**

1. Tartışma yazısı (argumentative essay) yazmak için geçirdiğiniz tüm süreci baştan sona genel olarak tarif eder misiniz?

2. Ana hat oluşturma aşamasında ne yaptınız? Ne tür şeyleri planladınız?

3. Yazınız için tez cümlenizi ve belirli detayları nasıl geliştirdiniz?

4. Tartışma yazısı yazarken herhangi bir zorlukla karşılaştınız mı? Karşılaştıysanız bunlar nelerdi?

5. Yazma sürecinizi izlemek için herhangi bir şey yaptınız mı? Kelime tercihlerinizin, gramer yapılarınızın doğru olduğundan ya da konuya ve tez cümlenize bağlı kaldığınızdan emin olmak için hiçbir şey yaptınız mı? Nasıl?

6. Tartışma yazınızın tamamını yazdıktan sonra ne yaptınız?

7. Kendi yazınızı nasıl değerlendirdiniz? Yazınızdan memnun musunuz?

**Evet ise**, yazınızın sizi memnun eden yönleri nelerdir?
**Değilseniz**, başarısızlığınıza neler sebep oldu?

## Appendix J: Writing Assessment Rubric

| ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY RUBRIC | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ORGANISATION** | **Introduction** | *Hook* | **1.** Catch the attention of the reader via quotation /question/fact /surprising statistics / background information about the topic. | ____ /1 |
| | | *Construct an introduction* | **2.** Explain the controversial issue. | ____ /1 |
| | | *Thesis statement* | **3.** Write a thesis statement mentioning the opposite point of view and giving your argument. | ____ /1 |
| | **Body Paragraphs** | *1st Body Paragraph* | **1.** Start the paragraph with a counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **2.** Rebut the counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **3.** Provide own ideas and support these ideas with solid reasons and evidence. | ____ /1 |
| | | *2nd Body Paragraph* | **1.** Start the paragraph with a counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **2.** Rebut the counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **3.** Provide own ideas and support these ideas with solid reasons and evidence. | ____ /1 |
| | | *3rd Body Paragraph* | **1.** Start the paragraph with a counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **2.** Rebut the counter argument. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **3.** Provide own ideas and support these ideas with solid reasons and evidence. | ____ /1 |
| | **Conclusion** | | **1.** Paraphrase the thesis statement. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **2.** Summarize opposing views, remind the reader the main points. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **3.** Leave the reader with the final thoughts on the topic. | ____ /1 |
| **UNITY & COHERENCE** | | | **1.** Use certain expressions and transition signals of contrast to introduce opposing points of view. | ____ /1 |
| | | | **2.** Provide consistency and unity (0: fails to communicate any messages/ 1: presents information but not arranged coherently/2: logically organized information or ideas.) | ____ /2 |
| **MECHANICS** | | | **1.** Use grammar correctly. (0: no correct sentence forms at all. / 1: a very limited range of structures with frequent errors. / 2: good grammar with few errors. / 3: a wide range of structures with minor errors.) | ____ /3 |
| | | | **2.** Use vocabulary correctly. (0: only a limited range of words which are used repetitively or inappropriately / 1: adequate range of vocabulary. / 2: a wide range of vocabulary used fluently and precisely.) | ____ /2 |
| | | | **3.** Use spelling, punctuation and capitalisation correctly. (0: a great number of spelling, punctuation and capitalisation mistakes / 1: several number of spelling, punctuation and capitalisation mistakes/ 2: no or a few number of spelling, punctuation and capitalisation mistakes.) | ____ /2 |
| | | | TOTAL | ___/ 25 |

# Appendix K: An Examplary Interview Transcript (HPS-30)

**Set A: Metacognitive Knowledge about Writing**

**Self-Knowledge as a Writer**

*1.* Have you ever had an experience that you felt successful as a writer? Describe this experience in as much detail as possible. What were the task, the assignment, and the circumstance? What factors helped you to become a successful writer?
*There is no assignment that I think as successful. I think I'm still writing like an A1-level student. Regarding writing, I do not find myself successful. I just remember my writing in which I wrote my memoirs in A2-level. It was good, I was able to express myself. I didn't have to come up with ideas. I just told what happened. Frankly, I'm not very good at generating ideas. I'm good at grammar and I think my grammar knowledge brought me to the B2 level.*

**2.** Have you ever had an experience that you felt unsuccessful as a writer? Describe this experience in as much detail as possible. What were the task, the assignment, and the circumstance? What factors caused you to become an unsuccessful writer?
*I can not remember any. I'm really bad at generating ideas. Especially when I am not given a few topic or options, I have great difficulty.*

**3.** What are your strengths and weaknesses as a writer? What experiences have led you to believe that you have these strengths and weaknesses?
*I'm good at grammar. I am good at using transition signals. I'm bad at generating ideas, but fortunately, my scores are not that bad. My body paragraphs are always short since I cannot produce enough ideas. The models we read at school are quite long. I do not consider myself sufficient in terms of word usage. My lexical knowledge is A1 level.*

**Metacognitive Awareness of Writing Tasks**

**4.** How would you decide the goals of a writing task?
*If my department was International Relations or else, maybe I could have goals for future, but my department is Industrial Engineering. Therefore, I have no other goal than making good grades and satisfying my teachers' expectations. The teacher is important. The more perfectionist the teachers is, the more we strive to write better.*

**5.** In your opinion, in general, what makes good writing?
*Conveying ideas successfully and having no grammar mistakes.*

**6.** How would you decide if your writing is effective or not?
*I never thought my writing as effective. I'm not sure of myself. I think that's a good thing. If I think I am so good, my magrin of error will be high.*

**Metacognitive Awareness of Strategies**

**7.** How do you usually go about completing a writing task?
*I think about what I can write here. I decide on my three main points before writing. I take small notes on the assignment sheet. I can't do anything if I start writing before I find these three ideas. I'm trying to take these notes in English. I usually rely on the first ideas I have found, but if I can't develop them or support them with examples. I go back and try to generate ideas again. After I write two or three sentences, I pause to read them because my sentences need to be compatible with each other. Also, if I write it all out at a sitting, it's unlikely to fix the mistakes I have made, because there is always a shortage of time. If my sentences are not consistent with each other, I do not try to correct my grammatical errors, but revise my ideas. Sometimes I change the sentence structure. I don't read what I have written again as a whole. I usually don't have enough time for that. As I said, I check what I have written in two or three sentences.*

**8.** When you are writing, what are the types of difficulties that you encounter?
*Generating ideas and use of vocabulary. It was also difficult for me to get used to writing essays while I was just writing paragraphs. Writing in Turkish and writing in English are very different. When I write Turkish as a Turk, I can find more ideas, improve my thoughts and writing. I have a lot to watch out for when I write in English.*

*9.* What do you do when you have trouble writing?
*I do not think so comprehensive. I do not encounter such big problems actually, so I don't feel the need to find a solution.*

**Set B: Metacognitive Strategies of Writing**

**1.** Could you describe in general the whole process that you took to write an argumentative essay from beginning to end?
*I found the three main points, and decided on my title. I also tried to give a counter-argument in the introductory paragraph. I thought about what one can defend, what they can scratch on this issue. Then, I defended my opinion.*

**2.** What did you do in your outline? And, what kind of things did you plan?
*I only decided on my three main points.*

**3.** How did you develop your thesis statement and specific details for your essay?
*I paid attention to the arguments and counter-arguments.*

**4.** Did you encounter any difficulties when you were writing an argumentative essay? What were they?
*I had trouble with the time. I had doubts about my use of some grammatical patterns, such as noun clause / adjective clause.*

**5.** Did you do anything to monitor your writing? Or did you do anything to make sure that your vocabulary was right, or did you do anything to make sure that you were on topic, that you were holding to the thesis? How?
*I didn't. I wrote and submitted. I didn't have time to read the entire essay anyway.*

**6.** What did you do after you wrote the whole argumentative essay?
*I just submitted it.*

**7.** How did you evaluate your own essay? Are you happy with your writing?
*I don't know. I never thought about it. It may sound a little lazy, but after writing and submitting, I never think about what I have written.*

<u>If yes</u>, what made you happy about your writing?
<u>If no,</u> what are the causes of your failure?

## Appendix L: Örnek Röportaj Dökümü (HPS-30)

**Bölüm I: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Bilgi**

**Yazar Olarak Kendini Tanıma**

1. Bir yazar olarak kendinizi başarılı hissettiğiniz bir deneyiminiz oldu mu? Bu deneyimi mümkün olduğunca detaylı bir şekilde tarif ediniz. Görev, ödev ve durum neydi? Sizce, başarılı olmanızı sağlayan faktörler nelerdi?
   *Başarılı olduğunu düşündüğüm bir ödev yok. Hala A1 öğrencisi gibi yazdığımı düşüyorum. Kendimi başarılı görmüyorum yazma anlamında. Sadece A2 de anılarımı yazdığım bir yazımı hatırlıyorum. O iyiydi, kendimi ifade edebilmiştim. Fikir üretmem gerekmiyordu, sadece başımdan geçenleri anlattım. Açıkçası fikir üretmede çok iyi değilim. Gramer de iyiyim ve beni B2'ye gramer bilgimin getirdiğini düşünüyorum.*

2. Bir yazar olarak kendinizi başarısız hissettiğiniz bir deneyiminiz oldu mu? Bu deneyimi mümkün olduğunca detaylı bir şekilde tarif ediniz. Görev, ödev ve durum neydi? Sizce, başarısız olmanıza sebep olan faktörler nelerdi?
   *Düşünemiyorum, fikir üretmekte gerçekten kötüyüm. Hele birkaç konu ya da seçenek verilmediğinde daha zorlanıyordum.*

3. Bir yazar olarak güçlü ve zayıf yönleriniz nelerdir? Size bu zayıf ve güçlü yönlere sahip olduğunuzu düşündüren deneyimler nelerdir?
   *Gramerde iyiyim. 'Transition signal' kullanımında iyiyim. Fikir üretmede kötüyüm; ama buna rağmen neyse ki notlarım çok kötü gelmiyor. Çok fikir üretemediğim için gelişme paragraflarım hep kısa oluyor. Okulda okuduğumuz örnekler epey uzun. Kelime kullanımı anlamında da kendimi yeterli görmüyorum. Kelime bilgim A1 seviyesinde.*

**Yazma Ödevlerinin Üstbilişsel Farkındalığı**

4. Bir yazma ödevinin hedeflerine nasıl karar verirsiniz?
   *Bölümün 'Uluslararası ilişkiler'' vs. olsaydı belki geleceğe yönelik hedeflerim olabildi. Ama bölümüm Endüstri Mühendisliği. O yüzden burada iyi not almaktan ve hocamı memnun etmekten başka bir hedefim yok. Öğretmen de önemli. Daha mükemmeliyetçi hocalar okuyacağı zaman daha çok çabalıyoruz iyi yazmak için.*

5. Size göre, bir yazıyı iyi yapan etmenler genel olarak nelerdir?
   *Kendi fikirlerini güzel aktarabilmesi. Gramer hatası olmaması.*

6. Yazınızın etkili olup olmadığına nasıl karar verirsiniz?
   *Hiçbir zaman yazılarımın etkili olduğunu düşünmedim. Kendimden emin olamıyorum. Bence, bu iyi bir şey. Çok iyi olduğunu düşünürsem, yanılgı payımın yüksek olacağını düşünüyorum.*

**Yazma Stratejilerinin Üstbilişsel Farkındalığı**

7. Bir yazma ödevini yerine getirme sürecini genellikle nasıl ele alırsınız?
   *Burada ne yazabilirim, onları düşünüyorum. 3 main pointi yazmadan belirliyorum. Ödev kâğıdının üstüne küçük notlar alıyorum. Bu üç fikri yazmaya başlamadan önce belirlemediğimde hiçbir şey yapamıyorum zaten yazma sırasında. Bu notları İngilizce almaya çalışıyorum. Genelde bağlı kalıyorum ilk bulduğum fikirlere ama geliştiremezsem, örnek vs bunlarla destekleyemezsem geri dönüp tekrar yeni bir fikir bulmaya çalışıyorum. İki üç cümle yazdıktan sonra, onları kontrol etmek için ara veriyorum; çünkü cümlelerimin birbirleriyle uyumlu olmaları gerekiyor. Birden yazarsam, yaptığım hataları düzeltebilmem pek mümkün olmuyor. Çünkü hep bir zaman sıkıntısı var. Cümlelerim birbiriyle tutarlı değilse gramer hatası olarak değil de fikir olarak değişiklik yapıyorum. Bazen cümle yapısını değiştiriyorum. Yazdıklarım tekrar bir bütün olarak okumuyorum açıkçası.*

*Yeterince sürem kalmıyor. Zaten yazarken iki üç cümlede bir kontrol ediyorum dediğim gibi. Bir de yazıp bitirmişim sonuçta neden kontrol edeyim diye düşünüyorum.*

8. Yazarken karşılaştığınız zorlukların türleri nelerdir?
*Fikir üretmek, kelime kullanımı, sadece bir paragraf yazarken essaye alışmak da zor oldu benim için. Türkçe ve İngilizce yazmak çok farklı. Bir Türk olarak Türkçe yazdığımda daha fazla fikir bulabiliyorum, düşüncelerimi ve yazımı geliştirebiliyorum. İngilizce yazarken dikkat etmem gereken çok şey var.*

9. Yazmada sorun yaşadığınızda ne yaparsınız?
*Öyle aman aman kapsamlı düşünmediğim için off-topic vs olma gibi çok büyük bir sorunla karşılaşmadım açıkçası. Öyle bir çözüm bulma gereksinimi duymadım.*

**Bölüm II: Yazma Hakkında Üstbilişsel Stratejiler**

1. Tartışma yazısı (argumentative essay) yazmak için geçirdiğiniz tüm süreci baştan sona genel olarak tarif eder misiniz?
*Üç 'main point'i (ana nokta) buldum, başlığımı belirledim. Introduction da counter-argument vermeye çalıştım. Neleri savunabilirler, nelere kaşı çıkabilirler bunları düşündüm. Önce kendi görüşümü savundum.*

2. Ana hat oluşturma aşamasında ne yaptınız? Ne tür şeyleri planladınız?
*Sadece 3 main pointi belirledim.*

3. Yazınız için tez cümlenizi ve belirli detayları nasıl geliştirdiniz?
*Karşıtlık olmasına önem verdim.*

4. Tartışma yazısı yazarken herhangi bir zorlukla karşılaştınız mı? Karşılaştıysanız bunlar nelerdi?
*Süreyle ilgili sıkıntım oldu. Bazı gramer kalıplarının kullanımıyla ilgili şüphem oldu, noun clause/ adjective clause gibi.*

5. Yazma sürecinizi gözlemlemek için herhangi bir şey yaptınız mı? Kelime tercihlerinizin, gramer yapılarınızın doğru olduğundan ya da konuya ve tez cümlenize bağlı kaldığınızdan emin olmak için hiçbir şey yaptınız mı? Nasıl?
*Yapmadım, yazdım ve teslim ettim. Zaten tamamını okumak için vaktim de kalmamıştı.*

6. Tartışma yazınızın tamamını yazdıktan sonra ne yaptınız?
*Teslim ettim hemen.*

7. Kendi yazınızı nasıl değerlendirdiniz? Yazınızdan memnun musunuz?
*Bilmiyorum, hiç düşünmedim. Kulağa biraz tembelce gelebilir; ama yazıp verdikten sonra yazdıklarımın üzerinde hiç düşünmüyorum.*

**Evet ise**, neleri doğru yaptığınızı düşünüyorsunuz? Yazınızın sizi memnun eden yönleri nelerdir?
**Değilseniz,** başarısızlığınıza neler sebep oldu?

## Öz Geçmiş

**Doğum Yeri ve Yılı** : Giresun - 1987

| Öğr. Gördüğü Kurumlar | : Başlama Yılı | Bitirme Yılı | Kurum Adı |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lise | 2001 | 2005 | Pendik Lisesi |
| Lisans | 2005 | 2009 | Kocaeli Üniversitesi |
| Yüksek Lisans | 2010 | 2019 | Uludağ Üniversitesi |

**Bildiği Yabancı Diller ve Düzeyi** : İngilizce – Advanced

İtalyanca – A2

| Çalıştığı Kurumlar | : Başlama ve Ayrılma | Kurum Adı |
|---|---|---|
| | 1. 2009-2012 | Kocaeli Kartepe Eşref Uslu İlköğretim Okulu |
| | 2. 2012-2015 | Yalova Ziya Gökalp İlkokulu |
| | 3. 2015- | Yalova Üniversitesi |

**Kullandığı Burslar** :

04-15.10.2010- Comenius Hizmetiçi Eğitim Bursu- International Projects Center, EXETER, UK. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Practical Ideas for Primary Classrooms.

**Yurt İçi ve Yurt Dışında Katıldığı Projeler** :

2014-2015- Avrupa Birliği Erasmus K2 Stratejik Ortaklıklar Projesi- "e-CLUE. Tellecollaboration. Culture and Language: Unseen Elements (Teleişbirliği. Kültür ve Dil: Görünmeyen Öğeler)"

*2015-2016*– Avrupa Birliği Erasmus K2 Stratejik Ortaklıklar Projesi- "Maths is Everywhere - Mathematical Journey through Europe (Matematik Her Yerde- Avrupa Üzerinden Matematiksel Yolculuk)"

**Katıldığı Yurt İçi ve Yurt**
**Dışı Bilimsel Toplantılar    :**

Çam, M. & Çam, E. (2015).  Foreign language speaking anxiety perceptions by university students and instructors in Turkey.  *The Self in Language Learning International Conference*, Mersin, Türkiye.

**Yayımlanan Çalışmala**r:

Çam, M. & Çam, E. (2015).  Foreign language speaking anxiety perceptions by university students and instructors in Turkey.  *The Proceedings of Self in Language Learning International Conference* (Publication number:1740383).

ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

## TEZ ÇOĞALTMA VE ELEKTRONİK YAYIMLAMA İZİN FORMU

| | |
|---|---|
| Yazar Adı Soyadı | Esra ÇAM |
| Tez Adı | The Role of Metacognitive Knowledge and Strategies in Turkish EFL Learners' Writing Achievement |
| Enstitü | Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü |
| Anabilim Dalı | Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı |
| Bilim Dalı | İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı |
| Tez Türü | Yüksek Lisans Tezi |
| Tez Danışman(lar)ı | Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem KARATEPE |
| Çoğaltma (Fotokopi Çekim) İzni | ☐ Tezimden fotokopi çekilmesine izin veriyorum <br><br> ■ Tezimin sadece içindekiler, özet, kaynakça ve içeriğinin % 10 bölümünün fotokopi çekilmesine izin veriyorum <br><br> ☐ Tezimden fotokopi çekilmesine izin vermiyorum |
| Yayımlama İzni | ■ Tezimin elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasına izin veriyorum <br><br> ☐ Tezimin elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasının ertelenmesini istiyorum <br> 1 yıl ☐ <br> 2 yıl ☐ <br> 3 yıl ☐ <br><br> ☐ Tezimin elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasına izin vermiyorum |

Hazırlamış olduğum tezimin yukarıda belirttiğim hususlar dikkate alınarak, fikri mülkiyet haklarım saklı kalmak üzere Uludağ Üniversitesi Kütüphane ve Dokümantasyon Daire Başkanlığı tarafından hizmete sunulmasına izin verdiğimi beyan ederim.

25.07.2019