
METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES IN WRITING

Dr. Kiran Kumar Kalapala

Assistant Professor of English, Department of Foreign Languages, Jazan University, Jizan, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Dr. Sobhana Nandyal Panduranga

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Samtah University College, Jazan University, Jizan, KSA.

Mukhtar Babiker Ali Juma

Lecturer in English, Jazan University.

<https://doi.org/10.59009/ijlllc.2024.0072>

ABSTRACT

Metacognition is, thinking about one's thinking. It refers to the processes used to plan, monitor, and assess one's understanding and performance. It includes a critical awareness of a) one's thinking and learning and b) oneself as a thinker and a learner. It also includes knowledge about when and how to use particular strategies for learning or problem-solving. The two components of metacognition are: (1) knowledge about cognition and (2) regulation of cognition. Metacognition encompasses the study of memory-monitoring and self-regulation, meta-reasoning, consciousness/awareness and auto-noetic consciousness/self-awareness. The purpose of this research was to examine the metacognitive strategies used by EFL learners in writing the research proposal and also to identify their attitude towards metacognitive strategies in doing the task. The participants of the study constituted 85 undergraduate female students of level 8, English Department, Samtah University College, Jazan University. A metacognition inventory and an attitude scale were adapted to meet the requirements of the study. The study results will help the teachers to support, facilitate and train the students to become autonomous learners so that the students will be able to achieve academic/research writing skills based on critical thinking skills. Summing up this study, the researcher has observed that university students should enrich their metacognitive abilities. It also indicated that English teachers should take up the responsibility to train Saudi students in enhancing metacognitive abilities to prepare them for future to meet personal, professional, communicative, and global challenges.

Keywords: Metacognitive Strategies, Attitudes, English Research Proposal Writing.

1. INTRODUCTION

Metacognition is "cognition about cognition", "thinking about thinking", "knowing about knowing", becoming "aware of one's awareness" and higher-order thinking skills (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metacognition>). Metcalfe, J., & Shimamura, A. P. (1994) asserted that metacognition includes knowledge about when and how to use particular strategies for learning or problem-solving.

Schraw, Gregory (1998) distinguished two components of metacognition: (1) knowledge about cognition and (2) regulation of cognition. Metacognition refers to a level of thinking that involves active control over the process of thinking that is used in learning situations. Planning the way to approach a learning task, monitoring comprehension, and evaluating the progress towards the completion of a task are metacognitive.

Importance of use of Metacognition in classrooms

The use of metacognitive thinking and strategies enables students to become flexible, creative, and self-directed learners. Metacognition particularly assists students with additional educational needs in understanding learning tasks, in self-organising and in regulating their own learning. (The Metacognitive Teacher and Learner: Teaching to Think, Learning to Learn) <https://www.sess.ie/metacognitive-teacher-and-learner-teaching-think-learning-learn-2>

Metacognition helps students improve their thought process and reflective thinking. The psychologists William James, Jean Piaget, and Lev Vygotsky theorized the role of metacognition for modern education (Fox and Risconscente, 2008). Their views on metacognition differed: James focused on “Self” and inward looking, Piaget elaborated on theories of metacognitive reasoning, and Vygotsky tied metacognition to consciousness. All three underscored the value of metacognition for intellectual growth. In higher education, metacognition is valued for the ways it charges and motivates students with self-regulation of their learning and enables transference of skills and content through reflection and abstract comprehension. College instructors can support student metacognition through various active learning techniques, learning frameworks, and opening / closing class exercises that encourage them to reflect upon and monitor their learning. (Encouraging Metacognition in the Classroom) <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/MetacognitioninClassrooms>

Self-reflection and metacognition play a vital role in growth and development of learning among the students. Self-awareness plays a critical role in improved learning because it helps students become more efficient at focusing on what they still need to learn. Improving metacognitive strategies related to students' schoolwork also provides young people with tools to reflect and grow in their emotional and social lives.

Reflection about Metacognition

Metacognition is essentially reflection on the micro level, an awareness of one's own thought processes as one completes them. Metacognitive reflection, however, takes thinking processes to the next level because it is not concerned with assessment, but with self-improvement (Watanabe-Crockett 2018). Perhaps most crucially, by shifting reflection from content to thought, students have a chance to put themselves back at the centre of the learning process. (Self-Reflection for Metacognition) <https://www.virtuallibrary.info/self-reflection-for-metacognition.html>

Lovett (2008) stated that reflection is an act of looking back in order to process experiences. Metacognition, a type of reflection, is a way of thinking about one's thinking in order to grow.

Research shows metacognition increases student motivation because students feel more in control of their own learning. Students who learn metacognitive strategies are more aware of their own thinking, and more likely to be active learners who learn more deeply.

Marsha Lovett, (2008) identified few advantages of metacognition:

- Changes the fixed versus growth mindset about students' ability to learn.
- Increased student ownership of learning and students taking control over their own learning.
- More positive attitudes in relation to school and learning.
- Improved performance not only academic but also in relation to behavioural performance.

Metacognitive Awareness

Jacobs, J.E., Paris, S.G. (1987) categorized metacognition into three types of metacognitive awareness in terms of metacognitive knowledge.

1. Declarative knowledge: refers to knowledge about oneself as a learner and about what factors can influence one's performance. Schneider, W; Artelt, C. (2010) referred it to as "world knowledge".
2. Procedural knowledge: refers to knowledge about doing things. This type of knowledge is displayed as heuristics and strategies. A high degree of procedural knowledge can allow individuals to perform tasks more automatically. Pressley, M; Borkowski, J.G.; Schneider, W. (1987) attributed that it is achieved through a large variety of strategies that can be accessed more efficiently.
3. Conditional knowledge: Garner, R (1990) refers to knowing when and why to use declarative and procedural knowledge. Reynolds, R.E. (1992) stated that it allows students to allocate their resources when using strategies and in turn allows the strategies to become more effective.

Metacognitive Strategies

Jacobs, J.E., Paris, S.G. (1987) affirmed that metacognitive regulation or "regulation of cognition" involves three skills.

1. Planning: refers to appropriate selection of strategies and the correct allocation of resources that affect task performance.
2. Monitoring: refers to one's awareness of comprehension and task performance.
3. Evaluating: refers to appraising the final product of a task and the efficiency at which the task was performed. This can include re-evaluating strategies that are used.

According to Brown, A (1987), metacognitive strategies is related to the "executive" function that consist of planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking process in information processing, and monitoring of one's production of comprehension, furthermore, evaluating learning after an activity is completed. As an entity, metacognition includes executive management and strategic knowledge. Executive management involves planning, monitoring, evaluating, and revising one's own thinking processes and products. Strategic knowledge involves knowing what (factual or declarative knowledge), knowing when and why (conditional or contextual knowledge) and knowing how (procedural or methodological knowledge).

Hartman, (2001) considered that both executive management and strategic knowledge metacognition are needed to self-regulate one's own thinking and learning. Finally, there is no distinction between domain-general and domain-specific metacognitive skills. This means that metacognitive skills are domain-general in nature and there are no specific skills for certain subject areas. Gourgey, A.F. (1998) stated that the metacognitive skills that are used to review an essay are the same as those that are used to verify an answer to a math question.

Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies

Cindy Perras (2014) quoted that "The Institute for Educational Leadership led National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth" (2014, <https://www.ldatschool.ca/metacognitive-strategies-or-thinking-about-my-thinking/>), suggested rehearsal, elaboration, organization and analyzing as the cognitive strategies.

Rehearsal is reciting items to be learned from a list. It is believed to influence the attention and coding process. It does not seem to help students connect current information with prior knowledge.

Elaboration is summarizing or paraphrasing. It is believed to improve the student's ability to store information into long term memory by building internal connections between items to be learned and assisting with the integration of new information with prior knowledge.

Organization is outlining. It helps learners select appropriate information and make the connections to be learned.

Analyzing is problem solving and critical thinking. It assists students with applying previous knowledge to new situations in order to solve problems and /or reach decisions.

The strategies help students to think about thinking. Metacognition is an important concept in cognitive theory. It consists of basic processes occurring simultaneously monitoring one's progress as one learns and making changes and adapting strategies if one perceives that one is not doing as well as one could.

Cindy Perras (2014) quoted that "The Institute for Educational Leadership led National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth" (2014, <https://www.ldatschool.ca/metacognitive-strategies-or-thinking-about-my-thinking/>), also suggested the basic meta cognitive strategies. They are:

- connecting new information to existing knowledge,
- selecting thinking strategies deliberately,
- planning, monitoring, and evaluating thinking processes.

Meta cognitive activities occur before or after an activity. An example of the relationship between cognitive and metacognitive strategies is a learner who uses self-monitoring when reading. The learner, through self-monitoring can sense that he or she does not comprehend what was read (metacognitive) and recognizes that they will understand the text better if they create an outline (cognitive). Gourgey, A.F. (1998) stated that the metacognitive skills that are used to review an essay are the same as those that are used to verify an answer to a math question.

The strategies to develop metacognition included:

- share and model self-monitoring processes (proofreading),
- explain, and provide handouts regarding particular strategies that are helpful,
- clarify and model when particular strategies are appropriate,
- clarify why particular strategies are helpful and useful.

The metacognitive strategies will help the students to improve in:

- planning English research proposal writing so that they would be able to write in a systematic way, logical manner, detailed way, consecutively and persuasively.
- monitoring factual and linguistic aspects in English research proposal writing which will help them to follow a flexible approach and focus on their writing.
- evaluating both form and content English research proposal writing by self-editing. **1.1**

Research Significance

Metacognition is an important concept in cognitive theory. Metacognitive activities occur before or after cognitive activity. Metacognitive strategies help students to think about thinking. Metacognitive strategies is to think about the way how students think about the learning strategies like planning, monitoring, and evaluating in the learning process. Therefore, metacognitive strategies on writing is thinking about the thinking processes or transferring knowledge processes and self-evaluating processes in research proposal writing. The purpose of this research was to examine the metacognitive strategies used by EFL learners in writing the research proposal and also to identify their attitude towards metacognitive strategies in

doing the task. The question items in the metacognitive strategies' inventory identified the metacognitive strategies used by the students in preparing the English research proposal and know the students' attitude/viewpoints towards the use of metacognitive strategies in the learning process. The instructors should consider the learning strategies used by the students while conducting an intervention program to improve the knowledge of the students in the Dept. of English.

The results of this study will help the teachers to support, facilitate and train the students to become autonomous learners so that the students will be able to achieve academic/research writing skills based on critical thinking skills. The present study is an ardent effort and clearly indicated that metacognitive strategies in English research proposal writing should be developed among Saudi students to prepare them for future personal and professional challenges.

1.2 Research Questions

1. What metacognitive strategies do the EFL learners use in research proposal writing to assess their learning ?
2. What are the EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive writing strategies in research proposal writing?

1.3 Research Objectives

- To categorize the metacognitive strategies that the EFL learners use in research proposal writing to assess their learning.
- To identify the EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

- There exists no significant association between the metacognitive strategies that the EFL learners use in research proposal writing to assess their learning.
- There exists no significant association between metacognitive strategies and EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing.

1.5 Variables

Dependent variable: Research proposal writing skills in English language is the dependent variable in the project.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Shedding light on the contribution of some previous research is fundamental since it will help to suggest and propose solutions concerning the research problem.

In the present study, the researcher has made use of related books, periodicals, abstracts, dissertations, handbooks, and journals in order to understand the problem and prepare the research design. The literature related to the various components of the present problem involved in the experiment i.e., Metacognitive Strategies in English have been extensively surveyed.

The review of literature has been divided into the following categories:

1. Theoretical background of Metacognition.
2. A Review of Related Studies.

2.1 Theoretical Background

Flavell (1979) classified metacognition into three components:

1. Metacognitive knowledge is what individuals know about themselves and others as cognitive processors. It is also called metacognitive awareness.
2. Metacognitive regulation is the regulation of cognition and learning experiences through a set of activities that help people control their learning.
3. Metacognitive experiences are those experiences that have something to do with the current, on-going cognitive endeavor.

John H. Flavell (1979) defined metacognition as knowledge about cognition and control of cognition. Metacognition also involves thinking about one's own thinking process such as study skills, memory capabilities, and the ability to monitor learning. This concept needs to be explicitly taught along with content instruction. Metacognitive knowledge is about one's own cognitive processes and the understanding of how to regulate those processes to maximize learning. Metacognition is a general term encompassing the study of memory-monitoring and self-regulation, meta-reasoning, consciousness/awareness and autoethic consciousness/self-awareness. The capacities are used to regulate one's own cognition, to maximize one's potential to think, learn and to evaluate.

Metacognition is 'stable' in those learners' initial decisions derive from the pertinent facts about their cognition through years of learning experience. Simultaneously, it is also 'situated' in the sense that it depends on learners' familiarity with the task, motivation, emotion, and so forth. Individuals need to regulate their thoughts about the strategy they are using and adjust it based on the situation to which the strategy is being applied. At a professional level, this has led to emphasis on the development of reflective practice, particularly in the education profession.

Recently, the notion has been applied to the study of second language learners in the field of TESOL and applied linguistics in general (Wenden, 1987; Zhang, 2001, 2010). This new development has been much related to Flavell (1979), where the notion of metacognition is elaborated within a tripartite theoretical framework. Learner metacognition is defined and investigated by examining their person knowledge, task knowledge and strategy knowledge.

Wenden (1991) has proposed and used this framework and Zhang (2001) adopted this approach and investigated second language learners' metacognition or metacognitive knowledge. In addition to exploring the relationships between learner metacognition and performance, researchers are also interested in the effects of metacognitively-oriented strategic instruction on reading comprehension (e.g., Garner, 1990, in first language contexts, and Chamot, 2005; Zhang, 2010). The efforts are aimed at developing learner autonomy, interdependence and self-regulation.

Metacognition helps people to perform many cognitive tasks more effectively. The strategies for promoting metacognition include self-questioning (e.g., "What do I already know about this topic? How have I solved problems like this before?"), thinking aloud while performing a task, and making graphic representations (e.g., concept maps, flow charts, semantic webs) of one's thoughts and knowledge. Carr, 2002, argued that the physical act of writing plays a large part in the development of metacognitive skills. Gammil, D. (2006) suggested word analysis skills, active reading strategies, listening skills, organizational skills and creating mnemonic devices as strategies that can be taught to students.

Anne Beaufort (2007) defined metacognition as "thinking about thinking". But the Framework for Success in post-secondary writing (The Council of Writing Program Administrators et al., 2011, p. 5 <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED516360.pdf>) furthers this definition by referring to metacognition as "the ability to reflect on one's own thinking as well as on the individual and cultural processes used to structure knowledge". Howard Tinberg (2015, p.75)

innovatively and accurately indicates that “metacognition is not cognition” explaining that “performance, however thoughtful, is not the same as awareness of how that performance came to be”. Metacognition, as Tinberg, H (2015) describes it, has an important connection to writing, specifically to students’ ability to reflect on their processes and their knowledge. Metacognitive writing strategies involve thinking about the writing process - planning, monitoring, and self-evaluating of what has been written. More explicitly, via the skills of planning, monitoring, and evaluating the writer manages, directs, regulates, and guides his/her writing production.

Cohen, Marisa (2012) claimed that metacognitive-like processes are especially ubiquitous when it comes to the discussion of self-regulated learning. Self-regulation requires metacognition by looking at one's awareness of their learning and planning further learning methodology. Miller, Tyler M.; Geraci, Lisa (2011) declared that attentive metacognition is a salient feature of good self-regulated learners but does not guarantee automatic application. Reinforcing collective discussion of metacognition is a salient feature of self-critical and self-regulating social groups. The activities of strategy selection and application include those concerned with an ongoing attempt to plan, check, monitor, select, revise, evaluate, etc.

Attitude and Metacognition

Brinol, Pablo (2012) pointed attitude, metacognition and how attitudes influence individuals act, and especially how they interact with others. Some metacognitive characteristics of attitudes include importance, certainty, and perceived knowledge, and they influence behavior in different ways. Attitude importance is the strongest predictor of behavior and can predict information seeking behaviors in individuals. Attitude importance is also more likely to influence behavior than certainty of the attitude. Metacognitive characteristics of attitudes may be key to understanding how attitudes change. Research shows that the frequency of positive or negative thoughts is the biggest factor in attitude change.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

There are many studies on metacognitive strategies because they help to improve the teaching and learning process. If learners’ errors and the causes of those errors are identified, errors can be corrected, though not all. Moreover, metacognitive strategies help direct the focus of the teaching and learning process. The investigator came across a few doctoral theses by the scholars who have worked on metacognitive strategies. They have been presented below in the chronological order.

Farahian, M. (2015) conducted research on assessing metacognitive strategies in English as a foreign language (EFL). Writing is dependent on a valid measure to assess metacognitive ability. Since there is no report of a validated domain -specific measure of metacognitive awareness of foreign language (FL) writing this study tried to develop and validate a metacognitive awareness writing questionnaire (MAWQ). In order to construct the questionnaire, an interview with 59 EFL learners was conducted. Based on the content analysis as well as the literature, a framework for metacognitive awareness of writing was developed which led to a hypothesized model, as well as a preliminary inventory. To validate the questionnaire, various exploratory factor analyses were run, and as a result, no clear pattern of hypothesized subscales of knowledge and regulation of cognition emerged. However, in the analysis of the whole questionnaire through EFA, the researcher’s assumption regarding the

two general scales of MAWQ was supported indicating that knowledge and regulation of cognition are two main components of MAWQ.

Azizi, M., Nemati and Estahbanati, N (2017) believed that by improving students' meta-cognitive awareness of elements of language, learning can be enhanced. Therefore, this study consisted of two main objectives. First, it aimed at examining meta-cognitive awareness of writing strategy use among Iranian EFL learners. Using a Friedman test to check if there was any significant difference among the participants in their use of writing strategies, it was found that the differences among the strategies were not significant. The second objective of the study was to examine the impact of the participants' meta-cognitive awareness of writing strategy use on their L2 writing performance. This was answered using two statistical techniques, namely Pearson correlation and Multiple Regression. It was found that there was a significant relationship between writing performance and all writing strategy categories (planning, monitoring, evaluation, and self-awareness) using Pearson Correlation. It was also found that the p-value was significant only for evaluation strategy category, but not for the rest using Multiple Regression. That is, it was found that strategy categories such as planning, monitoring, and self-awareness did not predict students' writing performance. The result of this study responds to the ongoing problems students have in their meta-cognitive awareness of writing strategy use which can contribute to raising proficiency levels in shorter time frames.

Zehua Wang and Feifei Han (2017) investigated metacognitive knowledge and control of writing strategy in English among 65 Chinese EFL learners in two argumentative writing tasks. Metacognitive knowledge was measured using a questionnaire written in simple present tense. Metacognitive control required writers to respond to a questionnaire written in simple past tense immediately following completion of each writing task according to the actual strategy use in the writing tasks. Students were grouped into high- and low-performing EFL writers using one standard error above or below the Mean scores of the writing tasks. One-way ANOVA was conducted on the four kinds of writing strategies (i.e., planning, cognitive, monitor-control, and evaluating). We found that while there were no differences on any type of the writing strategies for metacognitive knowledge, the two groups differed in the actual writing strategy use on each occasion. For the more familiar and easier writing topic, high- and low-performing students differed only in cognitive writing strategies. For the less familiar and more challenging writing task, high-achievers adopted significantly more planning, cognitive, and evaluating strategies than low-achievers. This research supported for distinction between metacognitive knowledge and control in EFL writing.

Ramazan Goctu (2017) aimed to investigate whether freshmen students at the Faculty of Computer Technologies and Engineering at International Black Sea University (Tbilisi, Georgia) use metacognitive learning strategies (MLS) in their academic writing and aware of them or not. It also found out whether their lecturers provide the development of MLSs in the classroom. He stated that among all the learning strategies, metacognitive strategy is a higher-order executive skill which entails planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The learners should develop command of the metacognitive strategy to be able to self-plan, self-monitor and self-evaluate their learning process which will make them independent, autonomous, and efficient learners. The sample of the study constituted 20 participants out of which only 15 of them volunteered to respond to the interview questions. The findings showed that less than half of the participants used and were aware of metacognitive learning strategies although teachers mentioned that such strategies were used during the classes. This study suggested to raise EFL writing instructors' awareness in teaching to train students to become self-regulated learners.

Hanieh Garmabi and Gholamreza Zareian (2016) examined the teachers' attitude towards the effectiveness of metacognitive strategies used by high school students. To achieve the study goals, 100 teachers who taught English at different high schools of three Cities of Iran were asked to complete 34 item thesis questionnaire which investigated the teachers' attitude toward the effectiveness of metacognitive strategy use while reading a text. The results of statistical analysis indicated that while male and female teachers have the same attitude about reading and post-reading metacognitive strategies, they have significantly different attitudes about pre-reading metacognitive strategies. The results offer implications and suggestions for the pedagogical considerations within the school and even at university contexts.

Khikmah, Nina Amelia Nurul (2018) used the qualitative method to present the findings about the most commonly used metacognitive strategies and attitudes toward the use of metacognitive strategies along with the discussion of the most commonly used metacognitive strategies and attitudes. Planning, monitoring, evaluating and attitudes toward the use of strategies were examined in this study. The finding of this research revealed that the most commonly used of metacognitive strategies were evaluating in the proposal writing process. Then, the students' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive strategies indicated that evaluation is the important feature in the metacognitive strategies. The result of this study will assist in the process of delivering knowledge during lectures in future.

2.3 Literature Gap: The literature review indicated that a plethora of studies have been undertaken to address the impact of metacognitive awareness in English language writing and their inter-relationship since it plays a key role on EFL learners' performance. The findings of the research studies in this area have shown that metacognition is an important aspect of learning strategies. Some research studies also show that the frequency of positive or negative attitude to use metacognitive strategies in writing is the biggest factor in attitude change. All in all, the Saudi Arabian and international studies have shed light on the ways how metacognitive awareness influences the performance of the EFL learners. Therefore, the present study was an ardent effort to fill the gap of literature by concentrating on the feasible impact of metacognitive awareness on EFL learners' performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

Quantitative research method was used to examine the level of metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing among Saudi students. It assessed the kinds of metacognitive strategies that the EFL learners use in research proposal writing to plan, monitor and assess their learning. It also identified the EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing.

Table 3.1: Research Design

Phase	Sample, Sampling, Sample size and Instrument	Calculations
Online Survey	Sample: Dept. of English students, Samtah University College, Jazan University.	Percentages, Chi square and 'p' value
	Sampling: Quota sampling	
	Sample size: 85 students.	

	Instrument: Students' Inventory	
--	--	--

Sample of the Study

The sample constituted 85 undergraduate female students of the Department of English, Samtah University College, Jazan University. The researcher made use of quota sampling which required the representative individuals who were between the ages of 25-30.

Data gathering Instrument

An inventory which was adapted from one of the previous studies done by Farahian, M (2015) in a way to meet the requirements of the research study was used as a data gathering instrument. An online survey inventory was administered which constituted question items related to metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. It was on a 2-point rating scale with true and/or false options. The participants were asked to respond in situational settings and personal settings.

The inventory consisted of question items related to Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating of Metacognitive strategies which the EFL learners use in research proposal writing. It also consisted of questions related to attitude towards the Metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing which were adapted from Rhema A., & Miliszewska I. (2014) to convene with the requirements of the study. The students were also asked to express their attitude towards the Metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing.

Validity of the Tool

Content Validity

The final form of the tool was presented to a panel of experts which consisted of English teachers, educationists, researchers, and language experts for scrutiny. They were requested to examine the coverage of the content in the test items keeping in view the objectives of teaching English in B.A course and also the future needs of the student. They expressed their satisfaction regarding the coverage of the important components in the tool. The experts also accepted the weightage given for each component as shown in the final form of the tool.

Construct Validity

While constructing the tool, the scientific procedure of construction of a tool was meticulously followed in each and every step. The experts examined the percentages given for each item and distribution of items in the tool. The table of components in the final form reveals that the tool possesses construct validity.

Reliability of the Tool

Test-retest method was adopted to determine the reliability of the test. The final form of the tool was administered to a representative sample of students at the first instance and the same test was administered to the same group of students after a gap of 4 weeks. The scores obtained in the first trial were compared with the scores obtained in the second trial. The high correlation revealed that the test is reliable ($r = 0.750$).

Data Collection: The study was conducted in the Department of English, Samtah University College, Jazan University. The data was collected from 85 undergraduate female students who formed the sample of the study. An online survey inventory has been administered to the female students of the Department of English to collect the data. The participants have been informed about the significance of the study.

Data Analysis: The data collected with the help of online survey inventory was analyzed.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Responses of the EFL learners in the Inventory - Metacognitive Strategies in Writing

1. Planning: Planning is useful because it helps one to organise one's thoughts and prioritise the way to present the information. By planning writing, it is more likely that one will end up with a coherent argument which enables to work out a logical structure and end point for one's writing before one starts the process. It is the process of selecting a particular metacognitive strategy before doing a task/writing process. It refers to the appropriate selection of strategies and the correct allocation of resources that affect task performance.

Table 4.1: Planning

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	Semester 2021-1 Students = 32				Semester 2021-2 Students = 53				Total no. of Students = 85				Statistical Results	
			True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	Chi square	p value
1	Planning	A skilful writer is familiar with writing strategies (e.g., planning or revising the text)	31	96.9	1	3.1	50	94.3	3	5.7	81	95.3	4	4.7	0.286	0.592
2		To improve my writing skill, I have to read a lot.	26	81.3	6	18.8	43	81.1	10	18.9	69	81.2	16	18.8	0.002	0.989
3		At every stage of writing, a skilful writer avoids making error.	24	75	8	25	44	83	9	17	68	80	17	20	0.802	0.371
4		I know which strategy best serves the purpose I have in my mind.	27	84.4	5	15.6	43	81.1	10	18.9	70	82.4	15	17.6	0.144	0.704
5		Before I start to write, I prepare an outline.	28	87.5	4	12.5	46	86.8	7	13.2	74	87.1	11	12.9	0.009	0.924
6		Before I start to write, I find myself visualizing what I am going to write.	26	81.3	6	18.8	49	92.5	4	7.5	75	88.2	10	11.8	2.412	0.120
7		My initial planning is restricted to the language resources (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, expressions) I need to use in my writing.	26	81.3	6	18.8	49	92.5	4	7.5	75	88.2	10	11.8	2.412	0.120
8		I set goals and sub-goals before writing (e.g., to satisfy teacher, to be able to write emails, to be a professional writer).	30	93.8	2	6.3	43	81.1	10	18.9	73	85.9	12	14.1	2.620	0.105
9		I make a draft before writing.	30	93.8	2	6.3	48	90.6	5	9.4	78	91.8	7	8.2	0.268	0.605
10		I have specific audience in my mind.	24	75	8	25	41	77.4	12	22.6	65	76.5	20	23.5	0.062	0.803
11		I choose the right place and the right time in order to write.	27	84.4	5	15.6	46	86.8	7	13.2	73	85.9	12	14.1	0.096	0.756
12		I use avoidance strategies (e.g., when I do not know a certain vocabulary item or structure I avoid it).	24	75	8	25	43	81.1	10	18.9	67	78.8	18	21.2	0.449	0.502
13		If my mind goes blank when I begin to write, I use other similar texts or resources to take hint (find the clue).	29	90.6	3	9.4	49	92.5	4	7.5	78	91.8	7	8.2	0.088	0.766

1. A skilful writer is familiar with writing strategies (e.g., planning or revising the text). It is evident that 81 students agreed and only 4 students disagreed with the statement. This question item deals with the background knowledge of the writer's familiarity with the writing strategies in research proposal writing process. Skilful writers *plan* what they *would write*, come up with ideas, draft, *revise* and edit. The chi square value is 0.286 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.592 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
2. To improve my writing skill, I have to read a lot. It is observed that 69 students agreed, and 16 students disagreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents opined that writing skills should be improved through reading habits. The chi square value is 0.002 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.989 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
3. At every stage of writing, a skilful writer avoids making error. It is visible that 68 students agreed but 17 students disagreed with the statement. A skilful writer always checks and rechecks at every stage to avoid errors. Sometimes even skilful writers make an error in the writing process, as an error is human. The chi square value is 0.802 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.371 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
4. I know which strategy best serves the purpose I have in my mind. It is indisputable that 70 students expressed that they could plan and select an appropriate strategy, and 15 students did not agree with the statement. It is interpreted that few students knew which strategy should be used to serve their purpose and also complete the task of writing on time. The chi square value is 0.144 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.704 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
5. Before I start to write, I prepare an outline. 74 students expressed that they prepare an outline before they start to write but 11 students expressed that they do not prepare any outline when they start to write. An outline not only helps one to organize thoughts, but also serves as a schedule for when certain aspects of writing should be accomplished. The chi square value is 0.009 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.924 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
6. Before I start to write, I find myself visualizing what I am going to write. 75 respondents expressed that they visualize what they are going to write but 10 students expressed that they do not visualize what they are going to write. By visualizing the outcome, one desires, it is easier for one to act, generate new ideas, and finish the manuscript. The chi square value is 2.412 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.120 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
7. My initial planning is restricted to the language resources (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, expressions) I need to use in my writing. It is evident that 75 students do refer to the language resources to start their writing and 10 students do not refer to language

resources to start writing. Planning is restricted to language resources as academic texts should be factual, concise, and accurate. Words should be chosen precisely and carefully so that the reader can accurately understand the concepts within the text. The chi square value is 2.412 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.120 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

8. I set goals and sub-goals before writing (e.g., to satisfy teacher, to be able to write emails, to be a professional writer). 73 students expressed that they set goals /sub-goals before writing and 12 students do not set goals/sub-goals before writing. Goals setting provides direction and focus, give a sense of personal satisfaction, help maintain motivation, especially during setbacks. Goals set a realistic timeline for goal accomplishment. They provide a better understanding of expectations. The chi square value is 2.620 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.105 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
9. I make a draft before writing. 78 students expressed that they make a draft before writing and 7 students do not draft before writing. During the draft writing stage students develop a more cohesive text and explore their topic, directed by purpose, audience, genre, and content. Drafting helps students expand upon, clarify, and modify their initial plans and ideas, and it helps them organize their content into a meaningful sequence or flow. The chi square value is 0.268 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.605 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
10. I have specific audience in my mind. It is visible that 65 students agreed that they have specific audience in their mind which means that they know their purpose of research proposal writing, but 20 students disagreed and do not specify their audience. It is always important to remember that academic texts are written with an academic audience in mind and the writing style needs to conform to the conventions of the field that one is studying. The chi square value is 0.062 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.803 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
11. I choose the right place and the right time in order to write. 73 students always decide the right place and the right time in order to write, but 12 students do not choose the right place and right time to write. When it comes to being in the right place at the right time, the place is more important than the timing and maintain consistency. The chi square value is 0.096 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.756 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.
12. I use avoidance strategies (e.g., when I do not know a certain vocabulary item or structure I avoid it). In this study, 67 subjects expressed that they use the avoidance strategies, but 18 students expressed that they do not use avoidance strategies. Avoidance strategies are one of the strategies learners use when they want to overcome a communicative difficulty. What is avoided is a word or structure in the target language

that the learner thinks is difficult and prefers to evade it with a parallel and easier word or structure. The chi square value is 0.449 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.502 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

13. If my mind goes blank when I begin to write, I use other similar texts or resources to take hint (find the clue). 78 students agreed that they use hints when their mind goes blank, but 7 students disagreed, and they do not use hints to revive research proposal writing. It is also important for students to know the processes for finding and interpreting similar texts or resources or context clues. The sentences should be reread. Attention should be paid to the words that come before and after the unfamiliar word. The students should be able identify context clues, make a guess about the word's meaning, and check the guess in the given context. The chi square value is 0.088 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.766 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

2. Monitoring: refers to one's awareness of comprehension and task performance. It is the process of metacognitive strategies that is used during any task/writing process. Self-monitoring incorporates academic and social skills (e.g., counting, reading, classifying, cooperating). The strategy increases students' awareness of their own behaviour. Self-monitoring produces positive results.

Table 4.2: Monitoring

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	Semester 2021-1 Students = 32				Semester 2021-2 Students = 53				Total no. of Students = 85				Statistical Results	
			True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	Chi square	p value
14	Monitoring	I am aware of different types of genres in writing.	29	90.6	3	9.4	49	92.5	4	7.5	78	91.8	7	8.2	0.088	0.766
15		While writing, I identify the mistakes I have made.	27	84.4	5	15.6	43	81.1	10	18.9	70	82.4	15	17.6	0.144	0.704
16		I am familiar with cohesive ties (e.g., therefore, as a result, firstly).	25	78.1	7	21.9	41	77.4	12	22.6	66	77.6	19	22.4	0.007	0.934
17		I know what to do at each stage of writing.	25	78.1	7	21.9	41	77.4	12	22.6	66	77.6	19	22.4	0.007	0.934
18		I find myself applying writing strategies with little difficulty.	27	84.4	5	15.6	40	75.5	13	24.5	67	78.8	18	21.2	0.947	0.330
19		I pause while writing and ask myself if the message is clear.	30	93.8	2	6.3	48	90.6	5	9.4	78	91.8	7	8.2	0.268	0.605
20		I know what coherent piece of writing is.	26	81.3	6	18.8	48	90.6	5	9.4	74	87.1	11	12.9	1.537	0.215

21	I know what to do when strategies I employ are not effective.	23	71.9	9	28.1	45	84.9	8	15.1	68	80	17	20	2.117	0.145
22	I make necessary modifications in my plan while writing.	25	78.1	7	21.9	46	86.8	7	13.2	71	83.5	14	16.5	1.089	0.296
23	I know when to use a strategy.	26	81.3	6	18.8	49	92.5	4	7.5	75	88.2	10	11.8	2.412	0.120
24	When I use a strategy, I ask myself if it is appropriate.	25	78.1	7	21.9	48	90.6	5	9.4	73	85.9	12	14.1	2.547	0.110
25	I can develop ideas creatively by using novel (new and different) sentences.	26	81.3	6	18.8	45	84.9	8	15.1	71	83.5	14	16.5	0.194	0.660
26	At every stage of writing, I use my background knowledge to create the content.	30	93.8	2	6.3	45	84.9	8	15.1	75	88.2	10	11.8	1.503	0.220
27	I mainly focus on conveying the main message rather than the details.	24	75	8	25	38	71.7	15	28.3	62	72.9	23	27.1	0.110	0.740
28	I automatically concentrate on both the content and the language of the text.	26	81.3	6	18.8	44	83	9	17	70	82.4	15	17.6	0.043	0.836
29	I can effectively manage the time allocated to writing.	22	68.8	10	31.3	46	86.8	7	13.2	68	80	17	20	4.059*	0.043
30	I have control over my attention and do not easily let myself side-tracked.	26	81.3	6	18.8	43	81.1	10	18.9	69	81.2	16	18.8	0.002	0.989
31	While writing, I consult resources such as a dictionary or the web to get help.	29	90.6	3	9.4	46	86.8	7	13.2	75	88.2	10	11.8	0.282	0.595
32	I stop while writing and ask myself how well I am doing.	32	100	0	0	47	88.7	6	11.3	79	92.9	6	7.1	1.334	0.248

14) I am aware of different types of genres in writing. 78 students expressed that they are aware of genres of writing while 7 students did not express that they are aware of genres in writing. Genres provide the writer with general organizational patterns that can help them arrange what they say and when they say it. For writers, using the patterns of a genre accepted by readers for accomplishing their purposes allows them to establish a working relationship with readers. The chi square value is 0.088 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.766 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

15) While writing, I identify the mistakes I have made. 70 students expressed that they identify their mistakes while writing but 15 students expressed that they do not know to identify their mistakes. It is useful for students to understand a variety of typical mistakes in written English, since they are the most amenable to correction. The chi square value is 0.144 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.704 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

16) I am familiar with cohesive ties (e.g., therefore, as a result, firstly). 66 students agreed that they are familiar with cohesive ties while 19 students do not have familiarity with cohesive ties. Familiarity with cohesive ties means it is appropriate usage of cohesive devices which enables readers and listeners to capture the connectedness between what precedes and what follows. The chi square value is 0.007 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.934 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

17) I know what to do at each stage of writing. 66 students expressed that they know what to do at each stage of writing and 19 students expressed that they do not know what to do at each stage of writing. Writing is a process that involves several distinct steps: prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing and especially research proposal writing. It is important for a writer to work through each of the steps in order to ensure that one has produced a polished, complete piece. The writing process is not always linear. A writer may move back and forth between steps as needed. For example, while one is revising, one might have to return to the prewriting step to develop and expand ideas. The chi square value is 0.007 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.934 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

18) I find myself applying writing strategies with little difficulty. 67 students agree that they find little difficulty in applying the writing strategies for their proposal writing process. Of course, using more complex, sophisticated English can make complex ideas more difficult for less proficient readers to understand. This is particularly important to consider when one is writing up research, because one often need to express complex ideas and arguments clearly. But 18 students do not agree that they feel really difficult in applying writing strategies for their proposal writing process. The chi square value is 0.947 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.330 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

19) I pause while writing and ask myself if the message is clear. 78 students monitor their writing by pausing their writing, checking the clarity of message in their writing. Therefore, they know that the purpose of their proposal writing should serve the purpose and it is delivered to the readers. Only 7 students do not do that in their process of writing. *When one pauses* with purpose, one will add meaning, clarity, and impact to it. The chi square value is 0.268 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.605 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

20) I know what coherent piece of writing is. 74 students know about the coherent piece of writing in their proposal writing process, but 11 students do not know about the coherent piece of writing in their proposal writing process. All parts of the text have to relate to each other in the context in which it appears and there has to be effective transition from one part or idea to the next. Coherence in writing can be achieved through the use of words and context. The chi square value is 1.537 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.215 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

21) I know what to do when strategies I employ are not effective. 68 students expressed that they know what to do when a particular strategy does not work and shift to the other alternative during research proposal writing but 17 students do not know what they need to do when they face that problem in research proposal writing. It is advisable for all the students to be aware of different strategies in the writing process. They should also develop metacognitive strategies in learning process. The chi square value is 2.117 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.145 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

22) I make necessary modifications in my plan while writing. 71 students expressed that they could make necessary modifications in their plan while working on the research proposal writing but 14 students do not know what to do when they face such a problem in research proposal writing. It is important for all the students to be aware of different metacognitive strategies in the writing process. They should be able plan, replan and modify wherever necessary. The chi square value is 1.089 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.296 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

23) I know when to use a strategy. 75 students expressed that know what to do when a particular strategy does not work and shift to the other alternative during research proposal writing but 10 students do not know what they need to do when they face such a problem in research proposal writing. Knowing how to communicate clearly and effectively in writing can help one to perform well and advance in the given situation. The chi square value is 2.412 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.120 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

24) When I use a strategy, I ask myself if it is appropriate. 73 students expressed that they could monitor themselves in using the appropriate strategy in the research proposal writing but 12 students do not know how to monitor themselves in using the appropriate strategy in the research proposal writing. Knowledge of the writing strategies helps to communicate clearly and effectively in research proposal writing. It will also help one to perform well and advance in the given task. The chi square value is 2.547 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.110 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

25) I can develop ideas creatively through using novel (new and different) sentences. 71 students expressed that they know how to develop ideas creatively using novel sentences in research proposal writing but 14 students expressed that they do not know how to develop ideas

creatively using novel sentences in research proposal writing. The students at the university level should be able to develop creative ideas using different sentences. They will be able to do only when they have the ability to organize their ideas in a systematic way using appropriate vocabulary and sentence patterns which allows them to write creative piece of writing. The chi square value is 0.194 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.660 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

26) At every stage of writing, I use my background knowledge to create the content. 75 students use their background knowledge to create the content at each stage of their research proposal writing but 10 students do not use their background knowledge to create the content at each stage of their research proposal writing. Background knowledge is the foundation of all academic study. It is essential for comprehension, making connections, and understanding the ideas. Relevant background knowledge, prior knowledge, or experience of students help to make connections to the text they are reading, and their comprehension increases. Good readers and writers constantly try to make sense out of what they read and write by seeing how it fits with what they already know. The chi square value is 1.503 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.220 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

27) I mainly focus on conveying the main message rather than the details. 62 students responded that they prioritize to focus on the main message of their research proposal writing rather than details but 23 disagreed with the statement and expressed that they do not focus on conveying the main message rather than the details in their writing. The students should be able to identify and differentiate the different aspects and on which aspect should be the focus rather than details. The chi square value is 0.110 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.740 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

28) I automatically concentrate on both the content and the language of the text. 70 students responded that they automatically concentrate on both the content and the language of the text in the process of reviewing and monitoring their research proposal writing but 15 students do not automatically concentrate on both the content and the language of the text in their research proposal writing process. As a writer, it is important not only to think about what you say, but how you say it. To communicate effectively, it is not enough to have well organized ideas expressed in complete and coherent sentences and paragraphs. One must also think about the style, tone, and clarity of his/her writing, and adapt these elements to the reading audience. Again, analysing one's audience and purpose is the key to writing effectiveness. In order to choose the most effective language, the writer must consider the objective of the document, the context in which it is being written, and who will be reading it. The chi square value is 0.043 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.836 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

29) I can effectively manage the time allocated to writing. 68 students responded that they can effectively manage time allocated to research proposal writing but 17 students responded that they cannot manage time effectively in research proposal writing. Time management can be

defined as the process through which individual plans and attempts to exercise a conscious level of control on his or her life when it comes to deciding the time which is spent on different activities. It allows an individual to improve his or her levels of efficiency, productivity, and effectiveness. It also requires an individual to judge the amount of time which will be required by him or her to complete a number of tasks related to the social, personal, and work life of an individual. All of these facts point to the direction that developing proper time management skills take both time and efforts from the side of an individual. It becomes more important to *manage time* during *research writing*. It is important for students to *allocate sufficient time* to the task. Apart from the focus on *writing*, there are certain time management tips for students which one can follow to develop effective time management skills with ease. The chi square value is 4.059* which is significant at 0.05 level. It indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.043 < 0.05$ which indicated that there is significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

30) I have control over my attention and do not easily let myself side-tracked. 69 students responded that they have control over themselves and do not get distracted, but 16 students responded that they cannot control themselves from distractions or get side-tracked. It is important for the university students to have focus and control their attention span and should not get deviated or distracted or side-tracked. The chi square value is 0.002 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.989 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

31) While writing, I consult resources such as a dictionary or the web to get help. 75 students consult resources for getting help during the research proposal writing process, but 10 students do not consult and utilize the resources to solve their problems in research proposal writing. The university students should consult resources such as a dictionary or the web to get help while writing. They should be able to use the appropriate resource based on the need and purpose of their writing. The chi square value is 0.282 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.595 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

32) I stop while writing and ask myself how well I am doing. 79 students responded that they stop and monitor their writing process and ask themselves how they progress in the research proposal writing but 6 students responded that they don't stop and monitor their writing process. Writing is a complex intellectual task which involves many component skills. Some students may lack such skills completely and some others may not have mastered. When students lack desired writing skills, their writing may not be satisfactory in multiple ways – from poor grammar and syntax to indistinct organization. The university students should develop and use metacognitive strategies as they are required to criticize an argument, define a problem and propose a solution, shape their writing to meet their readers' needs, or revise based on feedback. The chi square value is 1.334 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.248 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

3. Evaluating: refers to appraising the final product of a task and the efficiency at which the task was performed. This can include re-evaluating strategies that were used. It is the process of metacognitive strategies that is used while finishing a task/writing process. The purpose of the evaluation process is to highlight strengths, correct performance weaknesses, and develop unused skills and abilities. In order to do this, one must be willing to recognize areas that need improvement or development.

Table 4.3: Evaluating

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	Semester 2021-1 Students = 32				Semester 2021-2 Students = 53				Total no. of Students = 85				Statistical Results	
			True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	True	%	False	%	Chi square	p value
33	Evaluating	Topic familiarity has a significant effect on one's writing output.	29	90.6	3	9.4	49	92.5	4	7.5	78	91.8	7	8.2	0.088	0.766
34		Word by word translation from first language to English negatively affects one's ability in writing.	24	75	8	25	46	86.8	7	13.2	70	82.4	15	17.6	1.909	0.167
35		I believe that the more I practice writing, the more I improve my writing skill.	28	87.5	4	12.5	46	86.8	7	13.2	74	87.1	11	12.9	0.009	0.925
36		I know which problem in writing needs much more attention than others.	25	78.1	7	21.9	47	88.7	6	11.3	72	84.7	13	15.3	1.089	0.296
37		I ask myself if the content matches the outline I have already developed.	25	78.1	7	21.9	46	86.8	7	13.2	71	83.5	14	16.5	1.090	0.296
38		I find myself resorting to fixed set of sentences I have in mind instead of creating novel sentences.	24	75	8	25	35	66	18	34	59	69.4	26	30.6	0.075	0.385
39		When I get stuck, I can find ways to solve the problem.	28	87.5	4	12.5	49	92.5	4	7.5	77	90.6	8	9.4	0.5	0.448
40		After I finish the writing, I check whether the content fits the original plan.	27	84.4	5	15.6	46	86.8	7	13.2	73	85.9	12	14.1	0.096	0.756
41		When I cannot write complicated sentences, I develop other simple ones.	27	84.4	5	15.6	46	86.8	7	13.2	73	85.9	12	14.1	0.096	0.756
42		If I do revision, I do it at both textual and the content level.	26	81.3	6	18.8	46	86.8	7	13.2	72	84.7	13	15.3	0.579	0.446
43		When I do not understand something, I get help from others (e.g., my classmates, the teacher).	29	90.6	3	9.4	45	84.9	8	15.1	74	87.1	11	12.9	0.579	0.446
44		After I finish writing, I know how well I have done.	25	78.1	7	21.9	45	84.9	8	15.1	70	82.4	15	17.6	0.631	0.427
45		After I finish writing, I edit the content of my paper.	28	87.5	4	12.5	46	86.8	7	13.2	74	87.1	11	12.9	0.009	0.925
46		If I do revision, I do it at the textual features of the text (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, and spelling).	29	90.6	3	9.4	48	90.6	5	9.4	77	90.6	8	9.4	0.001	0.993
47		I know how to develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion for my writing.	28	87.5	4	12.5	45	84.9	8	15.1	73	85.9	12	14.1	0.111	0.739

33) Topic familiarity has a significant effect on one's writing output. 78 students agreed that topic familiarity has an impact on one's writing output. It helps them to develop ideas and evaluate themselves in the research proposal writing. But 7 students disagreed with the statement. It can be inferred that the better *topic familiarity* the students in student-initiated *topic*, the higher their *writing* performance will be. The chi square value is 0.088 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.766 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

34) Word by word translation from first language to English negatively affects one's ability in writing. 70 students gave their opinion that word by word translation negatively affects and delays the student's research proposal writing ability. But 15 students do not think that word by word translation from first language to English would have negative impact on the writing ability of students. Vocabulary is the basic material of English writing, if the amount of vocabulary is insufficient, the writing is difficult. Translation of word-for-word from first language to English conveys the wrong meaning. Translation of singular and plural forms and in lexical collocation from first language to English causes negative transfer. One should master the proper learning strategies, weaken negative transfer of mother tongue, according to the English habit of thinking to choose the words, sentences, and stylistic rules and improve the basic skills of writing to write authentic articles in English. The chi square value is 1.909 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.167 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

35) I believe that the more I practice writing, the more I improve my writing skill. 74 students believed that the more they practice writing, the more they would improve their writing skill. But 11 students do not think that practice helps to improve writing skill. Writing every day can help one become more aware of the limits of one's vocabulary. When one knows the limitations, one can expand one's vocabulary by finding accurate words or experimenting with word order to see if there are other ways to get one's message across. In this way, writing practice can help one craft a distinct voice, which is something that every good writer must have, and it can help one to become a better writer. The chi square value is 0.009 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.925 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

36) I know which problem in writing needs much more attention than others. 72 students know and can decide which problem in their writing process needs more attention which means that they could focus on the problem, prioritize the need, and evaluate themselves. 13 students do not know and cannot decide the priorities in the process of research proposal writing. It is important for all the university students to be aware of the different problems in writing and when problems arise which one needs more attention than others. The students should be able identify the problems, prioritise them and think how to find a solution using different metacognitive strategies in the writing process. The chi square value is 1.089 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.296 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

37) I ask myself if the content matches the outline I have already developed. 71 students evaluated themselves about the conformity of the research proposal writing content with the outline that they have already developed before. But 14 students do not think so. A strong outline details each topic and sub-topic in the paper, organizing the points helps to build an argument toward an evidence-based conclusion. Writing an outline will also help to focus on the task at hand and avoid unnecessary tangents, logical fallacies, and underdeveloped paragraphs. The steps to prepare an outline include identifying the problem, distinguishing main idea from supporting ideas. When the basic outline of the paper is developed, the contents should be organised to match the standard format of a research paper. The chi square value is 1.090 which indicated the difference of opinion

between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.296 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

38) I find myself resorting to fixed set of sentences I have in mind instead of creating novel sentences. 59 students find themselves in resorting to the fixed sentences in their mind rather than creating the novel sentences in developing the content of the research proposal writing. But 26 students do not try to do the process of resorting to the fixed sentences in their research proposal writing process. Writing papers in universities require **to come up with sophisticated, complex, and sometimes creative ways of structuring one's ideas**. Time should be taken to draft an outline which can help to determine whether ideas are connected to each other or not, what order of ideas works best, gaps in one's thinking and sufficient evidence to support them. The chi square value is 0.075 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.385 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

39) When I get stuck, I can find ways to solve the problem. 77 students can find ways to solve their problems when they get stuck during research proposal writing process. But 8 students cannot really find ways to solve problem when they get stuck during the process of writing a research proposal. It is fundamental for the students to recognize when they are stuck. If the student is stuck, the student should seek help or use an existing solution or find a work around or drop the feature or redefine the problem. In short, to keep from getting stuck one should: break the work into small parts, estimate each part in advance and pay attention to it. The chi square value is 0.574 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.448 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

40) After I finish the writing, I check whether the content fits the original plan. 73 students expressed that after finish writing, they check whether the content fits with the original plan of research proposal writing or not which means that they can self-evaluate themselves. But 12 students do not know how to do it. It is vital for the university students to prepare a basic outline of the paper and the contents should be organised to match the original outline/plan. The chi square value is 0.096 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.756 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

41) When I cannot write complicated sentences, I develop other simple ones. 73 students expressed that they develop simple sentences when they cannot write complicated sentences, solve their problem without much confusion and evaluate themselves during the research proposal writing. But 12 students either take advantage or try to develop simple sentences. Of course, the students develop simple sentences initially, but they should gradually learn to construct complicated sentences. It is indispensable for the university students to write compound-complex sentences. Writing compound-complex sentences allows a great deal of flexibility to explain how, why, or when something happened. It is important to understand which parts of the sentence are independent clauses and which are dependent clauses so that one can punctuate it correctly and avoid writing a run-on sentence. Once the students master this, they can freely write to express more complicated ideas with clarity. The chi square value

is 0.096 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.756 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

42) If I do revision, I do it at both textual and the content level. 72 students try to revise at both textual and the content level in the process of writing a research proposal which means that they can self-evaluate themselves. But 13 students do not try to revise their research proposal writing at both textual and the content level. Revision is an important part of the writing process. Revising is a way to learn about the craft of writing. It gives students an opportunity to reflect on what they have written. Revision is closely tied to critical reading; in order to revise a piece conceptually, students must be able to reflect on whether their message matches their writing goal. It is an essential habit for all students to check whether the information is well organized, appropriate, and complete. It gives an opportunity for the students to remove unnecessary text, rearrange paragraphs, or add sections/paragraphs at both textual and the content levels. The chi square value is 0.579 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.446 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

43) When I do not understand something, I get help from others (e.g., my classmates, the teacher). It is about getting help from others when students have a problem in research proposal writing process. In this study, 74 students get help from others like classmates or teacher when they do not understand something in the research proposal writing process. Yet, there are 11 students who do not seek any help from others. There is nothing wrong in seeking help from classmates, teacher and referring other resources. The chi square value is 0.579 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.446 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

44) After I finish writing, I know how well I have done. 70 students know how they have done after they finish writing their research proposal writing process. Yet, there are 15 students who do not know how they have done their research proposal writing. If the students know how to self-evaluate themselves, then, they are aware of and have the knowledge of metacognitive strategies. The chi square value is 0.631 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.427 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

45) After I finish writing, I edit the content of my paper. 74 students expressed that they edit the content of their research proposal after they finish writing. But 11 students expressed that do not edit the content of their paper. Editing is a key part of the writing process, but self-editing is difficult for many writers, as some find it hard to objectively read their own work. The students should be careful while self-editing their work. They should first take a **printout of the material**. *They should read aloud, edit line by line, get familiar with style guides, avoid clichés, embrace re-reading, and mind the syntax.* Proofreading is the last step one should take when self-editing. So, as one goes through one's piece of writing, one will be able to re-write sentences and paragraphs. The chi square value is 0.009 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is

0.925 > 0.05 which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

46) If I do revision, I do it at the textual features of the text (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, and spelling). 77 students do revise the textual features of the text in their research proposal writing. Yet, there are 8 students who do not revise the textual features of the research proposal writing. In the final stage of revision, one should look for ways to improve the clarity, consistency, and correctness of writing at the sentence- and word-level. So, grammar, vocabulary/word choice, spelling, correct citations, and similar errors should be edited. Language should be fine-tuned to improve clarity and consistency. The chi square value is 0.001 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is 0.993 > 0.05 which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

47) I know how to develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion for my writing. 73 students know how to develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion in their research proposal writing. But there are 12 students do not know how to develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion in their research proposal writing. It is crucial for university students to perform well in academic writing. They should develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion in their writing. A good introduction will identify the topic, provide essential context, and indicate particular focus. It also needs to engage readers' interest. Usually, body paragraphs will have basic structure. Body paragraphs are the middle paragraphs that lie between the introduction and conclusion. The paragraphs are key building blocks as they represent distinct logical steps within the whole argument. A strong conclusion will provide a sense of closure while placing one's concepts in a somewhat wider context. It will also, in some instances, add a stimulus to further thought. Introductions and conclusions play a special role in academic writing, and they demand much attention as a writer. The chi square value is 0.111 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is 0.739 > 0.05 which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

4. Attitude towards Metacognitive Strategies

Attitude is a point of view or feeling among the students on the different ways of using metacognitive strategies during the research proposal writing process.

Table 4.4: Attitude – Metacognitive strategies

S. No	Attitude towards Metacognitive Strategies	Semester 2021-1 Students = 32								Semester 2021-2 Students = 53								Total no. of Students = 85								Statistical Results	
		Str. Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str. Agree	Str. Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str. Agree	Str. Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str. Agree	Str. Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str. Agree	Chi square	p value				
Statements	(-) ve attitude	%	Neu. att.	%	(+) ve attitude	%	(-) ve attitude	%	Neu. att.	%	(+) ve attitude	%	(-) ve att.	%	Neu. att.	%	(+) ve att.	%	(-) ve att.	%	Neu. att.	%	(+) ve att.				
1	I feel confident in using metacognitive strategies	10	2	37.6	11	34.4	7	2	28.2	24	4	52.8	7	13.2	17	1	34	40	47	18	21.2	27	31.8	5.432	0.0661		
													(34+6)		(11+7)		(24+3)										

2	I believe that metacognitive strategies give me opportunity to acquire new knowledge	2	7	28.2	10	31.3	8	5	40.6	17	6	43.4	13	24.5	15	2	32.1	32 (19+13)	37.6	23 (10+13)	27.1	30 (7+23)	35.3	1.982	0.371
3	I believe that metacognitive strategies enhance my learning experience	2	4	18.8	11	34.4	12	3	46.9	16	4	37.7	12	22.6	20	1	39.7	26 (18+8)	30.5	23 (11+12)	27.1	36 (32+4)	42.4	3.614	0.164
4	I believe that evaluation is important feature of metacognitive strategies	2	3	15.7	11	34.4	9	7	50	18	5	43.4	8	15.1	20	2	41.5	28 (20+8)	32.9	19 (11+8)	22.4	38 (29+9)	44.7	8.3116	0.156
5	I believe that metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates all aspects of the proposal writing process	3	1	12.5	10	31.3	15	3	56.3	15	8	43.4	8	15.1	20	2	41.5	27 (18+9)	31.8	18 (10+8)	21.2	40 (35+5)	47	9.376**	0.009
6	I believe that using metacognitive strategies allows to increase learners' skill in proposal writing	1	1	6.2	10	31.3	18	2	62.6	15	6	39.6	12	22.6	18	2	37.8	23 (16+7)	27.1	22 (10+12)	25.9	40 (36+4)	47	11.384**	0.003
7	I would be interested in studying lectures that use metacognitive strategies	2	3	15.7	7	21.9	18	2	62.6	16	3	35.9	12	22.6	18	4	41.5	24 (18+6)	28.2	19 (7+12)	22.4	42 (36+6)	49.4	4.674	0.096

1) I feel confident in using metacognitive strategies. 3 students strongly agreed, and 24 students agreed that they feel confident in using metacognitive strategies during research proposal writing process. 18 students responded neutral, 6 students disagreed, and 34 students strongly disagreed with the statement. It is crucial for the university students to improve their level of

confidence if they have any plans to pursue their higher studies. The chi square value is 5.432 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.066 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

2) I believe that metacognitive strategies give me opportunity to acquire new knowledge. 7 students strongly agreed, and 23 students agreed that metacognitive strategies give them an opportunity to acquire new knowledge during research proposal writing. 23 students responded neutral, 13 students disagreed, and 19 students strongly disagreed with the statement. It is important for the students to be aware of and develop metacognitive strategies in learning process. The chi square value is 1.982 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.371 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

3) I believe that metacognitive strategies enhances my learning experience. 4 students strongly agreed, and 32 students agreed that metacognitive strategies enhance their learning experience in the process of writing a research proposal. 23 students responded neutral, 8 students disagreed, and 18 students strongly disagreed with the statement. It is quite obvious that the knowledge of metacognitive strategies will help the students to plan, monitor and evaluate themselves in their learning experience. The chi square value is 3.614 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.164 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

4) I believe that evaluation is an important feature of metacognitive strategies. 9 students strongly agreed, and 29 students agreed that evaluation is an important feature of metacognitive strategies in the process of writing a research proposal. 19 students responded neutral, 8 students disagreed, and 20 students strongly disagreed with the statement. Evaluation is an important feature of metacognitive strategies that is used while finishing a task/writing process and helps one to self-evaluate. The chi square value is 8.311 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.156 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

5) I believe that metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates all aspects of proposal writing process. 5 students strongly agreed, and 35 students agreed that metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates proposal writing process. 18 students responded neutral, 9 students disagreed, and 18 students strongly disagreed with the statement. Metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates all aspects of proposal writing which means that planning, monitoring, and evaluating are involved in the process. Planning is the process of selecting a particular metacognitive strategy before doing a task/writing process. Monitoring refers to one's awareness of comprehension and task performance. It is the process of metacognitive strategies that is used during any task/writing process. Evaluation process is to highlight strengths, correct performance weaknesses, and develop unused skills and abilities. In order to do this, one must be willing to recognize areas that need improvement or development. The chi square value is 9.376** which is significant at 0.01 level. It indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.009 <$

0.01 which indicated that there is significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

6) I believe that using metacognitive strategies allows to increase learners' skill in proposal writing. 4 students strongly agreed, and 36 students agreed that using metacognitive strategies allow for increased learners skill on proposal writing. 22 students responded neutral, 7 student disagreed, and 16 student strongly disagreed with the statement. It is indisputable that using metacognitive strategies allows to increase learners' skill in proposal writing. Planning refers to the appropriate selection of strategies and the correct allocation of resources that affect task performance. Monitoring increases students' awareness of their own behaviour. Self-monitoring produces positive results. Evaluating helps the students to identify their performance weaknesses and improve them. The chi square value is 11384** which is significant at 0.01 level. It indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.003 < 0.05$ which indicated that there is significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

7) I would be interested in studying lectures that use metacognitive strategies. 6 students strongly agreed, and 36 students agreed that they would be interested in studying lectures that use metacognitive strategies. 19 students responded neutral, 6 students disagreed, and 18 students strongly disagreed with the statement. It is observed that university students should enrich their metacognitive abilities and the EFL writing instructors should be aware of metacognitive instruction to train the students to become self-regulated learners. The chi square value is 4.674 which indicated the difference of opinion between semester 1 and semester 2 students. The p value is $0.096 > 0.05$ which indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of semester 1 and semester 2 students for this statement.

4.5 Discussion

It is evident from the Table 5.1: Planning that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. However, the level of using planning metacognitive strategies was not satisfactory among the university students. The students should focus to improve their planning metacognitive strategy before doing a task/writing process which refers to the appropriate selection of strategies and the correct allocation of resources that affect their task performance.

It is obvious from the Table 5.2: Monitoring that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. The students should improve their self-monitoring skills which incorporate academic and social skills. This strategy in turn increases students' awareness of their own behaviour and produces positive results.

It is noticed from the Table 5.3: Evaluating that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. However, the level of using evaluating metacognitive strategies was not satisfactory among the university students. The students should learn self-evaluating skills to know their strengths and areas (weaknesses) that need development.

The findings based on the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated that the level of using metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process should be developed among the university students. The teachers should take necessary measures to improve the planning, monitoring, and evaluating metacognitive skills among the university students. They should train the students to develop the metacognitive skills based

on their requirements. Hence, the teacher should plan for an intervention program like modeling metacognitive strategies in English research proposal writing.

It is visible from the Table 5.4: Attitude towards Metacognitive strategies that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do have positive attitude to use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. However, only 32% of the sample expressed that they feel confident in using metacognitive strategies. It has been found that it is imperative for the university students to develop their level of confidence in using metacognitive strategies. 35% of the sample expressed that they believed that metacognitive strategies give them an opportunity to acquire new knowledge. 42% of the sample expressed that they believed that metacognitive strategies enhance their learning experience. 45% of the sample expressed that they believed that evaluation is important feature of metacognitive strategies. 47% of the sample expressed that they believed that metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates all aspects of the proposal writing process. 47% of the sample expressed that they believed that using metacognitive strategies allows to increase learners' skill in proposal writing and 49% of the sample expressed that they would be interested in studying lectures that use metacognitive strategies.

As the research questions and objectives were stated earlier, the research hypotheses were developed to address the feasible nexus between metacognitive strategies and EFL learners use in research proposal writing. The first research question was to categorise what metacognitive writing strategies the EFL learners use in research proposal writing to plan, monitor and assess their learning. It is apparent from all the Tables (5.1, 5.2 & 5.3) that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. Hence, the first research objective has been achieved by assessing the metacognitive strategies and the first null hypothesis has not been accepted.

Table 4. 5 EFL Learners' usage of Metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing

#	Metacognitive Strategies	No. of Students	% of the Sample
1.	Planning 4. I know which strategy best serves the purpose I have in my mind. It is indisputable that 70 students expressed that they could plan and select an appropriate strategy, and 15 students did not agree with the statement. It is interpreted that few students knew which strategy should be used to serve the purpose and also complete the task of writing on time.	70	82%
2.	Monitoring 32. I stop while writing and ask myself how well I am doing. 79 students responded that they stop and monitor their writing process and ask themselves how they progress in the research proposal writing but 6 students	79	93%

	responded that they don't stop and monitor their writing process.		
3.	<p>Evaluating</p> <p>40. After I finish the writing, I check whether the content fits the original plan. 73 students expressed that after finish writing, they check whether the content fits with the original plan of research proposal writing or not which means that they can self-evaluate themselves. But 12 students do not know how to self-evaluate themselves.</p>	73	86%

The second research question was to identify the EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive writing regulation strategies in research proposal writing. It is clear from the Table 4: Attitude towards Metacognitive strategies that the students' responses in the Metacognitive Strategies inventory indicated that a majority of the students do have positive attitude to use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process. Hence, the second research objective has been achieved by assessing the impact of EFL learners' attitudes towards the use of metacognitive writing regulation strategies in research proposal writing and the second null hypothesis has not been accepted.

Table 4.6 EFL Learners' Attitude towards Metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing

#	Attitude towards Metacognitive strategies	No. of Students	% of the Sample
	4. I believe that evaluation is an important feature of metacognitive strategies. 9 students strongly agreed, and 29 students agreed that evaluation is an important feature of metacognitive strategies in the process of writing a research proposal. 19 students responded neutral, 8 students disagreed, and 20 students strongly disagreed with the statement.	38	45%

It is noteworthy to mention that the findings of the present study overlap with what have been examined by earlier researchers. There is an impact of metacognitive strategies on EFL learners use in research proposal writing and they have used planning, monitoring, and evaluating metacognitive strategies to a certain extent in their tasks. This finding has been in line with the research studies of Farahian, M. (2015), Azizi, M., Nemati and Estahbanati, N (2017), Zehua Wang and Feifei Han (2017) and Ramazan Goctu (2017). It is significant to state that the finding, 45% of the sample expressed positive attitude towards the use of metacognitive writing regulation strategies in research proposal writing which has been supported by Hanieh Garmabi

and Gholamreza Zareian (2016) and Khikmah, Nina Amelia Nurul (2018). The findings, conclusions, educational implications of the study and suggestions to EFL teachers have been presented and certain aspects for further exploration have also been suggested.

5. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The significant findings which emerged in the course of investigation are as follows:

1. It is evident from the Table 5.1: Planning that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process.
2. It is obvious from the Table 5.2: Monitoring that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process.
3. It is noticed from the Table 5.3: Evaluating that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process.
4. It is visible from the Table 5.4: Attitude towards Metacognitive strategies that the students' responses in the Metacognitive strategies' inventory indicated a majority of the students do have positive attitude to use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process.

5.1 Conclusions of the Study

From the above findings the following conclusions have been drawn out in the present research study:

1. A majority of the students do use metacognitive strategies such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating in research proposal writing process.
2. A preponderant number of the students do have positive attitude to use metacognitive strategies in research proposal writing process.

5.2 Educational Implications

The present project is a significant attempt in the direction of using metacognitive strategies in English research proposal writing. The results and findings would be quite useful for EFL teachers. Some of the educational implications derived from the findings of the study:

1. The study has revealed the fact that assessing metacognitive strategies of EFL learners' and then, providing instructions can help the students maintain and increase their interest in English research proposal writing.
2. The study makes crystal clear that the metacognitive strategies are more effective to improve the English research proposal writing among the students.
3. To develop self-instructional material to develop the students English research proposal writing.
4. The EFL teachers are suggested to take steps to diagnose the different kinds of problems faced by the students and make use of the metacognitive teaching strategies so as to improve their English research proposal writing.
5. Training programs should be organized to improve the standards of teaching English based on metacognitive strategies among the existing EFL teachers.

5.3 Recommendations to EFL Teachers

Chris Drew (2019) opined that the metacognitive strategies involve reflection on and regulation of how one thinks. One can control not only thoughts but also one's actions in an effective way. When learners "think about their thinking" they are more capable of self-improvement. When students apply metacognitive strategies, they become better learners. Metacognitive strategies can be learned, practiced, and made into habits in order to improve learning, studying, and thinking skills into the future. He suggested a list of metacognitive strategies as teaching strategies to help students learn better. They are:

1. Self-questioning
2. Meditation
3. Reflection
4. Awareness of strengths and weaknesses
5. Awareness of learning styles
6. Mnemonic devices
7. Writing the way, one works
8. Thinking aloud
9. Graphic organizers
10. Regulation checklists
11. Active reading strategies
12. Active listening strategies
13. Action plan

Metacognition is an important concept in cognitive theory. Metacognitive activities occur before or after cognitive activity. Metacognitive strategies help students to think about thinking. The findings of the research studies in this area have shown that metacognition is an important aspect of learning strategies. The results of this study will help the teachers to support, facilitate and train the students to become autonomous learners so that the students will be able to achieve academic/research writing skills based on critical thinking skills.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

1. To equip the students with a more efficient approach to research writing, a writing lab should be established and efficiently utilized to facilitate and supplement the writing process and assessment. The findings will be useful for providing materials in the writing lab where the prospective students can equip themselves with higher language proficiency.
2. In a broader context, the research findings suggest that if students practice frequently, they will eventually be able to write well in English. If these findings can be generalized, it will greatly benefit the English language teaching and learning process in the near future.
3. Replication of the study may be done with different samples in other professional courses.

6. CONCLUSION

Summing up this study, the researcher has observed that university students should enrich their metacognitive abilities and the EFL writing instructors should be aware of metacognitive instruction to train the students to become self-regulated learners. The present study is an ardent effort and clearly indicated that English teachers should take up the responsibility to

train Saudi students in enhancing metacognitive abilities in English to prepare them for future to meet personal, professional, communicative, and global challenges.

REFERENCES

- Anne Beaufort (2007) *College Writing and Beyond: A New Frame for University Writing Instruction*. <https://www.JSTOR.org/stable/J.CTTGK0>
- Azizi, M. Nemati, A. & Estahbanati, N. (2017). *Neta-Cognitive Awareness of Writing Strategy use among Iranian EFL Learners & its Impact on their Writing Performance*. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 5(1), 42-51.
- Brinol, Pablo (2012), *Social Metacognition*, Psychology Press, pp 21-42, 42-62.
- Brown, A. (1987). *Metacognition, executive control, self-control, and other mysterious mechanisms*. In F. Weinert and R. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, Motivation, and Understanding* (pp. 65–116). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Carr, S.C. (2002). "Assessing learning processes: Useful information for teachers and students". *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 37 (3): 156–162, doi:10.1177/105345120203700304.
- Chamot, A. (2005). *The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA): An update*. In P. Richard-Amato and M. Snow (eds), *Academic Success for English Language Learners* (pp. 87–101). White Plains, NY: Longman
- Chris Drew (2019). *13 Examples of Metacognitive Strategies* <https://helpfulprofessor.com/metacognitive-strategies/>
- Cindy Perras (2014). *Metacognitive Strategies or "Thinking about my Thinking"* <https://www.ldatschool.ca/metacognitive-strategies-or-thinking-about-my-thinking/>
- Cohen, Marisa (1 December 2012). "The Importance of Self-Regulation for College Student Learning". *ingentaconnect.com*. Retrieved 31 January 2020.
- Farahian, M. (2015). *Assessing EFL learners' writing metacognitive awareness*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 11(2), 39-51.
- Flavell, J.H. (1979). "Metacognition and cognitive monitoring. A new area of cognitive-development inquiry". *American Psychologist*. 34 (10):906–911. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325541946>
- Fox E and Riconscente M. (2008). *Metacognition and Self-Regulation in James, Piaget and Vygotsky*. *Education Psychology Review* 20:373-389. <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/MetacognitioninClassrooms>
- Gammil, D. (2006). "Learning the Write Way". *The Reading Teacher*. 59(8): 754–762. doi:10.1598/RT.59.8.3.
- 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. doi:10.3102/00346543060004517.
- Gourgey, A.F. (1998). "Metacognition in basic skills instruction". *Instructional Science*. 26: 81–96. doi:10.1023/A:1003092414893.
- Hanieh Garmabi and Gholamreza Zareian (2016), *EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards the Effectiveness of Metacognitive Strategies Used by High School Students*, *International Journal of Learning & Development* ISSN 2164-4063 2016, Vol. 6, No. 1, Doi:10.5296/ijld.v6i1.9124 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v6i1.9124>
- Hartman, 2001. In H. J. Hartman (Ed.) *2001 Metacognition in Learning and Instruction: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. pp.33-68

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274710464> Developing Students' Metacognitive Knowledge and Skills

Jacobs, J.E.; Paris, S.G. (1987). "Children's metacognition about reading: Issues in definition, measurement, and instruction". *Educational Psychologist*. **22** (3–4): 225–278. doi:10.1080/00461520.1987.9653052.

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. doi:10.1080/00461520.1987.9653052

Khikmah, Nina Amelia Nurul. (2018). *Metacognitive Strategies Awareness among EFL Learners in Proposal Writing*.

http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/22761/2/Nina%20Amelia%20Nurul%20Khikmah_D05213022.pdf

MARSHA LOVETT, (2008). *METACOGNITION IMPORTANCE AND OVERVIEW*, <HTTPS://WWW.MOEDU-SAIL.ORG/LESSONS/METACOGNITION-IMPORTANCE-OVERVIEW/>

Lovett, 2008. *Teaching Metacognition: Presentation to the Educause Learning Initiative Annual Meeting*, 29 January 2008.

https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/metacognition/teaching_metacognition.html

Lovett, 2008. *Cultivating Reflection and Metacognition*. <https://lsa.umich.edu/sweetland/instructors/teaching-resources/cultivating-reflection-and-metacognition.html>

Metcalf, J., & Shimamura, A. P. (1994). *Metacognition: knowing about knowing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Miller, Tyler M.; Geraci, Lisa (1 December 2011). "Training metacognition in the classroom: the influence of incentives and feedback on exam predictions". *Metacognition and Learning*. **6** (3): 303–314. doi:10.1007/s11409-011-9083-7. ISSN 1556-1631.

Pressley, M; Borkowski, J.G.; Schneider, W. (1987). "Cognitive strategies: Good strategy users coordinate metacognition and knowledge". *Annals of Child Development*. **5**.

Reynolds, R.E. (1992). "Selective attention and prose learning: Theoretical and empirical research". *Educational Psychology Review*. **4** (4): 345–391. doi:10.1007/BF01332144.

Ramazan Goctu (2017), *Metacognitive Strategies in Academic Writing*, *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region Vol. 2, Issue 2, 2017 Ph.D.*, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia. E-mail: rgoctu@ibsu.edu.ge

Rhema, Amal and Iwona Miliszewska, (2014) "Analysis of Student Attitudes towards E - Learning: The Case of Engineering Students Libya," *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, **11**, 188.

<https://www.informingscience.org/Publications/1987?Source=%2FJournals%2FIIISIT%2FArticles%3FVolume%3D0-0>

Schneider, W; Artelt, C. (2010). "Metacognition and mathematics education". *ZDM Mathematics Education*. **42** (2): 149–161. doi:10.1007/s11858-010-0240-2.

Schraw, Gregory (1998). "Promoting general metacognitive awareness". *Instructional Science*. **26**: 113–125. doi:10.1023/A:1003044231033.

Tinberg, Howard (2015), "Reconsidering Transfer knowledge at the Community College: Challenges and Opportunities". *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* **43.1**: 7-31. <https://collegecompositionweekly.com/2015/11/16/tinberg-howard-transfer-at-community-colleges-tetyc-sept-2015-posted-11162015/>

Watanabe-Crockett, L. (2018). *The Best Self-Assessment Questions for Encouraging a Growth Mindset*. [online] Global Digital Citizen Foundation. Available at: <https://globaldigitalcitizen.org/self-assessment-questions-growth-mindset>.

Watanabe-Crockett, L. (2017). *5 Ways to Encourage Best Self-Assessment Practices Among Learners*. [online] Global Digital Citizen Foundation. Available at: <https://globaldigitalcitizen.org/5-best-self-assessment-practices>.

Watanabe-Crockett, L. (2017). *25 Self-Reflection Questions to Get Students Thinking About Their Learning*. [online] Global Digital Citizen Foundation. Available at: <https://globaldigitalcitizen.org/25-self-reflection-questions>.

Watanabe-Crockett, L. (2018). *10 Top Self-Evaluation Tips for Every Learner's Success*. [online] Global Digital Citizen Foundation. Available at: <https://globaldigitalcitizen.org/10-self-evaluation-tips>.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall.

Wenden, A. L. (1987). "Metacognition: An expanded view on the cognitive abilities of L2 learners". *Language Learning*, **37** (4): 573–594. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1987.tb00585.x.

Zehua Wang and Feifei Han (2017), *Metacognitive Knowledge and Metacognitive Control of Writing Strategy between High- and Low-performing Chinese EFL Writers*, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 7, pp. 523-532, ISSN 1799-2591, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0707.04>

Zhang, L. J. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies in an input-poor environment. *Language Awareness*, *WWW*, **11** (4), 268–288.

Zhang, L. J. (2010). A dynamic metacognitive systems account of Chinese university students' knowledge about EFL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, *WWW*, **44** (2), 320–353.

Appendix - Inventory - Metacognitive Strategies in Writing

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	True	False
1	Planning	A skilful writer is familiar with writing strategies (e.g., planning or revising the text)		
2		To improve my writing skill, I have to read a lot.		
3		At every stage of writing, a skilful writer avoids making error.		
4		I know which strategy best serves the purpose I have in my mind.		
5		Before I start to write, I prepare an outline.		
6		Before I start to write, I find myself visualizing what I am going to write.		
7		My initial planning is restricted to the language resources (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, expressions) I need to use in my writing.		
8		I set goals and sub-goals before writing (e.g., to satisfy teacher, to be able to write emails, to be a professional writer).		
9		I make a draft before writing.		
10		I have specific audience in my mind.		
11		I choose the right place and the right time in order to write.		
12		I use avoidance strategies (e.g., when I do not know a certain vocabulary item or structure I avoid it).		
13		If my mind goes blank when I begin to write, I use other similar texts or resources to take hint (find the clue).		

Adapted from Farahian (2015)

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	True	False
14		I am aware of different types of genres in writing.		

15	Monitoring	While writing, I identify the mistakes I have made.		
16		I am familiar with cohesive ties (e.g., therefore, as a result, firstly).		
17		I know what to do at each stage of writing.		
18		I find myself applying writing strategies with little difficulty.		
19		I pause while writing and ask myself if the message is clear.		
20		I know what coherent piece of writing is.		
21		I know what to do when strategies I employ are not effective.		
22		I make necessary modifications in my plan while writing.		
23		I know when to use a strategy.		
24		When I use a strategy, I ask myself if it is appropriate.		
25		I can develop ideas creatively by using novel (new and different) sentences.		
26		At every stage of writing, I use my background knowledge to create the content.		
27		I mainly focus on conveying the main message rather than the details.		
28		I automatically concentrate on both the content and the language of the text.		
29		I can effectively manage the time allocated to writing.		
30		I have control over my attention and do not easily let myself side-tracked.		
31	While writing, I consult resources such as a dictionary or the web to get help.			
32	I stop while writing and ask myself how well I am doing.			

Adapted from Farahian (2015)

S.No	Metacognitive Strategies	Items	True	False
33	Evaluating	Topic familiarity has a significant effect on one's writing output.		
34		Word by word translation from first language to English negatively affects one's ability in writing.		
35		I believe that the more I practice writing, the more I improve my writing skill.		
36		I know which problem in writing needs much more attention than others.		
37		I ask myself if the content matches the outline I have already developed.		
38		I find myself resorting to fixed set of sentences I have in mind instead of creating novel sentences.		
39		When I get stuck, I can find ways to solve the problem.		
40		After I finish the writing, I check whether the content fits the original plan.		
41		When I cannot write complicated sentences, I develop other simple ones.		
42		If I do revision, I do it at both textual and the content level.		
43		When I do not understand something, I get help from others (e.g., my classmates, the teacher).		
44		After I finish writing, I know how well I have done.		
45		After I finish writing, I edit the content of my paper.		
46		If I do revision, I do it at the textual features of the text (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, and spelling).		
47		I know how to develop an appropriate introduction, body, and conclusion for my writing.		

Adapted from Farahian (2015)

Attitude towards Metacognitive Strategies

S.No	Attitude towards Metacognitive Strategies	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Statements					
1	I feel confident in using metacognitive strategies					
2	I believe that metacognitive strategies give me opportunity to acquire new knowledge					
3	I believe that metacognitive strategies enhance my learning experience					
4	I believe that evaluation is important feature of metacognitive strategies					
5	I believe that metacognitive strategies increase the quality of proposal writing because it integrates all focus of the proposal writing process					
6	I believe that using metacognitive strategies allow for increased learners skill on proposal writing					
7	I would be interested in studying lectures that use metacognitive strategies					

Adapted from Rhema A., & Miliszewska I. (2014)