The Journal of Applied Linguistics
Vol.8, No.17, pp.120-143, Fall & Winter 2015

A Comparative Study of Metacognitive Strategies in One-way vs. Two-way Speaking Tasks among Iranian EFL Learners

Faranak Sodagari[1], Adel Dastgoshadeh[*2]

1. Department of English, Kurdistan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran
2. Department of English, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

*Corresponding author: adastgoshadeh@gmail.com

Received: 2016.4.21
Revisions received: 2016.5.16
Accepted: 2016.7.12

Online publication: 2016.10.16

Abstract

This study was an attempt to investigate what metacognitive strategies are specifically employed by English learners when it comes to different speaking task types.60 students at advanced level (female) were randomly selected and given an OPT as a test of homogeneity. They were assigned to experimental and control groups. The MS questionnaire (Oxford, 1990) was also administered to see what MS they employed in speaking tasks. The control group was traditionally taught to practice one-way and two-way speaking tasks in a conventional way. The experimental group, however, practiced one-way and two-way speaking tasks after receiving MS instruction. After administering the posttest, an ANCOVA comparison of the mean ratings of the two groups on the posttest revealed a significant difference between the speaking ability and MS use of the two groups. The results indicated that the experimental group outperformed the control group leading to the conclusion that instruction in MS use prior to oral tasks had a significantly higher impact on EFL leaners' speaking ability. Statistically, the results obtained from descriptive statistics (ANCOVA) and the chi-square revealed that the difference between MS employed by participants in one-way speaking tasks versus two-way speaking tasks were significant.

Keywords: one-way speaking tasks, two-way speaking tasks, metacognitive strategies

Introduction

Speaking is not the oral production of written language, but involves learners in the mastery of a wide range of sub-skills which, added together, constitutes an overall competence in the spoken language (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). Lazaraton (1996) claims that the hard and demanding part of speaking English as a second language is that it mostly involves interaction; in fact, it is accomplished via interaction with at least one speaker. However, Rost (2002) categorizes speaking into two tasks: one-way task and two-way task; in the former, learner is responsible for doing something with the input (such as writing down key words, and formulating main notions), whereas in the latter, some input comes from outside, sometimes from a partner, and the learner should process that information, and eventually produce some kind of comprehensible output for a partner to complete a collaborative task (Rost, 2002).

As cited in Oxford (1990), "metacognitive strategies help learners manage: (1) themselves as learners, (2) the general learning process, and (3) specific learning tasks" (p. 197). Simply put, "metacognition is thinking about thinking" (Flavell, 1979, p. 906).

According to O' Mally and Chamot (1990), metacognitive strategies have been defined as "higher order executive skills that may entail of planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of activity" (p. 44).As Rubin (1987) claims, metacognitive knowledge is an important issue for learners' selecting and activating strategies.

According to Nunan (1989), one-way speaking or monologue focuses on giving interrupted oral presentation, and two-way speaking or dialogue focuses on interacting with other speakers. According to Brown and Yule (1983), speaking can have a transaction (transfer of information) function and/or an interaction (maintenance of social relationships) function. Ellis (2003, p 96) pointed out that one-way tasks can be performed in two different ways. The person holding the information can take entire responsibility for the information exchange, i.e., the one-way task is non-interactive, or the person holding the information can be assisted by the other participant(s) asking questions to obtain or clarify information, i.e., the one-way task is interactive. Eckard and Kearny (1981), Florez (1999) and Howarth (2001) define speaking as a two–way process involving a true communication of ideas, information or feelings.

Nunan (1991) believes that in two-way tasks all the students in a group discussion have unique information to contribute, and try to convey their meaning to others in an understandable way. Two-way tasks are said to promote negotiation of meaning more than one-way tasks do through requiring interaction among learners (Foster, 1998; Doughty & Pica, 1986).

O'Malley's (1987) definition of metacognitive strategies is that "metacognitive strategies involve thinking about the learning process, planning for learning, and self-evaluation after the learning activity has been completed" (P. 8). Flavell (1979) defined metacognition as "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (P. 906). According to Chamot and O'Mally (1990), metacognitive strategies are classified into planning, organizing, monitoring, and evaluating. The use of metacognitive strategies requires both *metacognitive regulation* and *metacognitive knowledge* (i.e., knowledge about selves, tasks, and strategies)" (Wei, Chen &Ottawa 2014, p. 62). The simplest explanation for metacognition is thinking about your thinking. In other words, metacognition means that the person can be aware of what he knows and what he doesn't know, realizing what the person will need to know for a specific task and having an opinion of how to apply current skills to learn what he doesn't know. In this study, the researcher gives learners metacognitive strategies questionnaire to find out which one of these strategies are employed in the process of their learning.

According to Chamot (as cited in Brown, 2006), explicit teaching of strategies is much more effective than simply asking the learners to use and combine whatever they know. Based on Chamot‟s account (as cited in Lessard-Clouston, 1997), teaching students how to learn on their own, find the most effective way to learn, and raise their own interest and motivation in learning are very important issues that require special attention.

In this study, the researcher tries to compare one-way speaking tasks versus two-way speaking tasks in the presence of metacognitive strategies, and the researcher wants to investigate the kinds of metacognitive strategies EFL learners employ in one-way (monologue), and two-way (dialogue) speaking tasks. Accordingly, the following research questions have been addressed:

1. Does the training of metacognitive strategies in one-way speaking tasks and two-way speaking tasks help EFL learners to have a better performance?
2. What metacognitive strategies are employed by EFL learners in one-way speaking tasks?
3. What metacognitive strategies are employed by EFL learners in two-way speaking tasks?

Method

Participants

The participants of this study were 60 (female) advanced Iranian EFL learners at Shenia Language Institute in Sanandaj. The age range of the participants was between 15-20 years old. To make sure that participants were homogeneous and at advanced level, the researcher conducted the proficiency test, Oxford Placement Test (OPT), and ran statistical procedures on the mean score of participants prior to treatment to demonstrate that they were homogeneous. The researcher just included those students whose scores on the Oxford Proficiency Test were one standard deviation above the mean.

Instrumentation

The study was conducted in three phases. In the first phase of the study, the researcher attempted to select the homogenized participants. To do this, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to the participants. In the second phase, the speaking pretest and posttest were given to the participants. In the third phase, the Metacognitive Strategies questionnaire was administered to the participants.

The "Metacognitive Strategy Use" of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) for speakers of other languages was utilized in this study to examine the metacognitive strategy use of the participants. This questionnaire is a language learning strategy instrument that has been extensively tested for reliability (ranging from 0.85 to 0.96 within a sample of 1200 university students) and validated in multiple ways (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). It has been applied to studies that correlated strategy uses with

variables such as learning styles, gender, and proficiency levels (Oxford, 1998; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989).

The questionnaire includes 50 close-ended Likert-type statements ranging from one to five in six parts according to Oxford's classification (Oxford, 1990) of learning strategies that includes memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. In this study, the participants only answered the statements which were related to metacognitive strategies, and were asked to show their use of metacognitive strategies on a five-point scale: Never: 1; Seldom: 2; Sometimes: 3; Usually: 4; and Always: 5. Since an interval scale was essential for recognizing the relationship between variables, numerical values were given for each option.

The questionnaire aimed to gather general information about L2 speaking strategies used by the participants in one-way and two-way speaking tasks. Table 1 shows the distribution of the statements along with their sources.

Table 1
Distribution of the Questionnaire Items

Statements	Sources		Represented strategy
	SILL	Original	
1. I try to find as many ways as I can use my English.	√		Overviewing and linking with already known materials
2. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	√		Paying Attention
3. I repeat silently to myself when someone is speaking English.		√	Delayingspeech production to focus on the listening
4. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	√		Finding out about Language Learning

5. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	√	Organizing
6. I look for people I can talk to in English.	√	Seeking practice opportunities
7. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	√	
8. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	√	Setting goals and objectives Identifying the purpose of a language task Planning for a language task
9. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	√	Self-monitoring
10. I think about my progress in learning English.	√	Self-evaluating

Rubric of Speaking Ability

The rubric of speaking ability was adapted from IELTS Speaking Band Descriptors (public version). The components of the speaking rubric focus on fluency and coherence, lexical resources, grammatical ranges/accuracy, and pronunciation.

Procedure

This study was carried out in 3 different phases. Phase 1 included tests of homogeneity of the learners. Phase 2 included the following different steps: 1. Pretest, 2.Treatment, and 3. Posttest. Phase 3 was the administration of the questionnaire.

Test of the Homogeneity Phase

In the first phase, in order to homogenize the participants of the study, a proficiency test called OPT (Oxford Placement Test, 2004) was used. The learners with the same L1 background were selected for the purpose of the study.

The OPT test consisted of 5 listening parts; students listened and answered the questions in 20 minutes. The second section of this test consisted of 5 reading parts, and in each part students had 10 minutes to answer the questions. The reading part included reading comprehension, vocabulary, communication, and grammar. The mean of the scores is 70 and standard deviation is 14. Students whose scores in Oxford Proficiency Test (OPT) was above 84 were selected to take part in the study (since 70-14=56 and 70+14=84). Therefore, out of 80 students, 60 students remained to participate in the study.

Pretest

In the second phase, following the OPT test, in which 80 learners took part, 60 participants were randomly selected for the purpose of the study. A pretest of speaking tasks was given to test the speaking proficiency of the participants.

The oral production of the participants was recorded, and the resulting audio files were then rated by two raters. The raters used the IELTS speaking rubric (public version) to evaluate the speaking proficiency of the learners. Finally, the participants were divided into experimental and control groups; each group consisted of 30 participants. The correlation coefficient between the two sets of scores given by the two raters for learners' performance on the pretest was r=. 72.

Treatment

The treatment step underwent 5 weeks of MS instruction to the participants of the experimental group (an overall of 10 sessions, twice a week) with each session lasting for one hour and ten minutes. The one-way and two-way speaking tasks were given to the control group in a traditional way. The speaking tasks were given to the experimental group with explicit teaching of metacognitive strategies during the treatment. Learners in the experimental and control group practiced speaking tasks such as conversations, discussions, role plays, and lectures in pairs or in groups. Tasks for the class activity were

selected from the speaking and communication parts of American English Files series (4 and 4).

In experimental group, each of the Metacognitive Strategies was taught before a speaking task in the following manner:

First, the selected Metacognitive Strategies was portrayed and explained, sometimes in the mother tongue, and demonstrated and exemplified by the teacher (the researcher). Second, extra examples were recalled from the participants according to their own learning experiences. Next, there was a small-group/whole-class discussion on the justification behind the application of each strategy. Also, the participants were asked to judge about the impact of the selected strategies on their learning process. Then, the students were persuaded to employ the covered strategies, and strategies were incorporated into everyday speaking class tasks, especially into discussions, and role plays. Finally, after applying the strategy on speaking tasks, there was a small-group/whole-class discussion on the practiced strategies. The students were strongly encouraged to provide some feedback on what they thought and how they felt when employing the strategies.

Posttest

After 5 weeks of treatment for the experimental group, in order to examine the effect of the treatment, a posttest of speaking tasks was given to the participants. The posttest was administered during the last week of the experiment to both control and experimental groups.

The oral production of the learners was recorded, and the resulting audio files were then rated by two raters on the basis of IELTS speaking rubric (public version).

In this step, two raters used the same rubric (IELTS Speaking Rubric) as the pretest phase in order to score the learners, and to evaluate the speaking proficiency of the learners. To address the first research question, the improvement of the learners' speaking was examined. The correlation coefficient between the two sets of scores given by the two raters for learners' performance on the posttest was r =. 76.

Metacognitive Strategy Questionnaire and Administration

In the third phase, to answer the second and third research questions, after 10 sessions of treatment, and after the posttest step, the metacognitive strategies questionnaire was given to the learners to be filled out in 20 minutes.

At first, one-way speaking tasks were given to the participants in the experimental group and then they were required to answer the questionnaire. Then, after two days, the two-way speaking tasks were given to the experimental group, and they answered the questionnaire. In this step, the researcher explored what metacognitive strategies were employed by the learners in one-way and two-way speaking tasks.

Results

The Homogeneity of the Learners

To homogenize learners with respect to their language proficiency, the researcher just included those learners whose scores on the Oxford Proficiency Test were one standard deviation above the mean.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for homogeneity of the learners

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Test of Proficiency	80	34	87	70.04	14.658
Valid N (listwise)	80				

The mean of the scores is 70 and standard deviation is 14. Therefore, given one standard deviation above the mean, the students whose scores in Oxford Proficiency Test were above 84 were selected to take part in the study (since 70-14=56 and 70+14=84). Therefore, out of 80 students, 60 students remained to participate in the study.

Metacognitive strategies and speaking performance of EFL learners

To find the answer for the first research question concerning the effect of training of metacognitive strategies in one-way and two-way speaking tasks on better performance of EFL learners, the researcher administered the pretest of

speaking test to two groups and two raters were asked to score their performance to observe the inter-rater reliability criterion; the correlation coefficient between the two sets of scores was also calculated. Following this, having completed the treatment phase, the researcher again administered the posttest to the learners in two groups. However, the experimental group took two tests based on one-way tasks and two-way speaking tasks. Moreover, the inter-rater reliability of the raters was also taken care of for the scores obtained from the post-test. The results obtained from ANCOVA are reported below. The scoring procedure for the speaking test score band was calculated between 0 and 9.

Before performing ANCOVA, the correlation coefficient between the scores given by the two raters was calculated for pretest and posttest and the results were as follows:

Table 3
Correlations between the scores given by raters on pretest

		Pre-test scores by rater A	Pre-test scores by rater B
Pre-test scores by rater A	Pearson Correlation	1	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	60	60
Pre-test scores by rater B	Pearson Correlation	.721**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	60	60

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient between two sets of scores given by the two raters for learners' performance on the pretest was acceptable (r=.72).

Table 4
Correlations between the scores given by raters on posttest

		Post-test scores by rater A	Post-test scores by rater B
Post-test scores by rater A	Pearson Correlation	1	.767**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	60	60

Post-test scores by rater B	Pearson Correlation	.767**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	60	60

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient between two sets of scores given by the two raters for learners' performance on the posttest was acceptable (r=.76).

Table 5
Tests of between-subjects effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	29.547[a]	3	9.849	41.789	.010
Intercept	18.344	1	18.344	77.834	.153
GROUP	3.180	1	3.180	13.491	.321
PRE	15.914	1	15.914	67.523	.020
GROUP * PRE	1.616	1	1.616	6.858	.401
Error	13.198	56	.236		
Total	2137.250	60			
Corrected Total	42.746	59			

a. R Squared = .691 (Adjusted R Squared = .675)

In the output obtained from this procedure, the only value that was needed to be checked is the significance level of the interaction term (shown above as Group*Pre). The rest of the output could be ignored. Indeed, if the sig. level for the interaction is less than or equal to .05, then the interaction is statistically significant, showing that the assumption is violated. In this situation, a significant result should not be observed. That is, a sig. value of greater than .05 is needed. As displayed in Table 5, the sig. or probability value was .401, safely above the cut-off. There has not been a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes. This supports the earlier conclusion gained from an inspection of the scatterplots for each group.

Table 6
Levene's test of equality of error variances[a]

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.670	1	58	.201

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

The details in Table 6 labeled as Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was checked to see if there had been any violation of the assumption of equality of variance. The sig. value should be greater than .05. If this value is smaller than .05 (and therefore significant), this means that the variances are not equal, and that the assumption is violated.

In this case there was no violation of the assumption because the sig. value is .201, which is larger than our cut-off of .05.

Now that the assumptions have been checked, the ANCOVA analysis is ready to explore the differences between the treatment groups.

Table 7
Descriptive statistics of the two groups

GROUP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Control	5.4500	.85450	30
Experimental	6.3667	.55605	30
Total	5.9083	.85118	60

In Table 7, labeled as Descriptive Statistics, the mean scores of each group were reported; the mean score of the control group was 5.45 with the standard deviation of .85 and the mean score of the experimental group was 6.36 with the standard deviation of .55. The number of participants in each group was 30.

Table 8
Tests of ANCOVA for experimental and control group

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	27.931[a]	2	13.966	53.733	.000	.653
Intercept	18.787	1	18.787	72.282	.000	.559
PRE	15.327	1	15.327	58.971	.000	.508
GROUP	8.699	1	8.699	33.472	.000	.370

Error	14.815	57	.260
Total	2137.250	60	
Corrected Total	42.746	59	

a. R Squared = .653 (Adjusted R Squared = .641)

The main ANCOVA results are presented in Table 8. The researcher tried to find out whether the groups were significantly different in terms of their scores on the dependent variable**,** that is, on the posttest. The line corresponding to the independent variable (in this case Group) was followed and read across to the column labeled as Sig. Since the value in this column was less than .05 (here, it was .00), the groups differed significantly. Therefore, the result was significant. There was a significant difference in the students' attitudes towards MS scores for subjects in the experimental group and the control group.

The effect size was also checked, as indicated by the corresponding partial eta squared value. The value in this case is .37 (a large effect size according to Cohen's 1998 guidelines). The guidelines (proposed by Cohen, 1998) for interpreting this value are:
.01=small effect, .06=moderate effect, .14=large effect.

Metacognitive Strategies Employed in One-way Speaking Tasks

As for the second research question concerning the extent to which metacognitive strategies were employed by EFL learners while working on one-way speaking tasks, the researcher made use of descriptive statistics to report the findings.

Table 9
Strategies employed in one-way speaking tasks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	finding out about language learning	25	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Organizing	22	17.9	17.9	38.2
	self-monitoring	19	15.4	15.4	53.7
	setting goals and objectives	15	12.2	12.2	65.9

identifying the purpose of a language task	15	12.2	12.2	78.0
planning for a language task	15	12.2	12.2	90.2
self-evaluating	12	9.8	9.8	100.0
Total	123	100.0	100.0	

To see if the difference between the strategies employed by the learners with regard to one-way tasks was significant, the researcher performed Chi-square.

Table 10
*Frequency * one-way speaking tasks strategies cross-tabulation*

		one-way task strategies							
		language learning	organizing and planning	self-monitoring	objectives	setting goals and	language task	language task	self-evaluating	Total
Frequency	Employed	25	22	19	15	15	15	12	123
	Not-employed	98	101	104	108	108	108	111	738
Total		123	123	123	123	123	123	123	861

Table 11
Chi-Square Tests for one-way speaking tasks

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.480[a]	6	.205
Likelihood Ratio	8.317	6	.216
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.695	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	861		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.57.

The main value that was checked from the output was the first chi-square value, Pearson Chi-Square. In Table 4.10, the value was 8.48, with an associated significance level of .205. Since to be significant, the sig. value

needs to be .05 or smaller, and in this case, the value of .205 was higher than the alpha value of .05, the result was significant.

Metacognitive Strategies Employed in Two-way Speaking Tasks

As for the third research question concerning the extent to which metacognitive strategies were employed by EFL learners while working on two- way speaking tasks, the researcher made use of descriptive statistics to report the findings.

Table 12
Strategies employed in two-way speaking tasks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	overviewing and linking with already known materials	27	16.7	16.7	16.7
	paying attention	24	14.8	14.8	31.5
	delaying speech production to focus on listening	21	13.0	13.0	44.4
	seeking practice opportunities	18	11.1	11.1	55.6
	setting goals and objectives	16	9.9	9.9	65.4
	identifying the purpose of a language	16	9.9	9.9	75.3
	planning for a language task	16	9.9	9.9	85.2
	self-monitoring	13	8.0	8.0	93.2
	Self-evaluating	11	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	162	100.0	100.0	

To see if the difference between the strategies employed by the learners with regard to two-way tasks was significant, the researcher performed Chi-square.

Table 13
*Frequency * one-way speaking tasks strategies cross-tabulation*

	one-way task strategies	tal o

		organizing and planning language learning	self-monitoring	setting goals and objectives	identifying the purpose of a language task	self-evaluating planning for a language task		
Frequency	Employed	25	22	19	15	15	15	12	123
	Not-employed	98	101	104	108	108	108	111	738
Total		123	123	123	123	123	123	123	861

Table 14
Chi-Square Tests for one-way speaking tasks

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.480[a]	6	.205
Likelihood Ratio	8.317	6	.216
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.695	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	861		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.57.

The main value that was checked from the output was the first chi-square value, Pearson Chi-Square. In Table 14, the value was 13.25, with an associated significance level of .104. Since to be significant, the sig. value needs to be .05 or smaller, and in this case, the value of .104 was more than the alpha value of .05, the result was significant.

Discussion

The present study describes the utilization of metacognitive strategies instructions in EFL speaking classes. The instruction is an interactive procedure through which the instructor can arrange the best method for performing a task with the learners. Oxford (1990) discusses the right conditions for utilizing

learning strategies and recommends that in order for a strategy to be useful, it should be identified with L2 activity, fit the learning styles of the user to some degree, and it should be used effectively and connected with other relevant strategies by the learner. Just by the satisfaction of all these needs may learning become easier, more enjoyable, faster, more independent, and more effective. As Lam (2009) points out, the instruction helps the learners develop an independent learning, and promotes their oral proficiency.

Cohen (2004) believes that both descriptive (e.g., Vandergrift 2003) and interventionist studies (e.g., Cohen 1998; Macaro, 2001) have demonstrated that learners who use strategies (especially the metacognitive ones) are more successful than those who do not. However, as he puts it, language researchers are beginning to link success in language learning with the 'effective' use of strategies.

The findings of this study revealed some information on the use of the metacognitive strategies by students in their speaking in EFL learning. Wu (2007) and Goh (2002) found that 'paying attention' to sub-classes of metacognitive strategies recorded high use of the strategy among Chinese students of a vocational institute in Hong Kong. This strategy is about focusing attention, and is one of the most essential criteria for successful learning. Shannon (2008) in a study found that self-evaluation was highly practiced and appreciated by learners as it contributes towards motivation and achievement. In fact, good learners tend to devote more time to monitoring and evaluating their learning as this contributes towards good achievement and lifelong learning (Tan & Tan, 2010). Students who can conduct self-evaluation would result in higher confidence to use L2 (Chu, 2008). Therefore, learners should learn how to use metacognitive strategies to build up learners' independence and autonomy towards promoting lifelong learning (Anita & Aida, 2011).

The results of the present study demonstrated that the incorporation of metacognitive strategies instruction in the syllabus can be a basic program in EFL courses. The disclosure of the metacognitive strategies as the most favored strategy groups suggests that the students showed a tendency to regulate their own learning in accordance with what metacognitive strategies are supposed to do (Oxford, 1990), including centering, planning, arranging, and evaluating one's own learning.

One of the advantages of using metacognitive instruction is making the students aware of these strategies, since such strategies involve conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning aim. Learners should have enough knowledge about their own thinking and actions which can only be achieved through strategy instruction. In other words, language instructors and learners should understand both language learning strategies and the relationships between language learning strategies and speaking skill. They have to confront the need of language learning strategies in improving speaking proficiency. Moreover, to make language instruction more practical, language instructors should focus on teaching the language as well as the appropriate strategies helpful in language learning (Rashtchi & Khani, 2010).

Finally, it can be concluded that metacognitive strategies give more chances to learners to practice their speaking tasks, and enhance their speaking abilities and expand their topic familiarity in different types of speaking tasks.

Refrences

Anita, M., & Aida, K. (2011).Learning strategies in second language learning and teaching. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(3).

Brown, C., & Yule, C. (1983).*Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York: Longman.

Cohen, A. D. (2004). Strategy-based learning of speech acts: Developing and evaluating a webbased curriculum. Paper presented at the Independent Language Learning Conference, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK. Retrieved February 2, 2007, from http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/CohenPapers/SBL_speech_acts.doc

Chu, R.H. N. (2008). *Shyness and EFL learning in Taiwan: A study of shy and non-shy college students' use of strategies, foreign language anxiety, motivation, and willingness to communicate* (Doctoral dissertation,

University of Texas, Austin). Retrieved from https://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2008/chuh41126/chuh41126.pdf

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: do they facilitate second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*, 305-325. Retrieved from: January, 17, 2016, http:// hiaincirebon.ac.id/ebook/indrya/Presentation in classroom/forster98.pdf

Eckard, R., & Kearny, M. (1981).*Teaching conversational skills in ESL*.Washington: Center of Applied Linguistics.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new era of cognitive development enquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906-911. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 1-23.

Goh, C. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. *System, 30*(2), 185-206.

Howarth, P. (2001). Process speaking: Preparing to repeat yourself. *MET, 10*(1), 39-44.

Lam, Y. K. W. (2009). Examining the effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on ESL group discussions: A synthesis of approaches. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(2), 129-150.

Lv, F. & Chen, H. (2010).A study of metacognitive-strategies-based writing instruction for vocational college student. *English Language Teaching Journal, 3(3),* 136-144.doi: 10.5539/elt.v3n3p136

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(4), 531-548.

McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (2003).*Materials and methods in ELT.A teacher's guide* (2nd edition.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2), 279-295.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The effect of training in the use of learning strategies on acquiring English as a second language. In A. Wenden& J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 133-144)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

O'Malley, J. M., &Chamot, A. U. (1990).*Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995).Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory of language learning (SILL).*System, 23*(1), 1-23.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies.* Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Shannon, S. V. (2008). Using metacognitive strategies and learning styles to create self-directed learners. *Institute for Learning Styles Journal 1*, 14- 31.

Tan, Y. H. & Tan, S. C. (2010).A metacognitive approach to enhancing Chinese language speaking skills with audioblogs. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology 26*(7), 1075-1089.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language learning*, *53*(3), 463-496.

Wei, J., Chen, Ch. J., & Adawu, A. (2014).Teaching ESL beginners metacognitive writing strategies through multimedia software. The CATESOL Journal, 26(1), 60-75.

Wu, M. F. (2007). The relationships between the use of metacognitive language learning strategies and language learning motivation among Chinese-speaking ESL learners at a vocational Education Institute in Hong Kong. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(3).

Biodata

Faranak Sodagari, English teacher at institutes and English to Persian translator in Sanandaj, Iran. She obtained her BA from Payamnoor, Sanandaj Branch in 2013 and MA in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj branch and Kurdistan Science and Research Branch 2016. Her main research

interests are genre analysis, impact of leaning strategies on different skills of English learning, and assessment.

Adel Dastgoshadeh, assistant professor at the Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj Branch, Iran. He received his Ph.D in TEFL Islamic Azad University, Tehran Branch, Iran. He has published and presented a number of articles in different journals and conferences.