Frontiers in Educational Practice and Research
Vol. 1 (2025), No. 2, pp. 77-89
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55578/fepr.2507.007

ARTICLE

The Effect of Metacognitive Strategy Training on Students' Speech Act Production

Masoud Kiani[1,*], Ali Roohani[2]

[1] *English Language Department, Shahrekord University, Shahrekord, Iran*

[2] *Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Shahrekord University, Shahrekord, Iran; Roohani.ali@gmail.com*

[*]Corresponding author. Email: kiani.ma22@gmail.com

Received: 22 May 2025, Accepted: 8 July 2025, Published: 14 July 2025

Abstract

The identification of learning styles and the implementation of successful learning strategies have a significant impact on English teaching and learning. This study investigates the extent to which metacognitive strategy training assists EFL learners to produce speech act of request, apology, refusal and complain. To this end, two intermediate-level classes were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Experimental group received metacognitive training and control group received conventional way of teaching speech acts. The treatment lasted for 11 sessions. Each session involved the metacognitive strategy instruction followed by pragmatic problem-solving tasks. To examine the data, the Shapiro-Wilk test and multivariate analysis of variance were conducted using SPSS software. The findings indicated that metacognitive strategy training led to notable improvements in various aspects of speech act production, such as making requests, apologies, refusals, and complain in experimental group. Moreover, Metacognition is essential for enhancing speaking abilities as it involves individuals being conscious of their own thinking processes to enhance their learning.

Keywords: Metacognitive Strategies; Speech Acts; Learning Strategies; Learning Style

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is the study of how language is used by people in relation to their society. Language is the primary tool for human communication, and its different uses are influenced by societal conditions that affect how individuals access and control their means of communication. Using a language involves engaging in speech acts such as stating information, issuing commands, asking for things, making commitments, and so on. These acts are typically enabled by and carried out in compliance with specific guidelines for utilizing language components. The focus on studying speech acts is because all forms of linguistic communication involve these acts. Recent scholarship builds on Searle's foundational work by emphasizing that linguistic communication is not merely about the use of words or structures, but about performing actions—such as requesting, apologizing, or refusing—within specific social and cultural contexts [1,2].

Since 1980s, there has been a growing focus on interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) in second language acquisition (SLA) research, particularly in relation to discourse and sociolinguistic competencies [3]. Speech acts have been a primary area of interest due to their varied expressions across cultures and languages [4-6]. Initially centered on the implicit/explicit distinction influenced by Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis, instructional pragmatics has evolved to be studied within more interactionist theoretical frameworks in recent years [7].

Austin's [8] seminal classification of speech acts into five types—verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives, and expositives—laid the groundwork for understanding how language functions as action. These categories illustrate the various ways speakers perform social actions through language, such as making judgments, exercising authority, committing to future actions, expressing social attitudes, or explaining viewpoints. While foundational, recent pragmatic research has

shifted focus from rigid categorization to how these acts are shaped by context, intention, and cultural norms in real-time communication [1,2]. Building upon and critiquing Austin's foundational work, Searle [9-11] refined Speech Act Theory by focusing more rigorously on illocutionary acts—the speaker's intended communicative force. He addressed key limitations in Austin's classification, such as the conflation of verbs with speech acts, inconsistencies in category definitions, and a lack of systematic principles for categorization. Searle proposed a more coherent taxonomy based on speaker intention and direction of fit, which continues to influence contemporary research in pragmatics [1,2].

Searle [11] proposed a refined classification of illocutionary acts into five categories based on speaker intention and the relationship between language and reality. These include: (1) Assertives, which commit the speaker to the truth of a proposition (e.g., stating, claiming); (2) Directives, which aim to get the hearer to do something (e.g., requesting, advising); (3) Commissives, which commit the speaker to a future action (e.g., promising, offering); (4) Expressives, which reveal the speaker's psychological state (e.g., apologizing, thanking); and (5) Declarations, which enact change in social or institutional reality through speech (e.g., resigning, marrying). This framework remains central in pragmatics, particularly in analyzing how speech acts function across linguistic and cultural contexts [1,2].

It is indisputable that individuals have unique learning styles when it comes to language acquisition. Each person, whether knowingly or unknowingly, employs specific strategies to succeed in learning a language. Both teachers and students have their own distinct teaching and learning styles, respectively, which can impact their academic achievements [12].

Metacognition involves reflecting on one's own thought processes, which includes both considering what we know and managing how we learn. These aspects are crucial for learning and personal development. Enhancing metacognitive awareness is important in education, as it allows students to understand their learning styles and choose the most effective methods. By developing this skill, students can improve their self-awareness and become more adept at comprehending and evaluating different situations using the best strategies and techniques [13-15].

Students can enhance their self-awareness by keeping a reflective journal. By writing about their daily experiences, teachers can better understand students' learning and comprehension levels. It is recommended for students to review previous material before moving on to new topics. Sessions should begin with a self-assessment of what the student wants to achieve. Students are encouraged to manage their time effectively, complete assignments punctually, develop study strategies, assess their progress, and adjust their learning approach as necessary. Cognitive and metacognitive skills play a crucial role in guiding students' thinking processes. Metacognition, which involves self-aware learning, is essential for academic success. Educators working with students of average to below-average intelligence should emphasize the importance of self-awareness, as these skills can improve academic performance [16-18].

Metacognition is the understanding of one's thought processes and the ability to control them. Training can enhance metacognitive skills, and educating students about metacognition and the importance of continuous learning, as well as raising teachers' awareness of its significance, can help students learn how to teach themselves. It is suggested that children's decision-making abilities can be shaped during primary education by involving them in activities that promote metacognitive awareness. Therefore, being prepared and understanding the circumstances involved may predict learning success. Teachers are urged to support students in developing their metacognitive awareness, encouraging them to set educational goals for themselves [19-21].

Students should be instructed in the concept of "learning to learn," which involves a shift from traditional learning methods to a more authentic approach. Developing metacognitive skills is crucial for continuous learning. Educators need to recognize the significance of integrating metacognitive education into their teaching practices, as this will assist students in acquiring adaptive metacognitive knowledge when faced with various situations that require both metacognitive and cognitive abilities. The curriculum and learning strategies should incorporate metacognitive skills to empower students to monitor and regulate their learning processes in order to tackle the challenges of academic life. Additionally, having metacognitive awareness helps students assess tasks, create strategies, employ specific tactics, track progress, evaluate outcomes, and adjust their methods accordingly [22,23].

Although numerous studies have examined speech acts in second language acquisition and the role of metacognitive strategies in language learning, few have explored the direct integration of metacognitive strategy training with the explicit instruction of speech acts. This study bridges that gap by investigating how metacognitive strategy training—emphasizing planning, monitoring, and evaluating—can improve the pragmatic production of specific speech acts (requests, apologies, refusals, and complaints) among intermediate EFL learners. By doing so, this research not only contributes to our understanding of how learners internalize and perform speech acts but also introduces a structured, strategy-based approach to pragmatic instruction that promotes learner autonomy and reflective practice in communication.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research in pragmatics aligns with the predominant theories and research focus in second language acquisition (SLA). It involves examining various intertwined factors such as linguistic, psychological, cognitive, sociological, affective, and social aspects to understand how second language pragmatics are acquired and learned. Numerous studies have explored the impact of factors like L2 proficiency (e.g.,[24-34]) motivation (e.g.,[35-38]), emotional intelligence [39,40], multiple intelligences [41], age, gender [42-44] both as physiological and socio-psychological variables, , personality types (e.g., [45-48]), and willingness to communicate [49] on second language learners' speech acts and conversational patterns.

Instruction in metacognition is not given enough importance in educational policies and practices. Teaching individuals to be aware of their own thinking processes is essential for fostering independent learners who can think critically, act decisively, take a stance, and make informed decisions. Metacognition also assists primary school teachers in explaining the advanced cognitive skills involved in teaching reading comprehension. Providing real-life experiences is another effective method to enhance students' awareness of metacognition and their motivation to learn. This approach enables teachers to observe, assess, and adjust their teaching methods based on students' needs, objectives, and environments. By incorporating metacognitive strategies into their instruction, teachers can help students recognize their knowledge gaps, correct errors, and develop their critical thinking skills. [50,51].

students' metacognitive awareness plays a significant role in their learning and academic success. When students have a strong understanding of their own thinking processes, they tend to excel in their studies. As a result, teachers are encouraged to adopt a more practical approach to instruction to engage students effectively. By promoting higher-order thinking skills, teachers can help students develop critical thinking abilities and improve their decision-making skills.

Milenkovic and Branka [52] showed a link between metacognitive awareness in writing and a communicative teaching approach for students. Takallou's research [53] also supported the connection between metacognitive awareness and attitude in the communicative approach. Therefore, students are crucial in shaping new teaching methods, and teachers should focus on helping students become aware of different learning strategies and use them efficiently.

Similarly, Tamin and Büykahska [54] discovered that students primarily utilized problem-solving strategies, followed by global strategies, and then support reading strategies. These strategies were more commonly employed than support reading strategies. Thus, students' awareness of their metacognitive processes plays a crucial role in shaping their attitudes towards communicative approaches.Furthermore, research by Thawarom et al. [55] indicates that enhancing one's metacognitive understanding is crucial for effectively accomplishing learning activities related to communicative skills.

According to Sulistyowati et al. [56], researchers have studied how metacognition impacts language learners' achievement and found that it has a positive influence on their learning outcomes. Bessy and Knouse [57] further argue that educators teaching foreign languages should prioritize developing students' metacognitive skills and awareness of language structure, while also explicitly teaching the importance of language learning. Additionally, Miller [58], noted that using metacognitive reading strategies and being consciously attentive while reading significantly contribute to language

learners' reading comprehension. This is because readers can become independent learners by understanding which strategies work best for them to achieve their goals efficiently.

Furthermore, Zulkiply [18] determined that students' communication skills are greatly influenced by their level of metacognitive awareness. This awareness allows students to enhance both resource sharing and information sharing. Engaging in social interactions has also been found to enhance metacognition. By participating in conversations with peers, students can improve their ability to provide more accurate explanations for their actions and experiences. Additionally, metacognitive awareness is essential for communication, understanding written content, language acquisition, problem-solving, and personality development.

Additionally, multiple studies have demonstrated a direct link between cognitive regulation and its components, as evidenced by language learning scores in writing. This suggests that individuals with advanced expertise possess better abilities to manage and structure their thoughts and actions when engaging in writing tasks [59].

Metacognitive awareness is crucial in language acquisition, especially in developing listening and speaking skills where the processes may not be readily apparent to the learner. Communicative strategies are linked to metacognition as language learners utilizing a communicative approach may have varying levels of awareness regarding their language use [60].

The communicative approach is closely linked to metacognition. The research study demonstrated a strong correlation between these two variables, indicating that students' attitudes towards the communicative approach are influenced by their metacognitive awareness. This suggests that students must possess metacognitive awareness in order to effectively speak, communicate, and write. Therefore, a robust metacognitive awareness is crucial in the realm of communication. Without it, students may struggle to convey knowledge to others, leading to poor academic performance. It is therefore advised that educators prioritize this critical factor to ensure students develop strong communication skills.

This study is grounded in two interrelated theoretical frameworks: Speech Act Theory and metacognition. Drawing on foundational work by Austin [61] and Searle [11], Speech Act Theory offers a pragmatic lens for analyzing how language functions as action in context—focusing on how learners perform communicative acts such as requests, refusals, and apologies with cultural and social appropriateness. Complementing this, the theory of metacognition, originally introduced by Flavell [62] and expanded in recent educational research [63,20], underscores the learner's capacity to consciously plan, monitor, and evaluate their language use. By synthesizing these perspectives, the current study investigates how explicit metacognitive strategy training can enhance learners' ability to produce pragmatically appropriate speech acts, thereby fostering both linguistic accuracy and communicative effectiveness in EFL contexts

To these ends, the following research questions were addressed:

Does Metacognitive Strategy Training have any significant effect on Students' Speech Act Production?

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The study involved 30 intermediate-level EFL learners (17 females, 13 males) aged between 17 and 23, enrolled in a private English language institute in Ahvaz, Iran. All participants were native speakers of Persian (L1), providing a relatively homogeneous linguistic and cultural background. This uniformity minimizes variability in speech act norms across cultures, allowing the study to more precisely assess the impact of the instructional intervention rather than cultural interference.

The participants were selected through convenience sampling, and their English proficiency level was determined using a TOEFL sample test. Based on the test results, all were classified at an intermediate level. Their pretest scores on the pragmatic tasks confirmed that they were also similar in terms of their initial L2 pragmatic competence.

The sample size (N=30) was chosen in line with similar quasi-experimental SLA studies, which often employ small to medium-sized samples due to practical constraints in language classrooms (e.g., [34,46]). Although relatively small, the sample size is justified through the use of controlled experimental design (random assignment to experimental and control groups) and robust statistical

analyses (e.g., MANOVA, t-tests), which support the internal validity of the findings. Future studies could expand the sample for greater generalizability.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. The TOEFL Sample Test

The TOEFL sample test was given to ensure that all participants had a similar level of proficiency in general English. The test consisted of 45 multiple-choice questions and two essay questions taken from the Reading Comprehension (30 questions) and Structure and Written Expressions (15 questions for structures and two for writing) sections of the paper-based TOEFL tests. According to the Educational Testing Service (ETS), scores of 15-21 (out of 30) in reading and 17-23 (out of 30) in structure and written expressions indicate an intermediate proficiency level. The participants in this study scored within these ranges, placing them at an intermediate proficiency level. The test took approximately an hour to complete. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) results from the TOEFL practice test indicated that, at the time of data collection, there was no significant difference in scores between the participants in experimental and control group.

3.2.2. Written discourse completion test (WDCT)

Before and after the treatment, a test called WDCT was given to evaluate how well the participants were able to perform specific speech acts. The test questions were selected from various previous studies and refined after a pilot test to ensure clarity and relevance. Each version of the WDCT contained 20 items, with five items focusing on each of the target speech acts: requests, apologies, refusals and complains. Participants had to respond to scenarios by filling in what they would say in those situations. The scenarios were designed to reflect social factors like power, social distance, and the level of imposition, as outlined in Brown and Levinson's taxonomy. It took approximately 40 minutes for participants to complete the WDCT. The pre-test and post-test of the WDCT showed good reliability with Cronbach's alpha values of .74 and .82, respectively.

The researchers and an expert in the field of EFL evaluated responses to WDCTs using a 4-point rating scale created by Jeringan [64]. The scale ranged from Level 1, indicating a response that was pragmatically unacceptable with non-native-like usage and errors, to Level 4, representing a performance that was completely acceptable and approached native-like usage. Each participant's final score was determined by averaging the ratings from the two evaluators. The inter-rater reliability of the WDCT pretest and post-test was assessed using Pearson product-moment correlation, yielding acceptable values of .86.

3.3. Procedure

To determine how often students use metacognitive strategies when speaking, a questionnaire was distributed where students could indicate their frequency as "never," "sometimes," or "always." It was conducted to assess the present utilization of metacognitive strategies. It was also carried out to teach metacognitive strategies and their connection to utilizing speech acts, which would be recognized as a component of the training process. This study included two classes: metacognitive strategy training and conventional training groups. It was done over a period of 11 consecutive sessions. In the first session, the participants took the WDCT pretest and were familiarized with the purpose of the study, instructional treatment, and the materials. During the next nine sessions, they received the instruction and worked on the target speech acts. Three sessions were allocated for each of the speech acts, with the learners working on a different combination of social variables in each session. The metacognitive strategy training was conducted in four weeks. Each session involved 90-minute meeting which participants were taught metacognitive strategies. The goal was to help students become more aware of how to use these strategies in their speaking abilities.

During the meetings, the researcher informed the students that they would be receiving metacognitive strategy training to enhance their speaking abilities. The researcher, who also served as a trainer for this training, will provide a detailed explanation of a modified version of Oxford's Metacognitive Strategy Training design. The training emphasized specific aspects of explicit training that help students carry out executive functions in managing cognitive strategies, such as self-planning, self-monitoring, and self-evaluating. Additionally, students were required to acquire a range of strategies. This training enhanced the students' awareness of metacognition, enabling them to utilize it and choose the most suitable strategy. The goal was to comprehend the students' knowledge and thought processes, as well as their capacity to control their thinking while completing a task. The researcher believed that this assessment would help students become more self-aware and ultimately enhance their independence in learning. The metacognitive strategy training would be introduced in

three stages of the Lesson Plan: before the activity, during the activity, and after the activity. Before starting the lesson, the teacher conducted an icebreaker activity to engage the students and focus their attention on the lesson content. By showing pictures of invitations, she prompted the students to analyze and share their thoughts on what they saw. The teacher also encouraged the students to express their opinions and ideas related to the images. Following this, the teacher outlined two specific objectives that the students were expected to accomplish by the end of the lesson. While engaged in the activity, students went through three distinct phases: preparation, practice and monitoring, evaluation and expansion. In the Preparation: Self-planning stage, students engaged in pre-speaking activities to recall what they already knew about the upcoming material. The teacher also aimed to remind students of the strategies they typically used for preparing for speaking tasks and the different aspects of speaking performance they were familiar with. During the second phase, practice and monitor: Self-Monitor, students were provided with the same topic but presented in various images. The teacher instructed them to collaborate in groups and focus on two key training goals: Metacognitive strategies and speaking aspects. The teacher supported the students by demonstrating when they faced challenges during group activities. Each student was required to present the text in their own words, while their group members listened and took notes on what needed to be retained and revised. Third phase, evaluation and expansion: Self-Evaluation and self-Expansion, was created to help students become more conscious of the strategies they employed and assess their speaking performance. The evaluation aimed to enhance self-assessment and the efficiency of strategies utilized by students in completing tasks. Students were required to determine which strategies were successful for specific tasks and understand the reasons behind their effectiveness. Additionally, they were encouraged to seek guidance when struggling to identify areas for improvement. In the follow-up session, students were invited to showcase their use of speech acts in front of their peers. The teacher encouraged the sharing of thoughts, feedback, and inquiries from the audience to generate new perspectives. Students were also provided with the opportunity to refine their speaking presentations and deliver them again if they chose to do so. In the last session, the WDCT post-test was administered.

4. RESULTS

In Table 1, details regarding the speech act of both the control and experimental groups are showed, the pre-test means score in the control group and experimental group are 30 and 31, respectively. That is, the mean of both control and experimental groups are not different considerably. As table 1 shows the post mean score in control and experimental groups are 48/733 and 136/066 that means, they increased considerably that shows the instruction was effective, however the mean score in experimental group was greater than control group mean score that means metacognitive strategy training was effective in experimental group.

Table 1. Statistical description of speech Act Production (Based on the Score Obtained From WDCT)

Group	Variable	N	Mean	SD
Experimental	Pre-test	15	31	10/549
	Post-test	15	136/066	10/549
Control	Pre-test	15	30	9/885
	Post-test	15	48/733	9/505

4.1. Inferential Findings

4.1.1. Normality of Data Distribution

In order to check the normality of the distribution of the research data, the Shapiro-Wilk test was used, and its results are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 2. Shapiro-Wilk Test Results

Group	Variable	Statistic	Sig
Experimental	Pre-test	0/905	0/115
	Post-test	0/914	0/156
Control	Pre-test	0/960	0/692
	Post-test	0/962	0/735

The Shapiro-Wilk test results from Table 2 indicates that the distribution of all the measured variables in the groups being studied is normal, with statistical significance (ps<0.05). It means that the

data for each variable follow a normal distribution and most of values in the data set are clustered around the mean and there are fewer values the further away from the mean.

4.2. Homogeneity of Test Variances

Based on the findings in Table 3, Levine's test indicated that there was uniformity in variances across all variables during both the pre-test and post-test phases ($p > 0.05$). It shows that the spread of values within each sample is relatively similar. In other words, the variation within each sample is not significantly different.

Table 3. The Results of Levine's Test

Group	Variable	Sig	*F*
Experimental	Pre-Test	0/673	0/182
	Post Test	0/003	10/948

Table 4. Paired T-Test to Investigate the Difference Between Pre-Test and Post-Test

Group	Variable	Mean	S.D.	t	p-value
Experimental	Pre test	30/50	10/057	-7/491	0/027
	Post test	92/40	46/872		

As can be seen in the above discussion, there is a significant difference between the average speech act in the pre-test and post-test stages. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was a significant change in the mean of the experimental group from the pre-test to the post-test, and this difference is significant ($p=0.027$). Also, as shown in Figure 4, the performance of the experimental group in the post-test compared to the pre-test stage was statistically significant ($p \leq 0.01$) However, no significant difference was observed in the performance of the control group in the post-test compared to the pre-test stage in the of speech act production ($p \geq 0.05$). These results show that metacognitive strategy training has a positive effect on the of students' speech act production.

Table 5. Paired T-Test Results for Experimental Group (Pre-test vs. Post-test)

Group	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	95%CI for Mean Difference	t	p-1
Experimental	Pre-test	30.50	10.06				
	Post-test	92.40	46.87	61.90	[43.21,80.59]	7.491	.02

The results indicate a statistically significant improvement in speech act performance following metacognitive strategy training. The mean increase of 61.90 points (95% CI: [43.21, 80.59]) confirms a substantial effect, suggesting that learners in the experimental group significantly outperformed their pre-test performance after receiving training.

5. DISCUSSION

The metacognitive strategy training had increased students' awareness of speech act production. It is suggested that there may be variations in the improvement of students' speaking skills. Some students directed their metacognitive strategies towards enhancing their fluency and pronunciation, while others aimed to improve their vocabulary and comprehension. In terms of the structural aspect, it appeared that students approached this aspect with little variation. Students' speaking ability is considered to be at an intermediate level in the language learning process. This is because they rely on the context and meaning of what they hear or read, rather than just linguistic cues. They demonstrate some fluency in their language comprehension and are able to speak effectively in structured and familiar tasks. During the training in the experimental group, the researcher observed that students showed increased participation compared to before the training. Initially considered inactive, the students became actively engaged in their learning and utilized metacognitive strategies after the training. Students' active involvement in self-expansion activities led to the incorporation of new ideas. The students primarily focused on expanding their pronunciation skills. Observations showed that students dedicated time to practicing the pronunciation of new words to enhance their speaking abilities, indicating that they viewed pronunciation as a crucial element in speaking.

In contemporary language education, teachers increasingly adopt strategy-based instruction to support learners in becoming more effective and autonomous communicators, with a growing emphasis on integrating metacognitive strategies to enhance speaking proficiency and pragmatic competence [65,66].Additionally, utilizing strategies for learning and using foreign languages is seen as a way to enhance success. A strategy is deemed successful if it offers beneficial assistance to students as they strive to learn or use a foreign language. There are various definitions of learning strategy provided by experts. Oxford's [67] foundational classification of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) into direct (e.g., memory, cognitive, compensation) and indirect (e.g., metacognitive, affective, social) strategies has significantly shaped second language acquisition (SLA) research. More recent scholarship has expanded upon this framework by emphasizing the dynamic and learner-centered nature of strategy use, particularly the role of metacognitive strategies in fostering autonomy, self-regulation, and strategic thinking [63,66]. These developments highlight that successful language learners not only apply specific techniques but also actively monitor, plan, and evaluate their learning processes based on context and individual needs.

A research study by Raoofi et al., [67] explores how metacognition influences the process of learning a second or foreign language. It looks for articles that were published from 1999 to 2012. This initial search finds a total of 76 studies. These studies indicate that teaching metacognition in various language areas can enhance both language acquisition and the use of metacognitive strategies.

According to Brown [69], strategies are defined as particular approaches to solving a problem or completing a task, methods used to achieve a specific goal, or organized plans for managing and influencing certain information. Proficient language learners can articulate the specific strategies they use, making it easier for them to recognize and apply these methods. This understanding also enables them to identify the key features or steps involved, offering guidance on how to proceed.

While Flavell's [62] early work introduced metacognition as the awareness and regulation of one's cognitive processes, recent studies have highlighted its vital role in developing communicative competence—particularly in speaking, where learners must monitor language choices, adjust strategies in real time, and reflect on their performance [20,63]. Recent research emphasizes that proficient language learners engage in a range of metacognitive strategies—such as goal-setting, planning, and anticipating communication challenges—prior to speaking tasks, which enhances their fluency, accuracy, and pragmatic appropriateness [63,66], Richards [70] stated that metacognitive strategies play a role in overseeing cognitive strategies during the learning process, functioning as an executive function. These strategies enable students to manage their own cognitive processes, whether they are used directly or indirectly. Recent studies underscore the value of explicit strategy instruction in helping language learners develop metacognitive awareness—enabling them to plan, monitor, and evaluate their use of language strategies effectively, which in turn fosters greater learner autonomy and communicative competence [63,66].

6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Training in metacognitive strategies helped students become more conscious of their planning, organization, monitoring, evaluation, and development to enhance their speaking skills. This training resulted in improvements in both their speaking abilities and their utilization of metacognitive strategies. Students required additional time to convert their theoretical understanding of metacognitive strategy application and speech act production into practical skills in order to effectively utilize them when needed. The development of metacognitive strategy training has led to the creation of a training program that involves active participation from both students and teachers. Moreover, in developing their metacognitive awareness, the participants were found affected to two factors; Self-appraisal and self-management.

The findings of this study underscore the value of integrating metacognitive strategy training into EFL instruction, particularly in the development of pragmatic competence. To make such training effective and sustainable in classroom contexts, educators can adopt the following practices:

1) Embed Metacognitive Phases in Lesson Plans

Lessons should explicitly guide students through the three main stages of metacognition:

Planning (before the task): Activate prior knowledge and set goals.
Example: Ask learners, "What kind of language do I need to make a polite request to a teacher versus a friend?"

Monitoring (during the task): Encourage awareness and real-time adjustment.
Example: Use a peer checklist during dialogue tasks: "Did my tone match the situation?"

Evaluation (after the task): Reflect on performance and strategy use.
Example: Use reflection prompts such as: "What part of my request felt awkward? What would I change?"

2) Incorporate Reflection Journals

Students can maintain weekly journals to document:
Strategies used for speech acts.
Difficulties encountered.
Adjustments made based on feedback.
Prompts might include:

- *"What strategy helped me sound more polite today?"*
- *"Did I monitor my speech during the role-play?"*

3) Use Think-Alouds and Modeling

Teachers can demonstrate how to plan and monitor pragmatic language use:
"Since I'm talking to a boss, I'll use indirect language— 'Would it be possible…' instead of 'I want…'"
Students then practice this in pairs or small groups, verbalizing their thought process before speaking.

4) Strategy Checklists and Self-Assessment

Provide students with customized strategy checklists for each speech act (e.g., apologies, refusals). These can be used before and after tasks.
Sample checklist for making a request:
Did I use an appropriate level of formality?
Did I give reasons or context for my request?
Did I check for the listener's reaction?

5) Curriculum-Level Integration

At a broader level, teachers and curriculum designers can:

Develop speech-act focused units that explicitly link form, function, and metacognitive strategy use.
Use portfolios where students track their speech act development and metacognitive growth.
Design peer workshops where learners critique not only *what* was said, but also *how consciously* language choices were made.

In conclusion, metacognitive strategy training offers a practical, evidence-based approach to improving pragmatic competence in EFL learners. By fostering reflection, planning, and adaptability, such training empowers learners to become more autonomous, culturally aware, and effective communicators.

Funding Statement: This study was not funded by any external sources.

Contribution: The authors contributed to the research and writing of this article and have read/agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Taguchi, N. (2019). *Second language acquisition and pragmatics*. Routledge.
2. Ren, W., & Li, S. (2022). The effectiveness of instructional approaches to L2 pragmatics: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 72*(1), 5–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12468
3. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1
4. Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018
5. Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching, 48*(1), 1–50. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263
6. Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge University Press.
7. Tajeddin, Z., & Tayebipour, F. (2012). The effect of dynamic assessment on EFL learners' pragmatic comprehension. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 4*(1), 73–106.
8. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.
9. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837
11. Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Ridwan, H., Sutresna, I., & Haryeti, P. (2019). Teaching styles of the teachers and learning styles of the students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1318*(1), 012028. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1318/1/012028
13. Constantino, J. A., Sison, M. H., & De Guzman, P. S. (2020). Metacognitive awareness and general average grade of 2nd year BEED and BSE students of NEUST-SIC. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences, 5*(3), 358–365.
14. Jaleel, S. (2016). A study on the metacognitive awareness of secondary school students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(1), 165–172. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040121
15. Pahayahay, G., & Cisneros-Pahayahay, M. R. (2017). Assessment of students' metacognitive awareness level in college algebra. *Advanced Science Letters, 23*(2), 1130–1133. https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2017.7534
16. Sawhney, N., & Bansal, S. (2015). Metacognitive awareness of undergraduate students in relation to their academic achievement. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 3*(1), 107–114.
17. Hindun, I., Nurwidodo, N., & Wicaksono, A. G. C. (2020). Metacognitive awareness components of high-academic ability students in biology hybrid learning: Profile and correlation. *Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia, 6*(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.v6i1.10638
18. Zulkiply, N. (2009). Metacognition and its relationship with students' academic performance. *The International Journal of Learning, 15*(11), 97–106.
19. Akaydin, B. B., Yorulmaz, A., & Cokcaliskan, H. (2020). Investigation of primary school students' metacognitive awareness and decision-making skill. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 16*(4), 158–171. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.268.10
20. Kallio, H., Virta, K., & Kallio, M. (2018). Modelling the components of metacognitive awareness. *International Journal of Educational Psychology, 7*(2), 94–122. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijep.2018.2789
21. Omprakash, A., Kumar, A. P., Kuppusamy, M., Sathiyasekaran, B. W. C., Ravinder, T., & Ramaswamy, P. (2021). Validation of Metacognitive Awareness Inventory from a private medical university in India. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 10*(1), 123. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_634_20

22. Pradhan, S., & Das, P. (2021). Influence of metacognition on academic achievement and learning style of undergraduate students in Tezpur University. *European Journal of Educational Research, 10*(1), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.10.1.381
23. Sonowal, M., & Alita, M. (2017). Metacognitive awareness and academic achievement of higher secondary level science stream students of Dibrugarh District, Assam. *International Education & Research Journal, 3*(6), 76–79.
24. Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2018). Proficiency and preference organization in second language refusals. *Journal of Pragmatics, 129*, 140–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.01.010
25. Bella, S. (2012). Pragmatic development in a foreign language: A study of Greek FL requests. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(13), 1917–1947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.08.006
26. Derakhshan, A. (2019). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' proficiency level and their knowledge of idiosyncratic and formulaic implicatures. *Language Related Research, 10*(5), 1–27.
27. Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning, 54*(4), 587–653. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00281.x
28. Galaczi, E. D. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics, 35*(5), 553–574. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu017
29. Roever, C. (2009). Teaching and testing pragmatics. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 560–577). Wiley-Blackwell.
30. Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(1), 27–67. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100001032
31. Rose, K. R. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development in Hong Kong, phase 2. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(11), 2345–2364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.03.002
32. Taguchi, N. (2005). Comprehending implied meaning in English as a foreign language. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00329.x
33. Taguchi, N. (2007). Development of speed and accuracy in pragmatic comprehension in English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 313–338. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00061.x
34. Takimoto, M. (2009). Exploring the effects of input-based treatment and test on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(5), 1029–1046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.12.006
35. Arabmofrad, A., Derakhshan, A., & Atefinejad, M. (2019). An interplay between Iranian EFL learners' specific and general interlanguage pragmatic motivation and their meta-pragmatic awareness. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(3), 77–94.
36. Tajeddin, Z., & Malmir, A. (2014). Knowledge of L2 speech acts: Impact of gender and language learning experience. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies, 1*(2), 1–21.
37. Takahashi, S. (2005). Pragmalinguistic awareness: Is it related to motivation and proficiency? *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 90–120. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/26.1.90
38. Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Multilingual Matters.
39. Safa, M. A. (2013). Emotional intelligence and SLA: The case of interlanguage pragmatic competence. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 1–24.
40. Derakhshan, A., Eslami, Z., & Ghandhari, N. (2021). Investigating the interplay of emotional intelligence and interlanguage pragmatic competence in Iranian lower-intermediate EFL learners. *Issues in Language Teaching, 10*(1), 37–66.
41. Sarani, A., & Malmir, A. (2020). Multiple intelligences as predictors of foreign language pragmatic knowledge: The case of five frequent English speech acts. *Teaching English Language, 14*(1), 183–211.
42. Diskin, C. (2017). The use of the discourse-pragmatic marker 'like' by native and non-native speakers of English in Ireland. *Journal of Pragmatics, 120*, 144–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.08.016

43. Malmir, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Identity processing styles as predictors of L2 pragmatic knowledge and performance: A case of common English speech acts. *Journal of Language Horizons, 4*(2), 187–209.
44. Tajeddin, Z., & Malmir, A. (2014). Knowledge of L2 speech acts: Impact of gender and language learning experience. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies, 1*(2), 1–21.
45. Kuriscak, L. M. (2006). *Pragmatic variation in L2 Spanish: Learner and situational effects* [Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University]. ProQuest.
46. Taguchi, N. (2014). Personality and development of second language pragmatic competence. *Asian EFL Journal, 16*(3), 203–221.
47. Taguchi, N. (2019). Second language acquisition and pragmatics: An overview. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 1–14). Routledge.
48. Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 23*(3), 361–374. https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271640200305X
49. Reinders, H., & Wattana, S. (2012). Talk to me! Games and students' willingness to communicate. In H. Reinders (Ed.), *Digital games in language learning and teaching* (pp. 156–187). Palgrave Macmillan.
50. Nordin, S., & Yunus, K. (2020). Exploring metacognitive awareness among teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 9*(2), 462–472.
51. O'Hara, S., Pritchard, R., & Pitta, D. (2019). Teaching with and for metacognition in disciplinary discussions. *Metacognition in Learning, 1*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.86665
52. Milenković, B. L. (2020). Student metacognitive awareness in L2 writing: Competence vs. performance. *Lipar: Časopis za književnost, jezik, umetnost i kulturu, 21*(72), 119–138.
53. Takallou, F. (2011). The effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on EFL learners' reading comprehension performance and metacognitive awareness. *Asian EFL Journal, 13*(1), 272–300.
54. Tamin, İ. B., & Büyükahıska, D. (2020). Reading strategy instruction on metacognitive awareness: The case of Turkish high school students. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 20*(2), 82–97.
55. Thawarom, T., Wilang, J. D., & Singhasiri, W. (2022). Metacognitive knowledge in performing a speaking task: A report from high and low proficient Thai university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 13*(3), 609–619. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1303.15
56. Sulistyowati, T., Mujiyanto, J., Rukmini, D., & Hartono, R. (2022). Developing and validating the metacognitive awareness speaking questionnaire. In *67th TEFLIN International Virtual Conference & the 9th ICOELT 2021* (pp. 210–217). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220201.036
57. Bessy, M., & Knouse, S. M. (2020). Metacognition, metalinguistic awareness, and relevance in language learning: A report on an intervention module project. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(2), 9. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2020.140209
58. Miller, G. (2017). *Metacognitive awareness and reading strategy use: Investigating the intermediate level ESL students' awareness of metacognitive reading strategies* [Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-River Falls].
59. Farahian, M., & Avarzamani, F. (2018). The impact of portfolio on EFL learners' metacognition and writing performance. *Cogent Education, 5*(1), 1450918. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1450918
60. Bøhn, H., & Myklevold, G. A. (2018). Exploring communication strategy use and metacognitive awareness in the EFL classroom. In Å. Haukås, C. Bjørke, & M. Dypedahl (Eds.), *Metacognition in language learning and teaching* (pp. 179–203). Routledge.
61. Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.
62. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906
63. Teng, F. (2022). *Metacognition in English language teaching and learning*. Routledge.

64. Jernigan, J. E. (2007). *Instruction and developing second language pragmatic competence: An investigation into the efficacy of output* [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University].
65. Bozorgian, H., & Alamdari, E. F. (2021). Enhancing L2 speaking through metacognitive instruction: A classroom-based study. *The Language Learning Journal, 49*(3), 293–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1503139
66. Chamot, A. U. (2019). Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 23*(4), 416–425. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819832605
67. Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
68. Raoofi, S., Chan, S. H., Mukundan, J., & Rashid, S. M. (2014). Metacognition and second/foreign language learning. *English Language Teaching, 7*(1), 36–49. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n1p36
69. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
70. Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.