An Investigation of the Relationship between Motivation and Metacognitive Awareness Strategies in Listening Comprehension: The Case of Iranian EFL Learners

Zohreh Kassaian
Department of English, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran
Email: zkassaian@yahoo.com

Momene Ghadiri
Department of English, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran
Email: mome_ghadiri@yahoo.com

Abstract—This study sets out to investigate the relationship between patterns of motivation and L2 listeners' metacognitive awareness and perceived use of strategies. A total number of 3o upper intermediate students from two English language teaching Institutes in Isfahan took part in this study. They were asked to fill in two questionnaires: (a) a questionnaire on motivation, which was developed by Vallerand et al. (1992), and (b) a questionnaire on Metacognitive awareness strategies in listening developed by Vandergrift et al. (2006). The results of the study revealed that: 1) there is no significant difference in terms of type of motivation among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners .2) In the category of mecognitive strategies, problem solving was the most frequently used strategy and planning and evaltuation was the least frequently used one. 3) Positive relationship was found between both types of motivation and use of metacognitive awareness strategies, except for mental translation and intrinsic motivation. 4) There was significant difference in mean scores of high and low motivation groups, for three categories of metacoginitive awareness strategies including planning and evaluation, directed attention, and person knowledge. This study suggested that listeners' metacognitive awareness should be cultivated and strategy instruction should be integrated into the teaching of listening.

Index Terms—metacognitive awareness listening strategies, patterns of motivation, Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners

I. INTRODUCTION

Attention in listening comprehension research is increasingly being directed at learners' self-reports of their understanding and awareness of the processes involved in listening in another language (Vandergift et al., 2006). It has been argued that awareness of strategies and other variables in learning can have positive influences on language learners' listening development (e.g., Bolitho et al., 2003; Wilson, 2003).

Motivation is also an important factor in learning a second and foreign language (Gardner, 1985b; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). It is defined as the individual's attitudes, desires, and effort (Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997). Moreover, Ryan and Deci (2000) define motivation as concerning energy, direction, and persistence -all aspects of activation and intention. Oxford and Shearin (1996) comment that "L2 learning is a complex process in which motivation plays a major role".

The present study aims at investigating whether there is any meaningful relationship between different kinds of motivation and Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategies. In other words, the purpose is to find out whether students who are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated will choose specific kinds of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategies.

This study is to answer the following questions:

Which Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy is the most commonly used strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners?

Is there any relationship between the type of motivation (intrinsic / extrinsic motivation) and the learners' choice of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners?

Are Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners intrinsically motivated or extrinsically motivated?

Is there any realtionship between degree of motivation and the choice of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners?

The first question is descriptive and does not lend itself to hypothesis testing, but based on the other questions the following null hypotheses can be formulated:

H01: There is no meaningful relationship between the type of motivation and the choice of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners.

H02: Among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners, there is no significant difference in terms of type of motivation.

H03: There is no meaningful relationship between the degree of motivation and the choice of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A. Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategies

The scope of listening strategy research has recently expanded to emphasize learners' cognitive appraisal or their metacognitive knowledge. In these investigations, listeners are asked to explicitly report their perceptions about themselves, their understanding of listening demands, their cognitive goals, their approach to the task, and their strategies. Studies have explored the impact of raising metacognitive awareness on learner listening performance and motivation (e.g., O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Vandergrift, 2002, 2003b, 2005a).

To elicit learners' metacognitive knowledge about listening, various procedures have been used, most commonly diaries (Goh, 1997), interviews (Goh, 2002a), and questionnaires (Goh, 2002b; Vandergrift, 2002, 2005a; Zhang, 2001). Results of these studies have shown that language learners possess knowledge about the listening process, albeit to varying degrees, and that this knowledge appears to be linked to listening abilities. Furthermore, research on the effects of metacognitive instruction has provided preliminary evidence that performance, confidence, and motivation can be enhanced through classroom instruction (Goh & Taib, 2006; Vandergrift, 2003b).

Goh (2000) administered a questionnaire to elicit learners' strategy knowledge and perceived strategy use in listening comprehension and learning. She found that the more skilled listeners demonstrated a higher degree of awareness of their listening problems. Similarly, Zhang (2001) examined strategic knowledge through questionnaire reports about the usefulness of speaking and listening strategies. In the case of comprehension strategies, she found a discrepancy between perceived usefulness and actual use of strategies such as getting the overall meaning of a text, paying attention to details, and concentration on a listening task in spite of difficulty. Goh (2008) lists some of the positive effects of metacognitive strategy training on listening comprehension. She states that it improves students' confidence and makes them less anxious in the listening process. She also believes that weak listeners in particular benefit much from the training.

Listening tasks that guide students through the process of listening can help learners develop the metacognitive knowledge critical to the development of self-regulated listening. In two investigations by Vandergrift, students were guided in the use of prediction, individual planning, peer discussions, and post listening reflections. Both beginner-level elementary school students (Vandergrift, 2002) and beginner-level University students of French (Vandergrift, 2003a) exposed to such an approach found it motivating to learn to understand rapid, authentic-type texts.

Vandergrift (2005a) further explored the hypothesized relationships among metacognition, motivation, and listening proficiency. When listening test scores were correlated with student-reported levels of motivation (grounded in self determination theory) and student-reported use of cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies, an interesting pattern of increasingly higher correlations among the three levels of motivation (amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation) and reported use of metacognitive strategies emerged. Vandergrift argued that these patterns of correlation provided some evidence for the hypothesized links among self-determination theory, self-regulated learning, learner autonomy, and metacognition. Vandergrift's sequence for guided listening was adopted for teaching tertiary-level Chinese English as a second language (ESL) students; they too reported increased motivation, confidence, and strategy knowledge (Liu & Goh, 2006).

According to Vandergrift et al. (2006) there are five factors underlying the metacognitive awareness strategies while listening. The first factor (problem solving) represents a group of strategies used by listeners to inference (guess at what they do not understand) and to monitor these inferences. The second factor (planning and evaluation) represents the strategies listeners use to prepare themselves for listening, and to evaluate the results of their listening efforts.   The third factor (mental translation) represents strategies that listeners must learn to avoid if they are to become skilled listeners. The fourth factor (person knowledge) represents listeners' perceptions concerning the difficulty presented by L2 listening and their self-efficacy in L2 listening. Finally, the fifth factor (directed attention) represents strategies that listeners use to concentrate and to stay on task.

Yang (2009) presented a study on the metacognitive strategies employed by English listeners in an EFL setting. The results of the study revealed that the participants used directed attention most frequently and they used monitoring least frequently. Besides, there were differences in the use of metacognitive strategies between successful and unsuccessful listeners. The differences existed in the use of directed attention, functional planning and self-management strategies. The study proposed that listeners' metacognitive awareness should be cultivated and strategy instruction should be integrated into the teaching of listening.

O'Bryan and Hegelheimer (2010) used a mixed methods approach to shed light on the development of four intermediate English students' listening strategy use and awareness over the course of one semester. Specifically, they investigated the complexities of students' listening strategy use by level of language proficiency (low intermediate to

high intermediate), the impact of repetition on listening strategies and the development of students' metacognitive awareness. Their findings indicted the important role of instruction in cultivation and development of metacogitive awareness strategies use while listening.

The present study used the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) to assess the extent to which language learners are aware of and can regulate the process of L2 listening comprehension. The design of this questionnaire is based on a theoretical model of metacognition, a construct that refers to thinking about one's thinking or the human ability to be conscious of one's mental processes.

B. Motivation

Motivation is one of the main determinants of second/foreign language (L2) learning achievement. In the last thirty years, there had been considerable amount of research done that explores on the nature and role of motivation in the L2 learning process.

Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) suggested that an individuals' motivation to learn an L2 is nurtured by both attitudes toward the L2 community and the goals, or orientations, sought through the acquisition of the L2. These researchers identified two classes of motivation. First, integrative motivation refers to a desire to learn the L2 in order to have contact with, and perhaps to identify with, members from the L2 community. This orientation can be contrasted with the instrumental orientation, which refers to a desire to learn the L2 to achieve some practical goal, such as job advancement or course credit (Noels, Pelletier, Clement & Vallerand, 2000).

Ryan, Kuhl and Deci (1997) introduced the Self-Determination Theory (SDT). According to the self-determination theory, there are two general types of motivation. Intrinsic motivation (IM) refers to motivation to engage in activity because it is enjoyable and satisfying to do and extrinsic motivation refers to the performance of an activity in order to attain some separable outcome.

Noels et al. (2000) categorized L2 intrinsic motivation (IM) into three types based on Self-Determination Theory and the empirical studies by Vallerand (1997) and Vallerand et al. (1992, 1993). IM-Knowledge is the motivation for learning an L2 for the feelings associated with exploring new ideas and developing knowledge; IM-Accomplishment refers to the sensations related to the attempt to master a task or to achieve a goal; IM-Stimulation is related to motivation based simply on the sensations stimulated by performing the task, such as aesthetic appreciation, fun or excitement.

Noels (2001a) investigated the relations between perception of teachers' communicative style and students' motivation. The results suggested that the teacher's behavior affects the students' generalized feelings of autonomy and competence. That is, the more the teacher was perceived as controlling, the less the students felt they were learning Spanish spontaneously and the lower the students' intrinsic motivation. Noels also found that the integrative orientation was strongly correlated with intrinsic motivation and identified regulation. However, this is not to indicate that intrinsic and integrative motivations are identical.

In terms of degree of self-determination, Three levels of extrinsic motivation have been distinguished empirically (Vallerand et al., 1992, 1993). They are classified as: (a) external, (b) introjected, and (c) identified regulation. External regulation refers to behavior that is determined through means external to the individual. Introjected regulation represents reasons for performing an activity that are more internalized than in external regulation. The third stage is identified regulation. At this point, the individual decides to perform behaviour because he or she views the activity as personally worthwhile (Deci & Ryan, 1995).

A final motivational concept proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) is amotivation. A person is considered amotivated when she or he does not see a relation between her or his actions and their consequences, but rather sees the consequences as arising from factors beyond her or his control.

Salehi and Ziahosseini (2007) investigated the relationship between motivation and the use of language learning strategies by Iranian university students. The results of the study revealed that extrinsic motivation did not correlate meaningfully with the choice of language learning strategies. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation correlated meaningfully with the choice of language learning strategies. It was also found that Iranian learners were intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated.

This study used the intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomy of motivation to investigate the influence of motivation on the use of metacognitive awareness strategies while listening to an oral text among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners. In simple terms, this study tried to examine whether there is any difference between those who are extrinsically motivated and those who are intrinsically motivated in the use of metacognitive awareness strategies in listening comprehension.

III. METHOD

A. Participants

A total number of 3o upper intermediate students from two different English Institutes in Isfahan took part in this study. Their age ranged between 18 and 28. They were all undergraduate university students of different majors. The sample consisted of both junior and senior students. Both male and female students were included. The number of male and female students was 11 and 19 respectively.

B. Instrumentation

The following instruments were used in this study:

a questionnaire on Metacognitive awareness in listening comprehension developed by Vandergrift et al. (2006) called Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ).

a questionnaire on motivation, which was developed by Vallerand et al. (1992), called Academic Motivation Scale (AMS),

The characteristics of each of the two questionnaires used in this study will be discussed below.

1. Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)

MALQ, a 21 item questionnaire developed by Vandergrift et al. (2006), has been used in different contexts as a consciousness-raising tool to raise students' awareness of the process of listening, to positively influence students' approach to listening tasks, and to increase self-regulated use of comprehension strategies. The items in MALQ are related to five metacognitive factors, problem-solving (six items), planning and evaluation (five items), mental translation (three items), person knowledge (three items), and directed attention (four items) (see appendix A).

The format of the questionnaire was designed following guidelines outlined by Brown (2001), Dʹörnyei (2003), and Gilham (2000). Students were asked to respond to items using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Point 1 means that the item does not refer to the learner at all. Points 2 and 3 indicate that the statement is a little true about the learner. The learner who marks point 4 shows that the item moderately represents their use of metacognitive awareness strategies while listening. Point 5 represents that the item corresponds a lot to the learner's metacognitive awareness and perceived use of strategies. Finally, point 6 shows that the learner exactly use the same strategy which is used in the item while listening to an oral text.

Vandergrift et al. (2006) used rigorous statistical processes to validate the items in the MALQ. The MALQ was tested several times with a large sample of respondents (N = 966) in various countries, in different learning contexts, and at different levels of language proficiency. Internal consistencies (Cronbach's alphas) were calculated for each of the multi-item MALQ factors, based on the participants' responses. Internal reliability estimates were respectable, ranging from .68 for the four items on the directed attention factor to .78 for the three items on the mental translation factor.

2. Academic Motivation Scale (AMS)

The AMS is divided into seven subscales. Three subscales designed to assess extrinsic motivation including (a) External Regulation (3 items; $\propto = .78$), (b) Introjected Regulation (3 items; $\propto = .67$), and (c) Identified Regulation (3 items; $\propto = .79$). Three distinct, unordered subscales (9 items, $\propto = .82$) designed to assess intrinsic motivation (intrinsic motivation to know, to accomplish things, and to experience stimulation). Finally, Amotivation was assessed with 3 items ($\propto = .81$) (see appendix B). Vallerand et al. reported that Cronbach's coefficient alphas for the subscales ranged from .83 to .86, In addition, test-retest reliability over a one-month period ranged from .71 to .83 for the subscales.

The instrument included a 1 to 7 scale for each item showing the extent it corresponded to the learners' reasons for learning English. Scale 1 means that the item does not refer to the learners' reasons at all. Scales 2 and 3 indicate that the reason represented by the items is a little true about the learners. The learners who mark scale 4 show that the item moderately represents their reason for studying English. Scales 5 and 6 with a little difference in degree represent that the item corresponds a lot to the students' reason for learning English. Finally, scale 7 shows that the learner has exactly the same reason mentioned in the item for learning English.

C. Procedures

1. Data Collection

The data of this study were collected in two successive class sessions. Administration procedures were similar in both institutes. In the first class session, MALQ was introduced and distributed among the participants. They were fully briefed on how to fill out the questionnaire. Participants were given ample time to complete the questionnaire. In the second class session, AMS was introduced and distributed among the participants. Again, participants were fully briefed on how to fill out the questionnaire. They were given ample time to complete the questionnaire. Both questionnaires were collected at the end of the class session. Some of them were discarded since they were not completed satisfactorily.

2. Data Analysis

The items were codified and entered into SPSS program for windows, version 16.0. A correlational analysis was used to determine whether there was a meaningful relationship between types of motivation and categories of Metacognitive awareness listening strategies. Descriptive statistics was used to determine the mean and standard deviations in both questionnaires. A paired t-test was run to determine the pattern of motivation among Iranian learners. A t-test was run to determine whether high and low motivation groups chose different kinds of language Metacognitive awareness listening strategies.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Frequency of the Use of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategies

In order to arrive at an answer to the first research question which stated, "Which Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy is the most commonly used strategy and which one is shunned among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners?" Descriptive statistics was used.

Comparing the means of strategies, it turned out that, though the use of metacognitive awareness strategies was not high among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners and the difference between uses of strategies was not highly significant, problem solving was the most frequently used strategy (mean=3.85on a 6-point scale) (see table 1&2). The means of the use of person knowledge and direct attention were in-between (means=3.77, 3.69 on a 6-point scale). The lowest frequency went to the mental translation and planning and evaluation (mean=3.64, 3.48 on a 6-point scale).

There is a contrast between this frequency-based strategy ranking and the one, which resulted from Yang (2009) study, where direct attention was the most frequently used category of strategies among 160 English sophomores from four intact classes at Chinese University.

However, the results coincide with those of Vandergrift et al. (2006) and O'Bryan and Hegelheimer (2010) findings that higher proficiency learners tend to use less translation strategies. In the category of metacognitive strategies, problem solving strategies were the most frequently used category of strategies. This result supports the fact that students were good at inferencing, and monitoring their inferences.

Directed attention, and person knowledge were sometimes used. This denotes that listeners, somehow, realized the importance of attention and attempt to look for more opportunities to practice listening outside the class. They also captured the difficulty presented by L2 listening and their self-efficacy in L2 listening. O'Malley et al. (1989) reported that in perceptual processing listeners used attentional strategies to maintain their concentration on the task

TABLE 1.
FREQUENCY OF THE USE OF METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS LISTENING STRATEGIES

Strategies	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
planning and evaluation	30	1.40	6.00	3.4867	.91679
directed attention	30	2.25	5.25	3.6917	.80858
person knowledge	30	2.00	6.00	3.7778	.94010
mental translation	30	1.67	5.00	3.6444	.97452
problem-solving	30	1.67	5.33	3.8500	.86697
Valid N (listwise)	30				

TABLE 2.
PERCENTAGE OF THE USE OF METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS LISTENING STRATEGIES

Strategies	N	Percentage
planning and evaluation	30	58.11
directed attention	30	61.52
person knowledge	30	62.96
mental translation	30	60.74
problem-solving	30	64.17
Valid N (listwise)	30	

As was anticipated from the literature (Vandergrift et al., 2006; O'Bryan and Hegelheimer, 2010) mental translation was the one of the two least frequently used categories of strategies. As the participants were upper-intermediate learners of English, they tend to use less mental translation strategies.

However, planning and evaluation was rarely used. As stated by Yang (2009) metacognitive strategies mirror listeners' learning awareness and learning beliefs. These results showed that problem solving, direct attention and person knowledge were conducive to successful listening in the eyes of listeners. Planning, evaluating, and monitoring were not effective enough. Alternatively, listeners had a good command of problem solving, direct attention and person knowledge and a poor mastery of planning, evaluating, and monitoring.

Before listening to some material, an instructor usually informs learners that they should attend to a listening task and ignore distractions and they should fix attention on specific aspects of the listening material by looking for key words and topic sentences. At the end of the listening class, the instructor reminds learners of more listening practice and previewing. It is natural for listeners to skillfully employ these strategies—directed attention, selective attention and self-management in their listening.

Besides, this fact showed that listeners' learning is not independent but instructor-centered. Planning, monitoring, evaluating are characteristics of self-directed language learning. The literature on self-directed language learning unanimously believes that self-direction requires learners to be able to plan, monitor and evaluate their language learning, which aims to promote learner autonomy (cf. Yang, 2009). The low means of the responses to planning and evaluation (mean=3.48) indicated that learners have not taken responsibility for their own learning and they lacked the spirit of learning independently and creatively (see table 1). Learner autonomy was absent in listeners.

B. Types of Motivation and Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategies

In order to answer the second research question and test the null hypothesis, "H01: There is no meaningful relationship between the type of motivation and language learners' metacognitive awareness listening strategies among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners", a correlational analysis was run. As table 3 shows, a positive but not high correlation was arrived at between intrinsic motivation and four categories of metacognitive awareness listening

strategies (except for mental translation strategies). In addition, a positive correlation was arrived at between extrinsic motivation and all five categories of metacognitive awareness listening strategies.   However, due to the small sample of the participants, the correlation (except for extrinsic motivation and directed attention) was not statistically significant. Therefore the coefficient of determination (common variance) was run. The results confirmed the Pearson correlation coefficient (see table 3).

TABLE 3.
PEARSON CORRELATION BETWEEN INTRINSIC/EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION AND METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS LISTENING STRATEGIES

		Planning and evaluation	Directed attention	Person knowledge	Mental translation	Problem solving
Extrinsic	Pearson Correlation	.216	.513**	166.	.078	.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.252	.004	.380	.682	.775
	Common Variance	4.66	26.31	2.75	.6	.3
	N	30	30	30	30	30
Intrinsic	Pearson Correlation	.349	.284	.346	-.013	.143
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.059	.128	.061	.944	.450
	Common Variance	12.18	8.06	11.97	-.016	2.04
	N	30	30	30	30	30

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

In the category of metacognitive awareness strategies, the correlations between planning and evaluation, person knowledge, problem solving and intrinsic motivation, though not significantly high, were more than extrinsic motivation. However, the correlation between directed attention and extrinsic motivation, in particular introjected regulation, was positively larger and statistically more significant. The reason pertains to performing an activity in response to some kind of pressure that the individuals have internalized. In other words, students try to direct their attention and concentrate on the listening task because they would feel guilty if it were not completed, or they put efforts into listening task   in order to impress others with their proficiency (Deci and Ryan ,1985).

In addition, the correlation between mental translation and extrinsic motivation was positive and more than intrinsic motivation, suggesting that external factors may lead learners to use more translation strategies while listening to an oral text, as intrinsic motivation will lead to less use of mental translation strategies. As indicated in table 3, negative but small correlation was found between mental translation and intrinsic motivation.

In all, from the results of this study, it cannot certainly be concluded that there is meaningful relationship between different types of motivation and language learners' metacognitive awareness listening strategies; as correlations between different types of motivations and metacognitive awareness listening strategies, except for extrinsic motivation and directed attention, were not highly significant and large. In other words, the first hypothesis is partially confirmed and partially rejected. The reason may also pertain to the fact that students' use of metacognitive awareness listening strategies was not high, too. However, as explored by Vandergrift (2005a), students' report of the use of metacognitive awareness listening strategies will be higher, if they are highly motivated.

C.   Patterns of Motivation

In order to answer the third research question and test the null hypothesis, "H02: Among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners, there is no significant difference in terms of type of motivation." a paired t-test was performed.

The null hypothesis was accepted. Although descriptive statistics (Table 4) indicted a little change in the patterns of motivation, paired t-test (Table 4.9) showed that there was not a significant difference between EFL students in terms of type of motivation.

This result was against that of the previous study (Salehi and Ziahosseini, 2007), where it was found out that Iranian learners were intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated. This difference may be due to the fact that in previous study just English literature and English Translation students were investigated; as in this study students were taking the English course beside their major of study.

The descriptive statistics calculated for intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation types as shown in table 4 yielded the means of 44.10, 41.03 and SDS of 11.32, 6.67 for each of them respectively. The mean of amotivation was very small (5.23), so it was overlooked.

TABLE 4.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR TWO TYPES OF MOTIVATION

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
extrinsic	30	29.00	58.00	41.0333	6.67
intrinsic	30	12.00	59.00	44.1000	11.32
Valid N (listwise)	30				

As can be seen in table 5, the t-value of a paired t-test (.134>0.05) did not show a significant difference between the means of the two categories (Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation). Therefore, the findings of this procedure prove that there is no significant difference in terms of type of motivation among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners.

TABLE 5.
A PAIRED T-TEST FOR INTRINSIC/ EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION CATEGORIES

	Paired Difference		T	df	Sig(2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation			
Extrinsic-intrinsic	-3.06667	10.88160	-1.544	29	.134

D. Total Motivation

An index, total motivation, was arrived at taking the median point into account. Two motivation groups, high and low, were considered. Using a t-test, the null hypothesis, "H03: There is no meaningful relationship between the degree of motivation and the choice of Metacognitive Awareness Listening Strategy among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners.", was tested. As shown in tables 6 and 7, this null hypothesis was rejected.

As shown in table 7, there was significant difference in mean scores of high and low motivation groups, for three categories of metacoginitive awareness strategies including planning and evaluation (P=0.005), directed attention (P=0.000), and person knowledge (P=0.050). However, no significant difference was revealed between the two groups in terms of use of mental translation (P=0.326) and problem solving (P=.100).

TABLE 6.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR TWO MOTIVATION GROUPS GROUP STATISTICS

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
planning and evaluation	high	15	.6556	.14729	.03803
	low	15	.5067	.12163	.03140
directed attention	high	15	.7000	.11594	.02994
	low	15	.5306	.09379	.02422
person knowledge	high	15	.6852	.14497	.03743
	low	15	.5741	.15239	.03935
mental translation	high	15	.6370	.15973	.04124
	low	15	.5778	.16507	.04262
problem-solving	high	15	.6852	.12930	.03338
	low	15	.5981	.14991	.03871

There is a contrast between the findings of this study and those of Salehi and Ziahosseini's (2007) study who found that although, there was a little difference in mean scores of high and low motivation groups, no significant difference was revealed between the two groups in terms of language learning strategy choice.

TABLE 7.
T-TEST FOR LOW AND HIGH MOTIVATION GROUPS RELATED TO THE CHOICE OF METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS LISTENING STRATEGY

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	T	df	Sig (2-tailed)
planning and evaluation	.000	.993	3.019	28	.005
directed attention	.331	.569	4.401	28	.000
person knowledge	.104	.750	2.046	28	.050
mental translation	.214	.647	.999	28	.326
problem-solving	.112	.741	1.703	28	.100

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study was to investigate the use of metacognitive awareness listening strategies, patterns of motivation as well as the relationship between motivation and L2 listeners' metacognitive awareness and perceived use of strategies among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners. A total number of 3o upper intermediate students from two English Institutes in Isfahan took part in this study. The following conclusions can be drawn from the study:

Regarding the use of metacognitive awareness strategies, some strategies are more frequently used than the others are, although the frequencies of the use was not high and the difference between uses of strategies was not highly significant. This finding necessitates prioritizing teaching sequences, with the least frequent strategies receiving as much emphasis as the most frequent ones.

In relation to the relationship between motivation and use of strategies, a positive relationship between types of motivation and use of metacognitive awareness strategies, except for mental translation and intrinsic motivation was found. However, as correlations between different types of motivations and metacognitive awareness listening strategies, except for extrinsic motivation and directed attention, were not highly significant and large, it cannot certainly be concluded that there is meaningful relationship between different types of motivation and certain types of learners' metacognitive awareness listening strategies.

Concerning patterns of motivation, the t-value of a paired t-test (.134>0.05) did not show a significant difference between the means of the two categories (Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation). Therefore, the findings suggested that there is no significant difference in terms of type of motivation among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners.

In terms of total motivation and use of strategies, there was significant difference in mean scores of high and low motivation groups, for three categories of metacoginitive awareness strategies including planning and evaluation (P=0.005), directed attention (P=0.000), and person knowledge (P=0.050). However, no significant difference was revealed between two groups in terms of use of mental translation (P=0.326) and problem solving (P=.100)

Finally, the fact that the use of metacognitive awareness strategies was not high among Iranian upper intermediate EFL learners suggested that listeners' metacognitive awareness should be cultivated and strategy instruction should be integrated into the teaching of listening. Teachers can use the results of this study as a guide to determine the strategies that have the potential to improve learners' motivation and learning. They can provide instruction and practice in using metacognitive awareness strategies while listening, especially in planning and evaluation, which was found to have the least frequency but positive influence on motivation. In addition, cultivating, maintaining and developing intrinsic motivation of EFL learners should be important goals pursued by all educators in the L2 field.

The major drawback of the study is the small size of the sample with 30 upper intermediate EFL learners, which may not have been a true representative of the larger population of Iranian EFL learners. Moreover, the data was obtained from only questionnaires; thus not allowing for a more exhaustive generalization about the patterns of motivation and use of metacoginitive awareness strategies. Further study can include a larger sample from different educational settings and compare students' use of metacognitive listening strategies across different levels of language proficiency.

APPENDIX A METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS LISTENING QUESTIONNAIRE (MALQ) DEVELOPED BY VANDERGRIFT ET AL. (2006)

Using the scale provided, decide how much you either agree or disagree with each statement.

Strongly agree   6   5   4   3   2   1   Strongly disagree

Type scale		Strategy or belief/perception						
Planning-evaluation	1.	Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Directed attention	2.	I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6
Person knowledge	3.	I find that listening in English is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mental translation	4.	I translate in my head as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	5.	I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Directed attention	6.	When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration right away	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	7.	As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Person knowledge	8.	I feel that listening comprehension in English is a challenge for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	9.	I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning-evaluation	10.	Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mental translation	11.	I translate key words as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Directed attention	12.	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	13.	As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning-evaluation	14.	After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Person knowledge	15.	I don't feel nervous when I listen to English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Directed attention	16.	When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	17.	I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mental translation	18.	I translate word by word, as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Problem-solving	19.	When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning-evaluation	20.	As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning-evaluation	21.	I have a goal in mind as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX B ACADEMIC MOTIVATION SCALE (AMS) DEVELOPED BY VALLERAND ET AL. (1992)

Using the scale provided, decide how much the statements correspond to you.

Corresponds completely	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Does not correspond at all

Statements

Amotivation

1. I don't know; I can't come to understand what I am doing studying English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
2. Honestly, I don't know, I truly have the impression of wasting my time in studying English 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
3. I cannot come to see why I study English, and frankly, I don't give a damn. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

External Regulation

4. In order to get a more prestigious job later on. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
5. In order to have a better salary later on. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
6. Because I have the impression that it is expected of me. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Introjected Regulation

7. Because I would feel guilty if I didn't know English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
8. Because I would feel ashamed if I couldn't speak to my friends from the English community in their native tongue. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
9. To show myself that I am a good citizen because I can speak English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Indentified Regulation

10. Because I think it is good for my personal development. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
11. Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak more than one language. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
12. Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Intrinsic Motivation-Knowledge

13. Because I enjoy the feeling of acquiring knowledge about the English community and their way of life. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
14. For the pleasure that I experience in knowing more about English literature. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
15. For the satisfied feeling I get in finding out new things. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Intrinsic Motivation-Stimulation

16. For the "high" I feel when hearing foreign languages spoken. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
17. For the pleasure I get from hearing English spoken by native English speakers. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
18. For the "high" that I experience while speaking English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Intrinsic Motivation-Accomplishment

19. For the enjoyment I experience when I grasp a difficult construct in English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
20. For the pleasure I experience when surpassing myself in my English studies. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
21. For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in English. 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

REFERENCES

[1]   Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanic, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten Questions about Language Awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 251–260.
[2]   Brown, H. D. (1994). Teaching by Principles. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
[3]   Brown, H. D. (1990). M & Ms for Language Classrooms? Another Look at Motivation. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 383–393). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
[4]   Brown, J. D. (2001). Using Surveys in Language Programs. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
[5]   Bacon, S. (1992). The Relationship Between Gender, Comprehension, Processing Strategies, and Cognitive and Affective Response in Second-Language Listening. *Modern Language Journal,* 76, 160–178.
[6]   Cheng, H. F., & Dornyei, Z. (2007). The Use of Motivational Strategies in Language Instruction: The Case of EFL Teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1, 153-174.
[7]   Clément, R. (1988). Echelles d'attitude et de Motivation Reliées aux Rapports Interethniques [Scales of Attitude and Motivation Related to Inter-Ethnic Relations] (Tech. Rep.). Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa, School of Psychology.
[8]   Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, Self-confidence, and Group Cohesion in the Foreign Language. *Language Learning,* 44(3), 417 - 448.
[9]   Coşkun,A. (2010). The Effect of Metacognitive Strategy Training on the Listening Performance of Beginner Students. *Research on Youth and Language,* 4 (1), 35-50.
[10]   Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R.W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language learning*, 41, 469-512.
[11]   Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry,* 11, 227–268.
[12]   Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human Autonomy: The Basis for True Self-Esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, Agency and Self-Esteem* (pp. 31–49). New York: Plenum.
[13]   Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in Education: The Self Determination Perspective. *The Educational Psychologist,* 26, 325–346.
[14]   Deci, E. L.,&Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior. New York: Plenum.
[15]   Deci, E. L. (1975). Intrinsic Motivation. New York: Plenum.
[16]   Dickinson, L., (1995). Autonomy and Motivation: a Literature Review. *System,* 23, 165–174.
[17]   Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration and Processing. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
[18]   Dörnyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and Motivating in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Modern Language Journal,* 78, 273–284.

[19] Dörnyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 Motivation: On with the Challenge. *Modern Language Journal, 78,* 515–523.

[20] Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign Language Learning. *Language Learning, 40* (1), 45-76.

[21] Dreyer, C., and Oxford, R. (1996). Learner Variables Related to ESL Proficiency among Afrikaans-Speakers in South Africa. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World.* Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

[22] Ehrman, M., (1996). An Exploration of Adult Language Learning Motivation, Self-efficacy, and Anxiety. In: Oxford, J.L. (Ed.), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.

[23] Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive Aspects of Problem Solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The Nature of Intelligence* (pp. 231–235). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[24] Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social Psychology and Second Language E-Learning. London: Arnold.

[25] Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin, *Learner Strategies in Language Learning.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

[26] Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, R. C. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13,* 266–272.

[27] Gardner, R.C. Tremblay, P.E., and Masgoret, N. (1997). Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: An Empirical Investigation. *Modern Language Journal, 81,* 344-362.

[28] Gillham, B. (2000). Developing a Questionnaire. London: Continuum.

[29] Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive Instruction for Second Language Listening Development: Theory, Practice and Research Implications. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 39(2), 188 -213.

[30] Goh, C. C.M. (2002). Exploring Listening Comprehension Tactics and their Interaction Patterns. *System*, 30(2), 185-206.

[31] Goh, C. (2002a). Teaching Listening in the Language Classroom. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

[32] Goh, C. (2002b). Learners' Self-Reports on Comprehension and Learning Strategies for Listening. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 12,* 46–68.

[33] Goh, C. (2000). A Cognitive Perspective on Language Learners' Listening Comprehension Problems. *System, 28,* 55–75.

[34] Goh, C. (1998). How Learners with Different Listening Abilities Use Comprehension Strategies and Tactics. *Language Teaching Research, 2,* 124– 147.

[35] Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Listeners. *ELT Journal,* 51(4), 361-369.

[36] Goh, C. C. M., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive Instruction in Listening for Young Learners. *ELT Journal, 60,* 222–232.

[37] Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL Students at Different Proficiency Levels. *System, 34*(3), 301-316.

[38] Noels, K. A. (2001a). Learning Spanish as a Second Language: Learners' Orientations and Perceptions of their Teachers' Communication Style. *Language Learning, 51,* 107-144.

[39] Noels, K.A., Clement, R., Pelletier, L.G., (2001). Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Integrative Orientations of French Canadian Learners of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 424–442.

[40] Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory. *Language Learning*, 50, 57-85.

[41] Noels, K.A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L.G. (1999). Perceptions of Teachers' Communicative Style and Students' Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (1), 23-34.

[42] O'Bryan, A. and V. Hegelheimer. (2010). Using a Mixed Methods Approach to Explore Strategies, Metacognitive Awareness and the Effects of Task Design on Listening Development. *RCLA • CJAL*, 12(1), 9–38.

[43] O' Malley, J.M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

[44] O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening Comprehension Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(4), 419-437.

[45] O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., and Russo, R. (1985 a). Learning Strategies Used by Beginning and Intermediate ESL Students. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-46.

[46] Oxford, R.L., & Shearin, J. (1996). Language Learning Motivation in a New Key. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to New Century (pp. 121–144). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

[47] Ramage, K., (1990). Motivational Factors and Persistence in Foreign Language Study. *Language Learning* 40, 189–219.

[48] Ridley, D.S., Schutz, P.A., Glanz, R.S. & Weinstein, C.E. (1992). Self-Regulated Learning: the Interactive Influence of Metacognitive Awareness and Goal-Setting. *Journal of Experimental Education* 60 (4), 293-306.

[49] Rubin, J. (1994). A Review of Second Language Listening Comprehension Research. *Modern Language Journal,* 94,199-221.

[50] Ryan, R. M., Kuhl, J., & Deci, E. L. (1997). Nature and Autonomy: Organizational View of Social and Neurobiological Aspects of Self-Regulation in Behavior and Development. In Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well Being. *American Psychologist, 78,* 199–221.

[51] Salehi, M &Ziahosseini, S.M. (2007). An Investigation of the Relationship between Motivation and Language Learning Strategies. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji,* 41, 85-107.

[52] Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom. Boston: Heinle.

[53] Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign Language Motivation: Internal Structure and External Connections. In R.L. Oxford, (Ed.), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century* (pp. 9–70). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

[54] Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics. New York: Harper Collins College Press.

[55] Tachibana, Y., Matsukawa, R., Zhong, Q.X., (1996). Attitudes and Motivation for Learning English: a Cross-National Comparison of Japanese and Chinese High School Students. *Psychological Reports* 79, 691–700.

[56] Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can Strategy Instruction Improve Listening Comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals,* 29(3), 331-342.

[57] Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. In Zanna, M. P. (Ed.). *Advances in*

Experimental Social Psychology, 29, 271-360.

[58] Vallerand, R. J., Fortier,M. S., & Guay, F. (1997). Self-Determination and Persistence in a Real-Life Setting: Toward a Motivational Model of High School Dropout. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1161–1176.

[59] Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C. B.,&Vallières, É. F. (1993). On the Assessment of Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Amotivation in Education: Evidence on the Concurrent and Construct Validity of the Academic Motivational Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 159–172.

[60] Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C. B., & Vallières, É. F. (1992). The Academic Motivation Scale: A Measure of Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Amotivation in Education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 1003–1017.

[61] Vallerand, R. J., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1989). Construction et Validation de l'échelle de Motivation en Ěducation (ÉMÉ) [Construction and Validation of the Échelle de Motivation en Éducation—ÉMÉ]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 21*, 323–349.

[62] Vandergrift, L. Goh, C.C.M., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ): Development and Validation. *Language Learning, 56*(3), 431-462.

[63] Vandergrift, L. (2005a). Relationships Among Motivation Orientations, Metacognitive Awareness and Proficiency in L2 Listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 70–89.

[64] Vandergrift, L. (2005b, May). Teaching Students How to Listen: Effects on Listening Achievement. Paper Presented at the Meeting of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, London, ON.

[65] Vandergrift, L. (2003a). Orchestrating Strategy Use: Toward a Model of the Skilled Second Language Listener. *Language Learning, 53*, 463– 496.

[66] Vandergrift, L. (2003b). From Prediction Through Reflection: Guiding Students Through the Process of L2 Listening. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 425–440.

[67] Vandergrift, L. (2002). It was Nice to See that our Predictions were Right: Developing Metacognition in L2 Listening Comprehension. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, 556–575.

[68] Vandergrift, L. (1997). The Strategies of Second Language (French) Listeners: A Descriptive Study. *Foreign Language Annals,* 30, 387–409.

[69] Wilson, M. (2003). Discovery Listening: Improving Perceptual Processing. *ELT Journal*, 57, 335–343.

[70] Yang, C. (2009). A study of Metacognitive Strategies Employed by English Listeners. *International Education Studies*. 2(4), 134-139.

[71] Zhang, D. (2001). Singaporean Secondary Three Students' Metacognitive Knowledge about English Oral skills Learning. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

[72] Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zohreh Kassaian is currently Assistant Professor of TEFL at Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. She has instructed BA, MA, and PhD courses at this department for many years. Her main areas of research are Psycholinguistics, Linguistics, Neurolinguistics, and Phonetics. She holds a PhD degree in TEFL, an MA degree in TEFL, and a BA degree in English Language and Literature.

Momene Ghadiri is an MA candidate of TEFL at university of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Her main areas of research are English Teaching, Discourse Analysis, and Sociolinguistics. She holds a BA degree in English translation.