Journal of Applied Studies in Language, Volume 7 Issue 1 (Jun 2023), p. 75—85
p-issn 2598-4101 e-issn 2615-4706 © Politeknik Negeri Bali
http://ojs2.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL

Self-report to investigate of metacognition growth in writing

Dina Ramadhanti[1], Diyan Permata Yanda[2]

Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat[1]
UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi[2]
[1]email: dina.ona05@gmail.com
[2]email: diyan_yanda@yahoo.com

Abstract - This study aims to describe the validity and reliability of the Metacognition Growth Questionnaire in writing. Using a quantitative approach, measurements were made of the metacognitive growth questionnaire, which was developed based on the metacognitive process theory, which consists of three, parts: the process of raising awareness, the process of monitoring/evaluating, and the process of controlling/regulating. A total of 30 students were randomly selected to be used as test subjects for the questionnaire instrument. The validity of the questionnaire items is known by using the bivariate product-moment correlation test. The reliability of the questionnaire is known by using Alpha Cronbach. The results showed that as many as 40 questionnaire items were declared valid, and overall, the questionnaire items were declared reliable. Thus, as many as 40 questionnaire items can be used to measure of students' metacognition growth in writing.

Keywords: self-report, metacognition growth, writing

Journal of Applied Studies in Language, Volume 7 Issue 1 (Jun 2023), p. 75—85
p-issn 2598-4101 e-issn 2615-4706 © Politeknik Negeri Bali
http://ojs2.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL

1. Introduction

Metacognition in cognitive psychology theory is seen as a form of awareness about one's cognition, how that cognition works, and how to manage it (Flavell, 1979). Metacognition is an automatic process but is the result of the cognitive system development process (Ikram & Aziz, 2017). This metacognition ability is considered important to achieve efficient use of cognition in solving math and language problems. In language, especially writing, metacognition plays a very important role and determines success in writing because written products are also known as applied metacognition (Hacker et al, 2009). Writing products are the result of controlling, directing, and monitoring metacognition. Students who are aware of their metacognition will be successful learners (Iwai, 2011; Goctu, 2017), while students who are not aware of their metacognition will experience problems in writing. Students who are not aware of their metacognition in writing tend to ask for help from others, do not understand what is written and are not aware of the usefulness of the strategies used (Ramadhanti et al, 2019). To find out students' metacognition, certain measuring tools are needed, for example in the form of self-reports, reflective journals, error analysis assessments, and thin aloud protocols (Ramadhanti, 2020).

One of the tools for measuring metacognition is a self-report. Self-report is used as a tool to monitor the development of learning motivation, level of performance, and academic development of students (Mauro et al, 2014). Monitoring the development of metacognition using self-reports, usually in the form of a questionnaire. The self-report questionnaire was developed according to the main dimensions of metacognition, namely: cognitive knowledge (declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge) and cognitive regulation (planning, monitoring, and evaluation). The questionnaire used has been patented, validated, and tested so that it is suitable for use as a tool to measure the development of students' metacognitive awareness. Self-reports are usually used before and after metacognitive strategy training. With this report, the teacher can compare the development of students' metacognitive awareness before and after metacognitive strategy training.

Several studies have shown that self-report questionnaires have been developed to measure students' metacognition, namely: The Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) (Schraw & Dennison, 1994) and The Metacognitive Self-Assesment Scale (MSAS) (Pedone et al, 2017) used to measure students' metacognitive awareness in language learning and other subjects. For language learning, especially listening, reading, and writing skills, self-reports are used which are developed according to each aspect of these language skills. To measure metacognitive awareness in listening is used The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) (Goh, 2008). To measure metacognitive awareness in reading is used The Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategy Inventory (MARSI) (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). To measure metacognitive awareness in writing is used The Metacognitive Awareness Writing Questionnaire (MAWQ) (Farahian, 2017); (Farahian, 2015); (Maftoon et al, 2014). To measure the metacognitive beliefs of language learners is used Foreign Language Attitude Survey (FLAS) (De Garcia et al, 1976) dan Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) (Horwitz, 1985).

However, a self-report questionnaire used to measure the growth of students' metacognition in writing and can be used in conjunction with reflective journals has not been developed. Metacognition grows and develops over time depending on the efforts made to foster metacognitive awareness. Research on the development of self-report questionnaires to determine the growth of students' metacognition in writing needs to be done. To monitor the growth of students' metacognition in writing, a measuring instrument was used in the form of a self-report questionnaire. This questionnaire contains a list of questions given to students to find out the growth of students' metacognition in writing. Students choose one of the five answer choices given in the list of questions. The five answer choices are also called the Likert scale, which is a scale used to determine attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a group of people regarding social phenomena (Riduwan, 2007). The social symptoms referred to in this

study are students' metacognition in writing. By using a Likert scale, the measured variables are translated into several dimensions, the dimensions are translated into several sub-variables, then the sub-variables are translated into several measurable indicators. This measurable indicator is used as a starting point for making instrument items in the form of statements that are responded to by respondents. Each answer is connected with the form of a statement or attitude support which is connected with words in the form of the respondent's answer.

The study was guided by the following research questions. a) How to prepare The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ)? b) What are the results of testing the validity and reliability of The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ)?

2. Method

This study used a quantitative approach to test the validity and reliability of the metacognition growth questionnaire in writing. A total of 30 students studying at the Indonesian Language and Literature Study Program, PGRI University, West Sumatra, were randomly selected to provide responses to the questionnaire items. The instrument used is a self-report questionnaire on the growth of metacognition in writing using metacognitive process theory, namely: the process of growing awareness, the process of monitoring, and the process of controlling metacognition (Haris et al, 2010); (Akyol & Garrison, 2011); (Magiera & Zawojweski, 2011); (Garrison & Akyol, 2015); (Hu & Deng, 2018). The data of this study is in the form of metacognition growth questionnaire test scores in writing. Data collection was carried out directly by gathering students into one class. The students were given a questionnaire and they responded according to their experience.

After the data was collected, data analysis was carried out to determine the validity and reliability of the metacognition growth questionnaire instrument in writing. Testing the validity and reliability of the questionnaire instrument using the Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS)-23. The validity of the questionnaire items was determined by conducting a bivariate product-moment correlation test. The basis for making valid questionnaire item decisions is done by comparing the sig values. (2-tailed) with a probability of 0.05. If the value of Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05 and the Pearson Correlation is positive, the questionnaire items are declared valid. If the value of Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05 and negative Pearson Correlation, questionnaire items declared invalid. If the value of Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05, meaning that the questionnaire items were declared invalid. The reliability of the questionnaire was determined by carrying out Cronbach's Alpha test. The basis for making decisions on the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test is: if the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.60, it means that the questionnaire is declared reliable or consistent. Meanwhile, if the value of Cronbach's Alpha <0.60 means that the questionnaire is declared unreliable or inconsistent. The basis for making decisions on the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test is: if the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.60, it means that the questionnaire/questionnaire is declared reliable or consistent. Conversely, if the value of Cronbach's Alpha <0.60 means that the questionnaire is declared unreliable or inconsistent. The items in the learning strategy questionnaire statement that have been declared valid and reliable are presented in the attachment section.

3. Results and Discussion

The preparation of the self-report questionnaire was carried out in five steps, namely: identifying research variables, describing research variables into sub-variables, looking for indicators or aspects of each sub-variable, compiling descriptors for each indicator, formulating each descriptor into instrument items, and completing the instrument with instructions for filling in and preface (Riduwan, 2007). In accordance with this statement, the variable referred to in this study is the process of metacognition in writing. The sub-variables of the metacognition process in writing consist of three, namely: the process of raising awareness, the process of monitoring/evaluation, and the process of controlling/regulation (Haris et al, 2010); (Akyol & Garrison, 2011); (Magiera & Zawojweski, 2011); (Garrison & Akyol, 2015); (Hu & Deng, 2018).

Journal of Applied Studies in Language, Volume 7 Issue 1 (Jun 2023), p. 75—85
p-issn 2598-4101 e-issn 2615-4706 © Politeknik Negeri Bali
http://ojs2.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL

There are three indicators for the sub-variable process of growing awareness, namely: the process of activating awareness of cognition, the process of activating awareness of tasks, and the process of activating of self-awareness. The sub-variable indicators of the monitoring/evaluation process consist of four, namely monitoring task difficulty and learning assessment ease, monitoring understanding and learning assessment, monitoring feeling of knowing, and monitoring learning progress. The control/regulation process sub-variable indicators consist of four, namely: controlling the planning and objectives of learning assignments; controlling strategy selection efforts and decision making; controlling the use of time, effort, learning steps, and performance; and control motivation, emotions, and the environment. Each item is designed using positive (favorable) question types and answers choices using a Likert scale. Each answer choice has its score, namely: strongly disagree (score 1), disagree (score 2), doubt (score 3), agree (score 4), and strongly agree (score 5) (Sugiyono, 2009). The details of the instrument grid for The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGW) are visualized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Instrument Grid of The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ)

Number	The Metacognition Processes		Indicator	Item Total	Number of Item
1	The process of raising awareness	a.	Activating awareness about cognition (declarative, procedural, conditional)	20	1—20
		b.	Activate awareness about tasks	2	21—22
		c.	Activate self-awareness	2	23—24
2	The process of monitoring/evaluation	a.	Monitoring of task difficulty and ease of learning assessment	2	25—26
		b.	Monitoring of understanding and assessment of learning	2	27—28
		c.	Monitoring of feeling of knowing	1	29
		d.	Monitoring of learning progress	1	30
3	The process of controlling/regulation	a.	Controlling of the planning and purpose of learning tasks	3	31—33
		b.	Controlling of strategy selection efforts and decision making	2	34—35
		c.	Controlling of the use of time, effort, learning pace, and performance	2	36—37
		d.	Controlling of motivation, emotions, and environment	3	38—40
Total				40	

Validity and reliability test of the self-report questionnaire using SPPS-23. Validity test using the Correlate Bivariate Product Moment Test. The Pearson correlation product moment validity test uses the principle of connecting each item's score with the total score of the respondent's answers. The basis for making a decision to test the product moment validity is done by comparing the sig. (2-tailed) with a probability of 0.05. If sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05 and the Pearson Correlation is positive, the questionnaire items are declared valid. If the sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05 and the Pearson Correlation is negative, the questionnaire items are declared invalid. If sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05, the questionnaire items were declared invalid. The results of the validity test of the questionnaire items for each sub-variable, namely: the process of raising awareness, the process of monitoring/evaluation, and the process of controlling/regulation.

First, the process of raising awareness. The sub-variable process of raising awareness consists of three indicators, namely: the process of activating awareness of cognition, the process of activating awareness of tasks, and the process of activating self-awareness. The number of items for the sub-variables of the awareness-raising process is 24 items. The sub-variable process of growing awareness consists of three indicators, namely: the process of activating awareness of cognition, the process of activating awareness of tasks, and the process of activating self-awareness. The process indicators of activating awareness about cognition

consist of three sub-indicators, namely: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge. The sub-indicators of activating awareness about declarative knowledge consist of seven, namely: activating awareness about the topic, activating awareness about the purpose of writing, activating awareness about audience needs, activating awareness about the scope of writing, activating awareness about text genre, activating awareness about rules-language of the text, and activate awareness about the writing process. The sub-indicator item items activate awareness about declarative knowledge totaling 7 items. The results of validating the sub-indicator item items activate awareness about declarative knowledge is visualized in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Results of Sub-Indicator Item Validation Activating Awareness of Declarative Knowledge

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_1	0.427	0.019	30	Valid	Used
Item_2	0.631	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_3	0.631	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_4	0.452	0.012	30	Valid	Used
Item_5	0.684	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_6	0.441	0.015	30	Valid	Used
Item_7	0.658	0.000	30	Valid	Used

The sub-indicators of activating awareness about procedural knowledge consist of five, namely: activating awareness about how to plan writing, activating awareness about how to produce text, activating awareness about how to connect ideas, activating awareness about how to add written details, and activating awareness about how to revise the text. The sub-indicator item items activate awareness about procedural knowledge totaling 8 items. The results of validating the sub-indicator item items activating awareness about procedural knowledge are visualized in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Results of Sub-Indicator Item Validation Activating Awareness of Procedural Knowledge

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_8	0.282	0.131	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_9	0.737	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_10	0.260	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_11	0.429	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_12	0.232	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_13	0.691	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_14	0.363	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_15	0.600	0.000	30	Valid	Used

The sub-indicators activating awareness about conditional knowledge consist of five, namely: activating awareness when considering critically about a particular writing task, activating awareness about the best skills and strategies that can be used, activating awareness about the type of scaffolding that can be used for task completion, activating awareness about when and why to use certain compositional processes, and activate awareness when modifying the learning environment. There are 5 sub-indicators activating awareness about conditional knowledge. The results of the validation of the sub-indicator item items activating awareness about conditional knowledge are visualized in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Results of Sub-Indicator Item Validation Activating Awareness of Conditional Knowledge

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_16	0.672	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_17	0.726	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_18	0.633	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_19	0.552	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_20	0.758	0.000	30	Valid	Used

Journal of Applied Studies in Language, Volume 7 Issue 1 (Jun 2023), p. 75—85
p-issn 2598-4101 e-issn 2615-4706 © Politeknik Negeri Bali
http://ojs2.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL

The indicator of activating awareness about the task consists of two, namely: activating awareness about the nature of the task in accordance with the knowledge and experience possessed and activating awareness about how to relate knowledge and experience according to the task. The indicator of activating awareness about the task is 2 items. The results of the validation of the indicator items activating awareness about the task are visualized in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Results of Sub-Indicator Item Validation Activating Awareness of Task

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_21	0.495	0.005	30	Valid	Used
Item_22	0.504	0.005	30	Valid	Used

The indicators of activating self-awareness consist of two, namely: realizing one's weaknesses in writing and realizing one's strengths in writing. There are 2 indicators of activating self-awareness. The results of the validation of the indicator items activating awareness about the task are visualized in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Results of Sub-Indicator Item Validation Activating Self-Awareness

Item	Test Result			Descriptions	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_23	0.541	0.002	30	Valid	Used
Item_24	0.136	0.474	30	Invalid	Revised

Second, the processes of monitoring/evaluation process. The sub-variable of the processes of monitoring/evaluation consists of four indicators, namely: monitoring task difficulty and learning assessment ease, monitoring understanding and learning assessment, monitoring feeling of knowing, and monitoring learning progress. The sub-variable of processes of monitoring/evaluation process sub-variable indicators total 6 points. The results of the validation of the item indicators for sub-variables of the monitoring/evaluation process are visualized in Table 7 below.

Table 7 Results of Sub-Variable Item Validation of The Processes of Monitoring/Evaluation

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_25	0.259	0.167	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_26	0.454	0.012	30	Valid	Used
Item_27	0.463	0.100	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_28	0.496	0.005	30	Valid	Used
Item_29	0.523	0.003	30	Valid	Used
Item_30	0.630	0.000	30	Valid	Used

Third, the process of controlling/regulation. The control/regulation process sub-variables consist of four indicators, namely: controlling the planning and objectives of learning assignments; controlling strategy selection efforts and decision making; controlling the use of time, effort, learning steps, and performance; and control motivation, emotions, and the environment. The control/regulation process sub-variables totaled 10 items. The sub-variables controlling the planning and objectives of learning assignments consist of three indicators, namely: controlling the learning process in accordance with the planning and objectives of writing assignments, controlling time effectively and maximally in collecting assignment materials and controlling the best performance in completing assignments. The sub-variables controlling the planning and purpose of learning assignments total 3 items. The results of the validation of the sub-variable items controlling planning and learning task objectives are visualized in Table 8 below.

Table 8 Results of Sub-Variable Item Validation of Controlling Planning and Learning Task Objectives

Item	Test Results			Description
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N	

Item_31	0.341	0.065	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_32	0.524	0.003	30	Valid	Used
Item_33	0.780	0.000	30	Valid	Used

The sub-variables controlling strategy selection and decision-making efforts consist of two indicators, namely: controlling when strategies are selected, used, and replaced according to learning tasks; and control when and why to change strategies to complete tasks. There are 2 sub-variables controlling strategy selection and decision-making efforts. The results of the validation of sub-variable item items controlling the strategy selection effort and decision making are visualized in Table 9 below.

Table 9 Results of Sub-Variable Item Validation of Controlling the Strategy Selection Effort and Decision-Making

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_34	0.687	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_35	0.667	0.000	30	Valid	Used

The sub-variables controlling the use of time, effort, learning steps, and performance consist of two indicators, namely: controlling the effective time and effort in completing tasks and controlling a series of writing steps effectively to complete tasks. There are 3 sub-variables controlling the use of time, effort, learning steps, and performance. The results of the validation of sub-variable item items controlling the use of time, effort, learning steps, and performance are visualized in Table 10 below.

Table 10 Results of Sub-Variable Item Validation of Controlling the Used of Time, Effort, Learning Steps, and Performance

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_36	0.643	0.000	30	Valid	Used
Item_37	0.105	0.582	30	Invalid	Revised

The sub-variables controlling motivation, emotions, and environment consist of three indicators, namely: controlling motivation in completing tasks; controlling of emotions, thoughts, and feelings while completing tasks; and controlling of the environment that can help and support the convenience of completing tasks. There are 3 sub-variables controlling motivation, emotion, and environment. The results of the validation of the sub-variable items controlling motivation, emotions, and the environment are visualized in Table 11 below.

Table 11 Results of Sub-Variable Item Validation of Controlling Motivation, Emotions, and the Environment

Item	Test Results			Description	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N		
Item_38	-0.141	0.459	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_39	0.026	0.893	30	Invalid	Revised
Item_40	0.214	0.255	30	Invalid	Revised

Reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha Test. The reliability test refers to the Alpha value contained in the SPSS output table. The basis for making decisions on the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test, namely: if the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.60, it means that the questionnaire is declared reliable. Meanwhile, if Cronbach's Alpha value is <0.60, it means that the questionnaire is declared unreliable. The results of the questionnaire reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha Test are visualized in Tables 12 and 13 below.

Table 12 Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 12 of the Case Processing Summary informs about the number of samples or respondents (N) analyzed in the SPSS program, namely N as many as 30 students. Because there is no blank data (in the sense that all the respondents' answers are filled in), the valid number is 100%.

Table 13 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.739	40

Table 13 of the Reliability Statistics provides the results of reliability statistics. N of Items (number of items or questionnaire items) is 41 with a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.739. Cronbach's Alpha value 0.739 > 0.60. As the basis for decision-making in the reliability test, it can be concluded that the 40 items or all items of The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ) are reliable.

Thus, The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ) is declared valid and reliable and can be used to measure the metacognition growth in writing. In writing, the self-report questionnaire can be used as a tool to monitor the development of metacognition because it contains information about the academic development of students, starting from their learning motivation, and their level of performance in learning, to the development of their academic achievement (Mauro et al, 2014), especially in writing. This self-report functions as (1) recognition of the representational nature of thinking, (2) recognition that mental representations are not objective images of external reality, (3) recognition that one's beliefs and those of others may be wrong, and (4) recognition that others may have different viewpoints and beliefs (Pedone et al, 2017). Tobias & Everson (2000) provides an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of self-report as a metacognition monitoring tool. The advantages of self-reports are that they are easy to give to groups and can be assessed quickly and objectively. Self-report scales usually ask respondents to choose a series of choices about their cognition processes and the strategies they use in the learning process. This kind of scale requires effective reading skills and is not suitable for elementary school-level children. In addition, because metacognition involves monitoring, evaluating, and coordinating cognition processes, the use of self-report as a metacognition monitoring tool raises several question marks, namely (1) Will students be aware of the processes that will be used during learning? (2) Can students describe and report the metacognition processes used, not just choose the available alternatives on a multiple-choice scale? (3) Will students report honestly about the process?

The Metacognition Growth in Writing Questionnaire (MGWQ) can be used before and after learning activities using metacognitive strategies. The teacher before carrying out learning can measure students' metacognitive awareness in writing using this questionnaire. After that, the teacher implements learning using metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies have been proven to be effective in improving language skills (Faridah et al, 2022); (Ramadhanti & Yanda, 2021); (Tawarik et al, 2021). During learning using metacognitive strategies, students can monitor their writing performance using a reflective journal. Through reflective journals, students can share their cognitive experiences while working on assignments, their strengths and weaknesses in writing, the strategies used, and the efforts made when experiencing problems in writing (Ramadhanti et al, 2020). After the learning activities were carried out, the students were given a self-report questionnaire again. Teachers can compare the performance and growth of students' metacognition before and after learning is carried out using metacognitive strategies. The teacher can also find out how far the students' metacognitive development is in writing.

4. Conclusion

The metacognition growth in writing can be monitored using metacognition measurement tools. One of them is called a self-report questionnaire. Self-report questionnaires were used before and after learning was carried out using metacognitive strategies. Metacognition continues to develop from time to time depending on the level of awareness of students towards their metacognition. The teacher's role is to increase students' metacognitive awareness by using metacognitive strategies in carrying out learning. Self-report is used as one of the tools used to monitor the growth of students' metacognition. Questionnaires were developed and tested so that they are suitable for monitoring of students' metacognition growth.

References

Akyol, Z., & Garrison, D. R. (2011). Assessing Metacognitive in an Online of Inquiry. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *14*(3), 183–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.01.005

De Garcia, R., Reynolds, S., & Savignon, S. J. (1976). Foreign-Language Attitude Survey. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *32*, 302–304.

Farahian, M. (2015). Assessing EFL Learners' Writing Metacognitive Awareness. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *11*(2), 39–51.

Farahian, M. (2017). Developing and validating a metacognitive writing questionnaire for EFL learners. *Issues in Educational Research*, *27*(4), 736–750.

Faridah, F., Setyaningrum, R. R., & Falakha, E. N. (2022). Metacognitive Strategy to Enhance Students' Reading Text-Ability: Case Study in the Vocational High School. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, *6*(2), 199–205. https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v6i2.646

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

Garrison, D. R., & Akyol, Z. (2015). Toward the Development of a Metacognition Construct for Communities of Inquiry. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *24*(4), 66–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.10.001

Goctu, R. (2017). Metacognitive Strategies in Academic Writing. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, *2*(2), 82–96.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive Instruction for Second Language Listening Development: Theory, Practice and Research Implications. *RELC Journal*, *39*(2), 188–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092184

Hacker, D. J., Keener, M. C., & Kircher, J. C. (2009). Writing is Applied Metacognition. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Handout of Metacognition in Education* (pp. 154–172). Routledge.

Haris, K. R., Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2010). Metacognition and Strategies Instruction in Writing. In H. S. Waters & W. Schneider (Eds.), *Metacognition, Strategies Use, & Instruction* (pp. 226–256).

Horwitz, E. K. (1985). Using Student Beliefs About Language Learning and Teaching in the Foreign Language Methods Course. *Foreign Language Annals*, *18*(4), 333–340.

Hu, Z., & Deng, Z. (2018). The Construct of Metacognition in the Processing of Translation Problems and its Measurement. *Topic in Education, Culture, and Social Development (TECSD)*, *1*(1), 76–78.

Ikram, Z. J. W., & Aziz, N. (2017). Kegiatan Metakognitif dalam Pemecahan Masalah Matematika. In Usman, A. Ismail, Nursalam, Z. J. W. Ikram, N. Hardianti, I. H. Islail, H. Sultan, & H. Usman (Eds.), *Prosiding Seminar Nasional "TELLU CAPPA"* (Issue September, pp. 810–820). Badan Penerbit Universitas Negeri Makasar.

Iwai, Y. (2011). The Effects of Metacognitive Reading Strategies: Pedagogical Implications for EFL/ESL Teachers. *The Reading Matrix*, *11*(2), 150–159.

Maftoon, P., Birjandi, P., & Farahian, M. (2014). Investigating Iranian EFL learners' Writing Metacognitive Awareness. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, *3*(5), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2014.896

Magiera, M. T., & Zawojweski, J. S. (2011). Characterizations of Social-Based and Self-Based Contexts Associated With Students ' Awareness , Evaluation , and Regulation of Their Thinking During Small-Group Mathematical Modeling. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, *42*(5), 486–520.

Mauro, C., Gomes, A., & Golino, H. F. (2014). Self-Reports on Students' Learning Processes are Academic Metacognitive Knowledge. *Psychology*, *27*(3), 472–480. https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-7153.201427307

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing Students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(2), 249–259. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.94.2.249

Pedone, R., Semerari, A., Riccardi, I., Procacci, M., Nicolo, G., & Carcione, A. (2017). Development of a Self-Report Measure of Metacognition: The Metacognition Self-Assessment Scale (MSAS), Instrument Desciption and Factor Structure. *Clinic Neuropsychiatri*, *14*(3), 185–194.

Ramadhanti, D. (2020). *Proses Psikologis-Kognitif Mahasiswa dalam Menulis. Disertasi. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.*

Ramadhanti, D., Ghazali, A. S., Hasanah, M., & Harsiati, T. (2019). Students' Metacognitive Weaknesses in Academic Writing: A Preliminary Research. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *14*(11), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i11.10213

Ramadhanti, D., Ghazali, A. S., Hasanah, M., Harsiati, T., & Yanda, D. P. (2020). The Use of Reflective Journal as a Tool for Monitoring of Metacognition Growth in Writing. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *15*(11), 162–187. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i11.11939

Ramadhanti, D., & Yanda, D. P. (2021). Students' Metacognitive Awareness and Its Impact on Writing Skill. *International Journal of Language Education*, *5*(3), 193–206. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i3.18978

Riduwan. (2007). *Skala Pengukuran Variabel-Variabel Penelitian*.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing Metacognitive Awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *19*(4), 460–475. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1994.1033

Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*.

Tawarik, O., Ikhsanudin, Wajdi, M., & Latip-Yusoph, S. (2021). Effect of CALLA Metacognitive Strategy Instruction on Reading Comprehension and Reading Awareness. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, *5*(2), 309–319. https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v5i2.309-319

Tobias, S., & Everson, H. (2000). Assessing Metacognitive Knowledge Monitoring. In G. Schraw & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Issue in the Measurement of Metacognition* (pp. 147–222).

Appendix

METACOGNITION GROWTH IN WRITING QUESTIONNAIRE (MGWQ)

Instructions:

1. Read each statement carefully!
2. Give your answer to the statement given by placing a check mark (√) on one of the five answer options, namely: strongly agree, agree, doubt, disagree, strongly disagree!
3. Give answers honestly according to your writing experience!

No	Items	Answer Options				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Doubt	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	I realized about a topic that I will develop into a text.					
2	I realized the goals I wanted to achieve in writing.					
3	I realize the needs of the audience in writing according to the topic of writing.					
4	I realize that the scope of what I write corresponds to the topic of writing.					
5	I realized that the genre of the text I wrote was in accordance with the topic of writing.					
6	I'm aware of the linguistic rules that suit the genre of the text I write.					
7	I'm aware of the process I go through while writing/.					
8	I'm aware of the way in which I plan my writing.					
9	I'm aware of how to produce texts, especially in terms of selecting the appropriate vocabulary for the writing topic.					
10	I'm aware of how to produce text, especially in an effort to organize sentences according to their structure.					
11	I realized how to produce text, especially in choosing lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion to connect each sentence into a coherent paragraph that makes sense.					
12	I realized how to develop ideas according to the genre of text that I wrote.					
13	I realized how to relate ideas according to the genre of the text that I wrote.					
14	I realized how to add writing detail according to the genre of the text that I wrote.					
15	I'm aware of how to revise my text.					

16	I realized when I was considering critically about a topic that I was going to develop into a text.					
17	I realized the best skills and strategies I could use in writing.					
18	I realized when I decided on the type of scaffolding that could help me in my finishing my writing.					
19	I realized when and why I used a certain writing process to produce a text.					
20	I realize when I modify the learning environment to support writing completion.					
21	I'm aware of the nature of writing assignments for various text genres according to my knowledge and experience.					
22	I realize when I relate the knowledge and experience I have to the genre of the text I'm writing.					
23	I realized my weakness in writing.					
24	I realized my strength in writing.					
25	I always monitor how difficult the writing assignments I receive.					
26	I always monitor every aspect of the assessment that I must pay attention to while writing a text.					
27	I always monitor my understanding while writing a text.					
28	I always monitor my writing progress by assessing my writing.					
29	I always monitored the level of awareness of the hard-to-remember knowledge and experiences associated with writing assignments.					
30	I always monitor writing progress by composing and checking my writing against the text grading criteria.					
31	I have a habit of planning assignments and goals to be achieved in writing as a form of controlling my learning process.					
32	I have a habit of using time effectively and optimally to collect writing materials according to the selected topic.					
33	I have a habit of always showing my best performance in finishing my writing					
34	I have a habit of choosing, using, and changing the strategies I use during writing.					
35	I have a habit of knowing when and why I change strategies as I finish writing.					
36	I have a habit of using effective time and effort in completing writing.					
37	I have a habit of performing a series of writing steps effectively.					
38	I have a habit of keeping myself motivated in finishing writing.					
39	I have a habit of keeping my emotions, thoughts, and feelings in check during completing writing assignments.					
40	I have a habit of paying attention to an environment that can help and support comfort during completing writing assignments.					