



Metacognitive Awareness Towards Academic Learning

Dedi Irwan^(✉), Annisa Luthfiana, Muhammad Iqbal Ripo Putra, Muhammad Lahir,
and Al Ashadi Alimin

IKIP PGRI Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia
dediirwanphd@gmail.com

Abstract. This descriptive research aimed to discover the level of metacognitive awareness towards academic learning to students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak. Cross sectional survey was implemented and 420 respondents were involved from all academic years and various backgrounds. The 52 items in Metacognitive Awareness Inventory by Schraw & Dennison (1994) were adopted with eight indicators from two main factors and the data was analyzed in descriptive statistics. It is reported that there is a high level of metacognitive awareness with the score of 86%. This favorable outcome will bring a significant benefit to students because metacognitive awareness is directly correlated to various indicators of academic success, including the overall grade point average. Additionally, three of the most prominent indicators are Debugging Strategies, Conditional Knowledge, and Evaluation. Meanwhile, the least applied indicator is Information Management Strategies. Two certain items that have a considerably much lower score are the one about remembering information and the one about using pictures or diagram in the learning process. This showcases the students' unique strength and weakness in the metacognitive awareness factors that need to be highlighted in their academic learning.

Keywords: metacognitive awareness · academic learning students of English education study program

1 Introduction

With the rapid globalization and advancement of technology, higher education has become one of the fundamental necessities for many individuals. In fact, there was a total of 700,000 applicants participating in the Entrance Selection of State Universities throughout all regions in Indonesia in 2020 [1]. On the other hand, along with this growth, there are also numerous emerging problems, especially related to the students' adaptation to academic learning in higher education. One reason behind this is that many of the youth face problems during the transition stage between high school and university, which is mainly due to students' prior expectations and the realities of academic learning in university. This later can result in severe anxiety, poor academic performance, and higher drop-out rates [2]. It is noteworthy that this is also a prominent

issue in Indonesia, because based on the 2020 Higher Education Statistics released by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, there was a staggering number of 602.208 students dropping out from private and public universities in 2019.

To combat this negative development, the students need to be more aware of the different environments in higher education so that they can improve their academic learning. One of the effective ways to achieve this is through metacognitive awareness. This is because according to [3], metacognition highlights the individual's awareness of their unique needs, the strategies, and the implementation in the learning process. Thus, once students acquire metacognitive awareness, their academic learning is expected to be better. Numerous research has been conducted with the result supporting this claim, and one of them is done by [4]. They found that there is a significant correlation between metacognitive awareness with learners' academic achievement. The findings of a similar research conducted by [5] also confirmed that planning and knowledge of conditions – which are a part of metacognitive awareness – lead to success in the learning process.

More importantly, metacognition is ncelargely a part of self-regulation, which is imperative in the learning process. This is because by adopting self-regulation, the students are able to implement metacognition, goal setting, monitoring, and evaluating one's actions in their academic learning [6]. In addition, [7] revealed that learners who are able to apply self-regulation can understand themselves better since they have the ability to identify their own shortcomings and strengths – which is also the primary focus of metacognitive awareness.

Therefore, it can be concluded that acquiring metacognitive awareness will allow students to be more prepared for their academic learning in higher education. Besides, this will grant them the opportunity to achieve better academic performance and reduce the risk of dropping out. On top of that, students can discover their strength and weakness from the metacognitive awareness indicators in their academic learning. Additionally, it is noteworthy that metacognitive awareness is not commonly researched in the academic environment of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak. All in all, due to these pivotal benefits, the research is aimed to discover the level of metacognitive awareness towards academic learning of students.

Metacognition is one of the prominent terms when looking at education from the psychological perspective. To put simply, metacognition is the understanding of the thinking process. [20] also describes it as our understanding of cognitive processes, as well as the use of this understanding when learning and remembering new things. [8] was one of the most prominent figures who shaped the foundation of this field of study. Based on the definition set by him, metacognition is made up of four components: metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive experience, goals, and the activation of strategies. He believed that the interaction between these four components are the basics behind the growth or decline of one's metacognitive skills. In a slightly different variation of the concept, [9] claimed that there are two subsections of metacognition, which are knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition.

According to [19], a very simple explanation of “knowledge about cognition” would be that it contains both an overall understanding of how information is absorbed by people and their knowledge regarding how they themselves learn. Then, [9] illustrated

that our understanding of cognition can further be broken down into three categories. Firstly, it is our understanding of our learning process which is known as Declarative Knowledge. Secondly, it is comprehension regarding which method is the most fitting which is known as Procedural Knowledge. Lastly, it is the knowledge about the situations that are suitable for certain cognitive activities which is called Conditional Knowledge.

The term “regulation of cognition” refers to the practice of exercising control over one’s own cognitive processing, such as the use of a variety of strategies in a flexible manner based on the circumstances and on intermediate learning objectives. According to [21] and [23], the actions of regulation include planning and monitoring before taking a certain class or completing a specific assignment, as well as the use of information management methods while doing learning activity. Therefore, regulation of cognition may be split into five distinct activities, which. Firstly, it is planning, which involves goal setting and allocating resources prior to learning. Secondly, it is information management strategies, which consists of skills and strategies used in the process of understanding the information more efficiently. Thirdly, it is comprehension monitoring, which is the assessment process of one’s learning or strategy use. Fourthly, it is debugging strategies, which include strategies used to correct comprehension and performance errors. Lastly, it is evaluation, which is the analysis of performance and strategy effectiveness once the learning process has completed.

It is imperative to assist students to develop the awareness of themselves as learners and to oversee the process. By doing this, one of the objectives of education, which is to lead students to be lifelong learners, can be accomplished. This is where metacognitive ability comes into play, because when students improve their metacognitive abilities, they often report a rise in their level of self-confidence [18]. Additionally, the ability to participate in metacognition will lead to the opportunity to become good learners as it is associated to intelligence as well [17, 22]. This is supported by [4] who reported in their research that both the knowledge of cognition factor and the regulation of cognition factors had a statistically significant link with one another. It was also revealed that there were significant relationships between the MAI and many broad indicators of academic success. In addition, [7] found out that the role of goal setting in metacognitive awareness in foreign language learning is indeed pivotal in metacognition. Hence, it has been widely claimed that metacognitive awareness plays a pivotal role in the academic performance of students.

2 Research Methodology

In this research, the cross-sectional survey was implemented in this research. It looks at a smaller group of people (samples) from a larger group of people (population) at one moment in time [10]. On top of that, this descriptive research is quantitative in nature as it intends to uncover patterns in attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and traits of a big group of people toward specific subjects or concerns [11]. The population was the students within the environment of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak. Additionally, active students currently majoring in English Education Study Program were the selected samples.

This research utilized internet survey as the means for the data collection process. The preferred website which hosted the internet survey was Google Form and the link was

distributed through Whatsapp along with the consent form and the guidance regarding the technicalities about how to fill in the survey. The questionnaire was adopted from a well-established instrument known as Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) which was created by [9].

Once the data collection process was completed, the responses from Google Form were compiled in a spreadsheet and thus were analyzed. Firstly, the response for “Yes” was assigned 1 and “No” was assigned 0. Then, the average score of each item was calculated by dividing the total score with the total amount of respondents (420). Afterward, the average score of eight indicators of metacognitive awareness was identified. Furthermore, the overall level of metacognitive awareness was calculated by finding the average score between the two main factors; Knowledge of Cognition and Regulation of Cognition. Following this, an analysis of which one is the most dominant among the indicators and factors was conducted. Finally, an analysis of which one is less applied among the indicators and factors was conducted.

3 Results and Discussion

The data collection process involved 420 respondents who are students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak from all academic years and various backgrounds. Furthermore, several variations were also involved in the questionnaire to discover the demographic of the respondents, namely genders, class, academic year, school of origin, region of origin, and age groups. In the questionnaire, there are two main factors that are addressed in the Metacognitive Awareness Inventory instrument, which are: Knowledge of Cognition and Regulation of Cognition. Furthermore, three indicators are utilized for Knowledge of Cognition, while five indicators are included in Regulation of Cognition. All 52 items for this were included in the questionnaire, and simple criteria were utilized by assigning Yes and No as the options to pick from.

The level of metacognitive awareness was calculated by finding the average score between the two primary factors; Knowledge of Cognition and Regulation of Cognition divided by 420 as the total of the respondents. The average score for Knowledge of Cognition reaches 86% while the figure for Regulation of Cognition is 86% as well. Ultimately, with the score of 86%, it can be said that there is a high level of metacognitive awareness towards academic learning to students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak. The data can be seen in the Table 1.

In addition, a closer comparison of the eight indicators show that Debugging Strategies has the highest score of 89%. This is closely followed by Conditional Knowledge

Table 1. The Level of Metacognitive Awareness

Factor	Average Score	Percentage
Knowledge of Cognition	360.03	86%
Regulation of Cognition	360.98	86%
Metacognitive Awareness	360.51	86%

(88%) and Evaluation (87%) on the second and third position respectively. Planning and Comprehension Monitoring both occupy the fourth place with an equal amount of 86%. Meanwhile, the indicators with the lowest score are Procedural Knowledge (85%), Declarative Knowledge (84%) and Information Management Strategies (82%). The data can be seen in the Table 2.

Furthermore, a closer look at each factor revealed a unique trend. The first factor, Knowledge of Cognition, refers to the information students possess about their academic learning. Then, the first indicator is Declarative Knowledge which receives an average score of 84%, followed by Procedural Knowledge with 85% and Conditional Knowledge with 85%. With an overall figure of 86%, it can be said that students applied a high degree of all Knowledge of Cognition in their academic learning. The data can be seen in the Table 3.

Following this is the factor of Regulation of Cognition, which describes about the implementation of learning strategy. It is divided into to five indicators. Firstly, Debugging Strategies gains an average score of 89%, which is the highest among all indicators. This is closely followed by the figures for Evaluation (87%), Planning (86%), Comprehension Monitoring (86%), and Information Management Strategies (82%). All indicators obtain an average score of 86%, which implies that students had a high degree of Regulation of Cognition. The data can be seen in the Table 4.

Table 2. The Comparison of Indicators in Metacognitive Awareness

Indicator	Average Score	Percentage
Debugging Strategies	373.6	89%
Conditional Knowledge	370.6	88%
Evaluation	363.33	87%
Planning	363	86%
Comprehension Monitoring	359.86	86%
Procedural Knowledge	356.75	85%
Declarative Knowledge	352.75	84%
Information Management Strategies	345.1	82%

Table 3. Result for the Indicators in Knowledge of Cognition

Indicator	Average Score	Percentage
Declarative Knowledge	352.75	84%
Procedural Knowledge	356.75	85%
Conditional Knowledge	370.60	88%
Overall Average	360.03	86%

Table 4. Result for the Indicators for Regulation of Knowledge

Indicator	Average Score	Percentage
Planning	363.00	86%
Information Management Strategies	345.10	82%
Comprehension Monitoring	359.86	86%
Debugging Strategies	373.60	89%
Evaluation	363.33	87%
Overall Average	360.98	86%

Afterward, a detailed analysis of each item shows that the percentage for Item 5 is noticeably lower (67%). This reveals that only about half of the respondents believed in their ability to remember information. Interestingly, for the indicator of Information Management Strategies, a stark gap can be seen between the highest score for Item 24 and the lowest score for Item 29. This means 95% of respondents claimed that they tried to translate new information into their own words, but only 52% of them admitted to drawing pictures or diagrams to improve their understanding. For Debugging Strategies, all items obtain a tremendous percentage except for Item 45 because only 78% of respondents claimed that they stop and go back over new information that is not clear. For Evaluation, the least preferred item among respondents with 75% score is Item 49 – which is about making a summary after learning. The data can be seen in the Table 5.

Comparison among eight indicators revealed that Debugging Strategies - which are strategies that learners used to correct the understanding and errors of performance [9]- is the most applied indicator among students. This is quite the opposite from the result of research by [12] who found that debugging strategies is second lowest indicator of university students in the final semester. Furthermore, the second most applied indicator is Conditional Knowledge, which is about the effectiveness of certain learning strategies. Interestingly, this indicator is the least applied one in the research conducted by [13] among nursing students. Following this, the third most prominent indicator is Evaluation, which is the capacity of analyzing performance and strategy effectiveness after learning. This is another noteworthy trend among students of English Education Study Program in IKIP PGRI Pontianak because [14] discovered the opposite among students from Petra University in Jordan because evaluation is the second lowest indicator instead.

On top of that, it can be concluded that the Regulation of Cognition is the more dominant factor among students of English Education Study Program in IKIP PGRI Pontianak. This is mostly because two out of top scoring three indicators are from this factor, namely Debugging Strategies and Evaluation. This means that students should reap the benefit from this factor because they are more capable of implementing and managing the activities they must do in order to achieve a successful academic learning.

On the contrary, the least applied indicator is Information Management Strategies – which are the skills and strategy sequences used to process information more efficiently, such as organizing, elaborating, summarizing, selective focusing [9]. On the other hand,

Table 5. Results for the Items for All Indicators

Indicator	Item	Description	Applying (n)	Percentage
Declarative Knowledge	Item 1	I understand my intellectual strengths and weaknesses.	400	95%
	Item 2	I know what kind of information is most important to learn.	402	96%
	Item 3	I am good at organizing information.	314	75%
	Item 4	I know what the teacher expects me to learn.	375	89%
	Item 5	I am good at remembering information.	283	67%
	Item 6	I have control over how well I learn.	325	77%
	Item 7	I am a good judge of how well I understand something.	328	78%
	Item 8	I learn more when I am interested in the topic.	395	94%
Procedural Knowledge	Item 9	I try to use strategies that have worked in the past.	384	91%
	Item 10	I have a specific purpose for each strategy I use.	349	83%
	Item 11	I am aware of what strategies I use when I study.	354	84%
	Item 12	I find myself using helpful learning strategies automatically.	340	81%
Conditional Knowledge	Item 13	I learn best when I know something about the topic.	392	93%
	Item 14	I use different learning strategies depending on the situation.	349	83%
	Item 15	I can motivate myself to learn when I need to.	380	90%

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

Indicator	Item	Description	Applying (n)	Percentage
	Item 16	I use my intellectual strengths to compensate for my weaknesses.	370	88%
	Item 17	I know when each strategy I use will be most effective.	362	86%
Planning	Item 18	I pace myself while learning in order to have enough time.	349	83%
	Item 19	I think about what I really need to learn before I begin a task.	387	92%
	Item 20	I set specific goals before I begin a task.	357	85%
	Item 21	I ask myself questions about the material before I begin.	334	80%
	Item 22	I think of several ways to solve a problem and choose the best one.	379	90%
	Item 23	I read instructions carefully before I begin a task.	394	94%
	Item 24	I organize my time to best accomplish my goals.	341	81%
Information Management Strategies	Item 25	I slow down when I encounter important information.	314	75%
	Item 26	I consciously focus my attention on important information.	380	90%
	Item 27	I focus on the meaning and significance of new information.	383	91%
	Item 28	I create my own examples to make information more meaningful.	359	85%
	Item 29	I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand while learning.	219	52%

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

Indicator	Item	Description	Applying (n)	Percentage
	Item 30	I try to translate new information into my own words.	397	95%
	Item 31	I use the organizational structure of the text to help me learn.	328	78%
	Item 32	I ask myself if what I'm reading is related to what I already know.	372	89%
	Item 33	I try to break studying down into smaller steps.	356	85%
	Item 34	I focus on overall meaning rather than specifics.	343	82%
Comprehension Monitoring	Item 35	I ask myself periodically if I am meeting my goals.	348	83%
	Item 36	I consider several alternatives to a problem before I answer.	365	87%
	Item 37	I ask myself if I have considered all options when solving a problem.	375	89%
	Item 38	I periodically review to help me understand important relationships.	364	87%
	Item 39	I find myself analyzing the usefulness of strategies while I study.	348	83%
	Item 40	I find myself pausing regularly to check my comprehension.	343	82%
	Item 41	I ask myself questions about how well I am doing while I am learning something new.	376	90%
Debugging Strategies	Item 42	I ask others for help when I don't understand something.	393	94%

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

Indicator	Item	Description	Applying (n)	Percentage
	Item 43	I change strategies when I fail to understand.	397	95%
	Item 44	I re-evaluate my assumptions when I get confused.	376	90%
	Item 45	I stop and go back over new information that is not clear.	328	78%
	Item 46	I stop and reread when I get confused.	374	89%
Evaluation	Item 47	I know how well I did once I finish a test.	364	87%
	Item 48	I ask myself if there was an easier way to do things after I finish a task.	379	90%
	Item 49	I summarize what I've learned after I finish.	317	75%
	Item 50	I ask myself how well I accomplish my goals once I'm finished.	368	88%
	Item 51	I ask myself if I have considered all options after I solve a problem.	370	88%
	Item 52	I ask myself if I learned as much as I could have once I finish a task.	382	91%

according to the research by [13], this is the most applied indicator among nursing students. This comparison shows that students of English Education Study Program in IKIP PGRI Pontianak were less attentive to the strategies to process information.

Furthermore, two specific items have been highlighted since it scored significantly lower compared to the others. The first one is Item 5 and the lower score indicates that students only had a moderate level of ability to remember information. However, the finding of research by [15] suggests otherwise, since it revealed that successful English as Foreign Language students considered text memorization and imitation as the most effective methods of learning English instead. Moreover, Item 29 received the lowest score among all, which means that only half of the students would utilize visual components in learning, such as diagrams or pictures. On the contrary, visual organizers are actually highly effective to communicate information in EFL [16].

More importantly, the overall level of metacognitive awareness among students of English Education Study Program in IKIP PGRI Pontianak is reported as high. This is a tremendously positive outcome because metacognitive awareness is correlated to many broad indicators of academic success, including the overall grade point average [4]. This implies that students already possessed the necessary metacognitive awareness which can lead them to attain higher academic performance.

4 Conclusion

The focused problem in this research is to discover the level of metacognitive awareness towards academic learning to students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI PONTIANAK. The data collection process involved 420 respondents from all academic years and various backgrounds. The 52 items in Metacognitive Awareness Inventory by [9] were adopted in this research with eight indicators from the two main factors. The first factor is Knowledge of Cognition which is represented by Declarative, Procedural, Conditional Knowledge as the three indicators. The second factor is Regulation of Cognition which involves Planning, Information Management Strategies, Comprehension Monitoring, Debugging Strategies, and Evaluation as the five indicators.

It is reported that there is a high level of metacognitive awareness towards academic learning to students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak. This favorable outcome would bring a significant benefit to students considering the fact that metacognitive awareness is directly correlated to various indicators of academic success, including the overall grade point average [4].

Additionally, three of the most prominent indicators are Debugging Strategies, Conditional Knowledge, and Evaluation. Meanwhile, the least applied indicator is Information Management Strategies. Two certain items that have a considerably much lower score are Item 5 (I am good at remembering information) and Item 29 (I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand while learning). This highlights the unique strength and weakness of students of English Education Study Program of IKIP PGRI Pontianak in the metacognitive awareness factors that need to be highlighted in their academic learning.

References

1. N. H. Perwitasari, "Pengumuman SBMPTN 2020, total peserta lulus 167.653 dari 702.420," 2020. <https://tirto.id/pengumuman-sbmptn-2020-total-peserta-lulus-167653-dari-702420-fXSN> (accessed Aug. 20, 2022).
2. S. Hassel and N. Ridout, "An investigation of first-year students' and lecturers' expectations of university education," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 8, Jan. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2017.02218/FULL>.
3. D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, A. C. Graesser, B. J. Zimmerman, and A. R. Moylan, *Self-Regulation from: Handbook of Metacognition in Education Routledge*. Michigan: Routledge, 2009. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203876428.ch16>.
4. A. Young and J. D. Fry, "Metacognitive awareness and academic achievement in college students," *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1–10, 2008.

5. H. Kallio, K. Virta, and M. Kallio, "Modelling the Components of Metacognitive Awareness," *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 94–122, Jun. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.17583/IJEP.2018.2789>.
6. M. Williams, S. Mercer, and S. Ryan, *Exploring psychology in language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Exploring_Psychology_in_Language_Learnin.html?id=fcSNDAAAQBAJ
7. N. Bursalı and H. Öz, "The role of goal setting in metacognitive awareness as a self-regulatory behavior in foreign language learning," *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 662–671, 2018, Accessed: Aug. 19, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/455/260>
8. J. H. Flavell, "Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry," *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 906–911, Oct. 1979, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>.
9. G. Schraw and R. S. Dennison, "Assessing metacognitive awareness," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 460–475, 1994, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/CEPS.1994.1033>.
10. D. Ary, L. C. Jacobs, C. Sorensen, and A. Razavieh, *Introduction to Research in Education*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2010. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2022. [Online]. Available: [http://mis.kp.ac.rw/admin/admin_panel/kp_lms/files/digital/CoreBooks/Core%20Books%20in%20economics%20Management%20and%20Rural%20Development/B106_%20Initial%20to%20Research_%20Introduction%20to%20research%20in%20education\(BookFi\).pdf](http://mis.kp.ac.rw/admin/admin_panel/kp_lms/files/digital/CoreBooks/Core%20Books%20in%20economics%20Management%20and%20Rural%20Development/B106_%20Initial%20to%20Research_%20Introduction%20to%20research%20in%20education(BookFi).pdf)
11. J. W. Creswell, *Educational research : planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson, 2012. Accessed: Aug. 19, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Educational_Research.html?id=4PywcQAACAAJ
12. B. Taufiqurachman, "Metacognitive awareness of university student: a survey study," Universitas Islam Indonesia, 2021. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/handle/123456789/30590>
13. A. A. Ata, A. Elsayed-El, and A. Abdelwahid, "Nursing Students' Metacognitive Thinking and Goal Orientation as Predictors of Academic Motivation," *American Journal of Nursing Research*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 793–801, Jul. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.12691/AJNR-7-5-12>.
14. N. M. Aljaberi and E. Gheith, "University Students' Level of Metacognitive Thinking and their Ability to Solve Problems," *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 121–134, 2015, Accessed: Aug. 19, 2022. [Online]. Available: www.aijernet.com
15. Y. Ding, "Text memorization and imitation: The practices of successful Chinese learners of English," *System*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 271–280, Jun. 2007, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SYST.2006.12.005>.
16. S. Kang, "Using visual organizers to enhance EFL instruction," *ELT Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 58–67, Jan. 2004, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ELT/58.1.58>.
17. Borkowski, J. G., Carr, M., & Pressley, M., "Spontaneous" strategy use: perspectives from metacognitive theory, *Intelligence*, 11(1), 61–75, 1987, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896\(87\)90027-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(87)90027-4)
18. Jaleel, S., & P, P, A study on the metacognitive awareness of secondary school students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(1), 165–172, 2016 <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040121>
19. Livingston, J. A, *Metacognition: an overview*, ERIC document reproduction service, 2003
20. Ormrod, J. E, *Human learning* (eighth edition), Pearson, 2018

21. Pintrich, P. R., A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 385–407, 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>
22. Sternberg, R. J., What Should Intelligence Tests Test? Implications of a Triarchic Theory of Intelligence for Intelligence Testing. *Educational Researcher*, 13(1), 5–15, 1984, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X013001005>
23. Vermunt, J. D., & Vermetten, Y. J., Patterns in Student Learning: Relationships Between Learning Strategies, Conceptions of Learning, and Learning Orientations. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 359–384, 2004 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0005-y>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

