Research paper

Investigating the Relationship between Iranian EFL Learners' Learning Style and Metacognitive Listening Awareness at Two Levels of Language Proficiency

Najmeh Ahmadianfar, Mohammad Taghi Farvardin* & Niloufar Baratpour

Department of English Language Teaching, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Citation

Ahmadianfar, N., Farvardin, M. T., & Baratpour, N. (2022). Investigating the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning style and metacognitive listening awareness at two levels of language proficiency. *Journal of New Advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 967-982

10.22034/Jeltal.2022.4.2.6

Received
2022-08-28
Revised
2022-10-03
Accepted
2022-10-16

Keywords:
EFL learners, language proficiency, learning style, metacognitive awareness

Abstract

In this study, the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning style and metacognitive listening awareness at two proficiency levels (pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate) were examined. To this end, two questionnaires were administered to 142 Iranian EFL learners at eight language institutes in Shiraz, Iran. Among the participants, 75 were at the pre-intermediate level, and 67 were at the upper-intermediate level. To ascertain participants' learning style, they were invited to complete the Reid's Learning Style Questionnaire (RLSQ) (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic). To measure the participants' metacognitive listening awareness, the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaires (MALQ) were given to the participants. The Pearson correlations were measured to detect the relationship between EFL students' learning style and their listening metacognitive awareness at two levels of language proficiency. In addition, regression analyses were done to check which component of RLSQ can best predict the participants' metacognitive listening awareness. At two levels of language proficiency, the results demonstrated a significant association between Iranian EFL learners' learning style and their metacognitive listening awareness. Metacognitive listening awareness was assessed for pre- and upper-intermediate EFL students using the Beta values, which were used to compare the relative contributions of each learning style to metacognitive listening awareness. Beta values of four predictor variables (visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) revealed that auditory style had a higher contribution to the metacognitive listening

awareness in the upper-intermediate group, and visual style had a stronger contribution to the dependent variable in the pre-intermediate group. The results of the study help teachers detect the interplay between learners' learning styles and metacognitive listening awareness.

*Corresponding Author: Mohammad Taghi Farvardin
Address: Islamic Azad University, FarhagShar, Ahvaz, Iran
E-mail: farvardin.tefl@gmail.com

Introduction

Listening is believed to be the most difficult skill for English as a foreign language (EFL) learners to acquire (Zarrabi, 2020). This difficulty is compounded for EFL learners in Iran, since the majority of class time is spent learning reading and writing skills, not allowing learners to develop other skills efficiently (Bozorgian, 2014). In this line, it has been argued that teachers who teach foreign languages need to be mindful of their students' metacognitive listening strategies to use practical ways in the learning process (Papy, 2016). Metacognitive strategies are often referred to as procedures that enable learners to direct, regulate, and manage their own learning (Goh, 2008). Their principal role is to integrate old and new knowledge, carefully select strategies for thinking, supervise learning processes such as planning, monitoring, correcting errors, and reviewing the effectiveness of learning strategies (Ridley et al., 1992). The focus of metacognitive awareness is on the strategies and the tasks we used in learning the second language (L2) (Panaoura & Philippou, 2007). Metacognition is a term referring to a person's capacity to comprehend their mental processes (Nelson,1996). It is composed of two main parts, metacognitive knowledge and regulation. Metacognitive knowledge is the knowledge acquired with an individual's cognitive processes. It is a way for learners to learn about themselves as learners and their relationship to their work (Panaoura & Philippou, 2007).

Besides metacognitive awareness, learning style can be a determining factor in learner differences. Since the recent decade, scholars have given more attention to the learning style in language pedagogy have introduced practical information into the learning process. According to Brown (2000, p. 113), learning styles "refer to consistent and rather enduring tendencies or performances within an individual." Learners and their learning styles are the critical parts of teaching a new language (Atika, 2019). There are four types of learning styles: visual, aural, kinesthetic (movement-oriented), and tactile (touch-oriented) (Atika, 2019). Style is expressed through learning strategies (overt learning behaviors/actions) (Francisco, 2021). According to this attitude, by finding learners' preferences in language learning, the best strategies can be defined and teach them more straightforward, faster, and entertaining.

Although learning style and its relationship with metacognitive awareness had been investigated in a few studies, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, no research has been

conducted on the relationship between learning style and metacognitive listening awareness at two distinct levels of language proficiency.

Based on the gap in the literature, the relationships between learning styles and metacognitive listening awareness of pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate level EFL learners were examined. Moreover, this study sought to investigate the predictive power of each learning style in metacognitive listening awareness at both pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate EFL learners.

Review of Literature

Learning Style

Learning style is more related to how you learn than what you are learning (Atika, 2019). Learning style has received significant attention and has become the primary focus of various L2 studies (Francisco, 2021). Reid (1987) categorised learning styles into three distinct categories: sensory or sensory activity-based learning styles, cognitive learning styles, and affective/temperament-based learning styles. The sensory or perceptual learning style is suited to the physical environment wherein we learn and make use of our senses to comprehend information. Cognitive learning styles are individual's information processing habits. Affective style is generally described as a dimension of personality that influences attitudes and values and social interaction. In addition, affective learning style is related to emotions and feelings.

Metacognitive Listening Awareness

Metacognitive listening awareness is a kind of awareness, which includes learners' understanding of listening needs, cognitive goals, and attention to goals and strategies (Vandergrift et al., 2006). Problem solving, planning and assessment, human knowledge, mental translation, and focused attention are all examples of metacognitive listening awareness strategies (Vandergrift et al., 2006). The problem-solving strategy is included in several strategies used by trainees to generate and monitor these conclusions (Mohammadali & Negin, 2014). Planned and evaluated outcomes include hearing test preparation and evaluation. The third strategy is mental translation, which includes specific methods. Listeners should avoid making false claims about their abilities as professional listeners (Mohammadali & Negin, 2014). Fourth, personal knowledge is a strategy that involves learner awareness and perspective, focusing on listening difficulties and learner confidence (Mohammadali & Negin, 2014). These are strategies or approaches for learners to remain focused and engaged in their listening activities.

Empirical Studies

According to the literature, several studies have attempted to focus on the importance of learning style in learning a second/foreign language. Bailey et al. (2000) conducted a study to predict foreign language ability using university-level learning styles. The purpose of this research was to show which learning styles lead to high or low academic performance. One hundred college students participated in this study. The results showed that the excellent

students in this sample usually like the informal structure of the classroom and tend to obtain information through the information rather than the kinesthetic mode.

Vandergrift (2003) directed a study to examine the correlation between listening proficiency and listening strategy. For this purpose, participants included 36 junior high school French students in Canada for testing their listening comprehension. The study revealed that in comparison to less skilled listeners, the metacognitive strategies are used more often. Thus, the study suggested to apply metacognitive strategies for the less-skilled listener would prompt their listening comprehension.

The results of a study on the learning styles by Riazi and Riassati (2007) of Iranian EFL learners showed that teachers were unaware of their student's learning style preferences. Data analyses revealed that the participants (as a sample of Iranian students) are visual and auditory for both groups (pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate) rather than kinesthetic.

Memnun and Akkaya (2009) tested the metacognitive level of primary school teacher consciousness. The focus of this research is to ascertain primary school teachers' degree of metacognitive awareness and to establish if there are significant variations between grades and genders. For this purpose, the Metacognitive Awareness Scale was applied to 263 candidate professors (157 women, 106 men) studying at Uludag University. The findings indicated that the majority of primary school instructors have a high degree of metacognition. Additionally, there was no statistically significant difference in the metacognitive awareness ratings of male and female prospective teachers. However, there were meaningful differences in the metacognitive awareness scores of candidate teachers of different classes.

In addition, Yüksel and Yüksel (2012) studied the metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. This research aimed to measure the metacognitive awareness of Turkish university students on academic reading strategies. As a result, a reading strategy survey is utilized to ascertain students' metacognitive knowledge of the support methods they use whether global reading, problem-solving, or academic reading. The findings revealed that participants employed academic reading strategies on a regular basis; therefore, they were frequently aware of these strategies. The results confirmed the importance of metacognition in learning and encourage the university professor to use teaching methods and strategies to present information to students in order to encourage the use of metacognitive skills that effectively influence academic performance and achievement.

In another study, Rezaeinejad et al. (2015) investigated the relationship between students' learning styles and educational results. Specifically, the major goal of this research was to evaluate the link between high school students' learning and their academic achievement in high school. In this research, 3,958 students participated. There was a significant relationship between the learners' learning style utilizing the visual language learning style and the mean score among mathematics students. There was a strong positive and significant correlation between students' active reflection-based learning styles, their visual language-based learning

styles, and their mean scores. Students that consistently use global, visual-language, and sensory-intuitive learning styles in the humanities do not have a higher mean score based on their learning styles.

Papy (2016) examined the relationship between metacognitive awareness of listening strategies, their usage, and listening comprehension among English learners at Azna township high school. For this purpose, a group of (n = 113) senior English learners from Azna High School were randomly selected. Listening comprehension was assessed at the start and end of the term. In addition, the MALQ or Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (Vandergrift et al., 2006) was used at the beginning and end of the program to determine the kinds of metacognitive preferences they used in their listening comprehension. The results showed a statistically significant and positive correlation between the MALQ score and the learners' listening comprehension. The results encouraged English learners to consciously recognize and use metacognitive strategies which promote their language learning.

Vatanjoo (2019) also examined the effect of foreign language learning styles on Iranian language learners' metacognitive awareness. A questionnaire on learning style and metacognitive awareness was given to 80 EFL students to investigate the impact of learning style on metacognitive awareness. The findings revealed that EFL learners' learning styles had no effect on the primary components of their metacognitive awareness (cognitive adjustment and cognitive knowledge). Furthermore, the learning style of EFL students does not have a significant effect on the subcomponents of cognitive adjustment. Therefore, the learning style of foreign language students generally does not seem to have a meaningful impact on their metacognitive awareness.

Bakkaloglu (2020) examined elementary and middle school students' metacognitive awareness considering the factors gender, grade, and area. Metacognitive awareness in elementary and middle school students was measured by a survey approach in the current investigation. The Metacognitive Awareness Scale was applied to 399 students in the third grade (195 girls and 204 boys) and 4,444 students in the fourth and fifth grades. Research showed no gender difference in the scores of elementary and middle school students' metacognitive awareness. When metacognitive awareness scores were examined by grade, it was shown that fifth-grade students scored higher than other groups.

Finally, Francisco (2021) investigated the impact of learning style on students' metacognitive awareness during the pandemic Covid-19, which caused the changes in the learning style preferences of learners in three kinds of learning styles: visual, auditory, and tactile. The results revealed a significant effect of learning styles (i.e., visual, auditory, and tactile) on learners' metacognitive awareness in knowledge cognition and regulation cognition.

Based on the previous studies and the gap in the literature, the researchers attempted to examine the relationship between learning style and metacognitive listening awareness of pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate level EFL learners. Moreover, this study sought to

investigate the predictive power of each learning style in metacognitive listening awareness at both pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate EFL learners. Therefore, the following research questions were posed:

Q1) Are there any significant relationships between learning styles and metacognitive listening awareness of pre-intermediate level EFL learners?

Q2) Which learning style can better predict the metacognitive listening awareness of pre-intermediate level EFL learners?

Q3) Are there any significant relationships between learning styles and metacognitive listening awareness of upper-intermediate level EFL learners?

Q4) Which learning style can better predict the metacognitive listening awareness of upper-intermediate level EFL learners?

Methods

Participants

Initially, 160 EFL students were chosen from eight language institutes. They were chosen using a stratified random sampling procedure from eight different English language institutes in Shiraz, where four education districts have been identified according to the Ministry of Education. Therefore, two institutes were selected randomly from each district, and 20 learners were selected randomly from each institute at pre-intermediate, and upper-intermediate levels. The participants' level of proficiency was determined through Oxford Placement Test (OPT). After collecting the data, the number reduced to 142 (48 male and 94 female) EFL learners. The participants' age ranged from 18 to 50. Among the 142 EFL learners, 75 were at the pre-intermediate level, and 67 were at the upper-intermediate level.

Instruments

Learning Style Questionnaire

The first instrument employed was the Reid's learning style questionnaire. Reid's (1987) original research used self-report questionnaires based on existing learning instruments (Appendix A). To ascertain the genuine nature of their learning style, participants were invited to complete the Reid's Learning Style Questionnaire (RLSQ) (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic). There are 28 items in this questionnaire. Each item on the RLSQ has five possible values: SA = Strongly agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree. RLSQ was used for this research because it is the most often used instrument for assessing non-native English speakers' learning styles (Decapua & Wintergerst, 2005). The minimum possible score was 28, and the maximum possible score was 140. The overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this questionnaire was calculated to be 0.82.

Metacognitive Listening Awareness Questionnaire

Metacognitive Listening Awareness Questionnaire (MALQ) developed by Vandergrift et al. (2006) were given to participants to measure their metacognitive listening awareness (see Appendix B). The questionnaire consists of 21 items, each of which has six possible responses:

strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, slightly disagree = 3, partly agree = 4, agree = 5, and strongly agree = 6. For some questions in the MALQ, it is also worth mentioning that be known as a metacognitive conscious listener; the listener should not select 6 but 1. Five dimensions of MALQ include problem-solving (items 5-7-9-13-17-19), organizing and assessment (items 1-10-14-20-21), mental translation (items 4-11-18), knowledge of persons (items 3-8-15), and directed attention (items 2-6-12-16). The minimum possible score was 21, and the maximum possible score was 126. The overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this questionnaire was calculated to be 0.78.

Data Collection Procedure

At first, 160 EFL learners were selected from 8 language institutes in Shiraz based on stratified random sampling. In the first session, the participants were asked to answer RLSQ in 20 minutes. Then, the following week, MALQ was given to them, and they answered the MALQ in 15 minutes. After collecting the data, the number of participants reduced to 142. Finally, the questionnaires were scored and entered SPSS for further analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

Two-tailed Pearson's correlations were calculated to investigate the relationship between the learning style of EFL learners and their listening metacognitive awareness at two levels of language proficiency. Then, regression analyses were done to check which component of RLSQ can best predict the participants' metacognitive listening awareness.

Results

After ensuring the normality of the data through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores of MALQ were computed (see Table 4.1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of MALQ Scores for Pre-intermediate and Upper-intermediate Groups

Group	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Pre-intermediate	80.55	17.64	41	116	75
Upper-intermediate	84.37	16.28	46	118	67

As Table 1 shows, for the pre-intermediate level EFL learners, the mean and standard deviation of the participant's scores on the MALQ were 80.55 and 17.64, respectively. In addition, for the upper-intermediate level EFL learners, the mean and standard deviation of the participant's scores on the MALQ were 84.37 and 16.28, respectively. Table 2 shows the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum of the participant's scores on the RLSQ and its subcomponents (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) in the pre-intermediate group.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of RLSQ Scores for the Pre-intermediate Group

Learning Style	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Visual	21.75	6.25	8	35	75
Auditory	20.43	6.79	8	34	75
Tactile	18.39	5.82	7	30	75
Kinesthetic	17.96	6.10	7	30	75

As Table 2 depicts, among the subcomponents of the learning style, the visual type had the highest mean score (M = 21.75, SD = 6.25). Moreover, the kinesthetic type had the lowest mean score (M = 17.96, SD = 6.10). Table 3 illustrates the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum of the participants' scores on the RLSQ and its subcomponents (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) in the upper-intermediate group.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of RLSQ Scores for the Upper-intermediate Group

Learning Style	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Visual	22.64	6.49	8	35	67
Auditory	23.25	6.31	7	35	67
Tactile	20.41	6.27	7	31	67
Kinesthetic	19.17	5.95	7	32	67

As Table 3 shows, among the subcomponents of the learning style, the auditory type had the highest mean score (M = 22.64, SD = 6.49). Moreover, the kinesthetic type had the lowest mean score (M = 19.17, SD = 5.95). Two-tailed Pearson correlations were computed between the scores of MALQ and the scores of RLSQ to determine the relationship between them. Cohen's (1988) criterion for interpreting the strength of correlation was followed. Cohen (1988) stated that the correlation coefficient of more than 0.50 is strong, between 0.20 and 0.50 is moderate, and less than 0.20 is weak. Table 4 illustrates the correlation coefficients between the scores of MALQ and RLSQ in the pre-intermediate group.

Table 3

Correlation Coefficients between the Scores of MALQ and RLSQ in the Pre-intermediate Group

	1	2	3	4	5
1. MALQ	–				
2. Visual	0.465**	–			
3. Auditory	0.449**	0.651**	–		
4. Tactile	0.411**	0.688**	0.560**	–	
5. Kinesthetic	0.376*	0.581**	0.662**	0.536*	–

*p <.05, **p <.01

As shown in Table 4, the results of the two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant and fairly strong relationship between the participant's scores on the MALQ and visual learning style (r = 0.465, p <.01). Moreover, kinesthetic learning style had the lowest relationship with the MALQ (r = 0.376, p <.05). Table 5 shows the correlation coefficients between the scores of MALQ and RLSQ in the upper-intermediate group.

Table 4

Correlation Coefficients between the Scores of MALQ and RLSQ in the Upper-intermediate Group

	1	2	3	4	5
1. MALQ	–				
2. Visual	0.481**	–			
3. Auditory	0.526**	0.714**	–		
4. Tactile	0.430**	0.673**	0.648**	–	
5. Kinesthetic	0.407**	0.659**	0.611**	0.635*	–

*p <.05, **p <.01

As shown in Table 5, the results of the two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant and strong relationship between the participants' scores on the MALQ and auditory learning style (r = 0.526, p <.01). Moreover, kinesthetic learning style had the lowest relationship with the MALQ (r = 0.406, p <.01).

To answer the second research question, multiple regression analyses were conducted on the participant's scores in the pre-intermediate group. Table 6 is the model summary of the regression analysis on EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness as the dependent variable and the type of learning style (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) as the independent variables.

Table 5

Model Summary

Model	R	R^2
1	.495	.245

Note: Predictors: types of learning style; Dependent Variable: metacognitive listening awareness

As Table 6 illustrates, the R^2 was 0.245, which implies that the learning style accounted for about 24% of the variance in the EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness scores. To determine the most powerful predictor of pre-intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness and to compare the unique contribution of each independent variable, the Beta values were computed (see Table 7).

Table 6
Multiple Regressions

	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	---	5.004	.000
Visual	0.255	3.492	.009
Auditory	0.227	3.180	.032
Tactile	0.201	2.985	.061
Kinesthetic	0.190	3.024	.070

Note: Dependent Variable: metacognitive listening awareness

As Table 7 displays, the Beta value of visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic learning styles as the predictor variables was significant (p <.05). The visual style had the highest Beta value suggesting a stronger contribution to the dependent variable, metacognitive listening awareness, accounting for about 25% of the variance in the metacognitive listening awareness scores. The auditory style also accounted for 23% of the variance in the metacognitive listening awareness scores. To answer the fourth research question, multiple regression analyses were conducted on the participants' scores in the upper-intermediate group. Table 8 is the model summary of the regression analysis on EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness as the dependent variable and the type of learning style (i.e., visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic) as the independent variables.

Table 7
Model Summary

Model	R	R^2
1	.572	.327

Note: Predictors: types of learning style; Dependent Variable: metacognitive listening awareness

As Table 8 illustrates, the R^2 was 0.327, which implies that the learning style accounted for almost 33% of the variance in the EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness scores. To determine the most powerful predictor of upper-intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness and to compare the unique contribution of each independent variable, the Beta values were computed (see Table 9).

Table 8
Multiple Regressions

	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	---	6.125	.000
Visual	0.274	4.260	.004
Auditory	0.305	4.758	.000
Tactile	0.223	3.391	.059
Kinesthetic	0.205	3.112	.067

Note: Dependent Variable: metacognitive listening awareness

As Table 9 shows, the Beta value of visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic learning styles as the predictor variables was significant (p <.01). Auditory style had the highest Beta value suggesting a stronger contribution to the dependent variable, metacognitive listening awareness, accounting for about 30% of the variance in the metacognitive listening awareness scores. The visual style also accounted for 27% of the variance in the metacognitive listening awareness scores.

Discussion

This study focused on the probable relationship between Iranian EFL learners' learning style and metacognitive listening awareness. Two-tailed Pearson correlations were calculated between the MALQ and RLSQ scores in order to investigate the relationship between the two in pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups. The results revealed a significant and strong relationship between the participants' scores on the MALQ and visual learning style in the pre-intermediate group and a significant and strong relationship between the participants' scores on the MALQ and auditory learning style in the upper-intermediate group.

The findings showed that learning style types accounted for about 24% of the variation in pre-intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness scores and approximately 33% of the variance in upper-intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness scores. The beta value was computed to determine the most powerful and influential predictor of pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate EFL learners' metacognitive listening awareness and to compare the unique contribution of each independent variable. The visual type of learning style was the most powerful predictor of upper-intermediate, which suggests a stronger contribution to the dependent variable, metacognitive listening awareness, and the auditory types of learning style were the most powerful predictor of upper-intermediate, which suggest a stronger contribution to the dependent variable, metacognitive listening awareness.

According to the result of Tabatabaei and Mashayekhi (2013), advanced and intermediate listeners showed different learning style preferences than the other listeners which are in line with the results of this study at the end.

Indeed, metacognitive awareness can be acquired by training. For this respect, Francisco (2021) argued that the metacognitive awareness of students could progress by training. Nevertheless, learning style is a personal preference of learners that differs from person to person, and each person has a fixed preference and trends which make them less likely to change. These results revealed the differences of each learner's learning style on their metacognition awareness. To this end, during the process of learner's language promotion, their learning style preferences can change, which can also impact their ability of metacognitive awareness.

Additionally, learners are different in the degree of metacognitive awareness and their listening comprehension. Learners in the pre-intermediate group had a better metacognitive listening awareness in visual learning style, even though the learners in the upper-intermediate

group had a better metacognitive listening awareness in auditory learning style. Therefore, teachers can manage the teaching process according to learners learning style preferences by preparing activities and tasks to improve learners' performance and metacognitive awareness.

Conclusion

The subsequent findings were yielded: Learning styles preference is related to learner's level of language proficiency; the pre-intermediate learners had a better performance on listening comprehension in visual learning style; upper-intermediate learners had a better performance on their listening comprehension in auditory learning style.

The results of current research can provide helpful pedagogical insights for learners and language teachers. To improve the levels of metacognitive listening awareness of EFL learners, teachers can work on learners' learning styles preferences according to their level of language proficiency. It can be recommended the EFL teachers be conscious of different learning styles and how they affect the learning process of learners. Additionally, they can provide a range of activities to accommodate their students' diverse learning styles. For this purpose, it can be helpful for teachers to figure out their students learning style preferences by using an amount of accessible learning style questionnaires, and by considering the result of these tests, they can manage some plans and tasks in their teaching process of a foreign language for students at different language proficiency levels. Knowing the better learning style for each level of language proficiency can help learners improve their learning and language skills more effectively. Moreover, teachers can help learners improve their language proficiency by focusing on metacognitive strategies and learning styles.

There were some limitations in this study. First, the participants' age ranged between 18 to 50 years old, so the results may not be applied to younger learners. Second, due to the Coronavirus Pandemic, the possible way for data collection was solely using questionnaires. Third, in this study, the participants were selected from pre- and upper-intermediate levels as participants from other levels of language proficiency were not available for the researcher.

There are some pieces of suggestion which can be insightful for future studies. Other studies can be performed with participants at different levels of labguage proficiency. Additionally, it is necessary to explore the influence of learning style on other metacognitive skills such as reading, writing, and speaking awareness. The focus of this research was on listening skill and future studies can be performed on other skills such as speaking, writing, and reading. Moreover, further studies can focus on the differences between male and female EFL learners to investigate the relationship between learning style and metacognitive listening awareness.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all EFL learners who participated in this study.

References

Atika, R. N. (2020). Interactions among learning styles, language learning strategies and gender of EFL learners. SALEE: *Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education, 1*(1), 67-82.

Bakkaloglu, S. (2020). Analysis of metacognitive awareness of primary and secondary school students in terms of some variables. *Journal of Education and Learning, 9*(1), 156-163.

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (2000). Using learning style to predict foreign language achievement at the college level. *System, 28*(1), 115-133.

Bozorgian, H. (2014). The role of metacognition in the development of EFL learners' listening skill. *International Journal of Listening*, *28*(3), 149-161.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (Vol. 4). New York: Longman.

Cohen, J. (1988). Set correlation and contingency tables. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 12*(4), 425-434.

Francisco, C. D. (2021). The learning style of students and its effect on their metacognitive awareness during Covid-19 pandemic. *Learning*, *5*(1), 123-129.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC journal*, *39*(2), 188-213.

Memnun, D. S., & Akkaya, R. (2009). The levels of metacognitive awareness of primary teacher trainees. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 1919-1923.

Mohammadali, M. S., & Negin, S. (2014). ESL learners listening performance under the impact of metacognitive strategies' different subscales. *Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 3*(8), 32-37.

Nelson, T. O. (1996). Consciousness and metacognition. *American psychologist*, *51*(2), 102.

Panaoura, A., & Philippou, G. (2007). The developmental change of young pupils' metacognitive ability in mathematics in relation to their cognitive abilities. *Cognitive development, 22*(2), 149-164.

Papy, G. H. (2016). *The Relationship between Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Strategies and Listening Comprehension of Iranian High School English Learners*. (Unpublished master's dissertation). Lorestan University, Lorestan, Iran.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL quarterly*, *21*(1), 87-111.

Rezaeinejad, M., Azizifar, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). The study of learning styles and its relationship with educational achievement among Iranian high school students. *Procardia-social and behavioral sciences*, *199*, 218-224.

Riazi, A., & Riasati, M. (2007). Language learning style preferences: A learner's case study of Shiraz EFL institutes. Asian EFL Journal. linking hub.

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. *The journal of experimental education*, *60*(4), 293-306.

Tabatabaei, O., & Mashayekhi, S. (2013). The relationship between EFL learners' learning styles and their L2 achievement. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 245-253.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). From prediction through reflection: Guiding students: Through the process of L2 listening. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*(3), 425-440.

Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C., Mareschal, C. J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language learning*, *56*(3), 431-462.

Vatanjoo, P. (2019). *The effect of foreign language learning styles of Iranian language learners on their metacognitive awareness*. (Unpublished master's dissertation). Marvdash Azad University, Marvdash, Iran.

Yüksel, İ., & Yüksel, İ. (2012). Metacognitive awareness of academic reading strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *31*, 894-898.

Zarrabi, F. (2020). Investigating the relationship between learning style and metacognitive listening awareness. *International Journal of Listening*, *34*(1), 21-33.

Appendix A: Learning Style Questionnaire

Please respond to each statement quickly, without too much thought. Try not to change your responses after you choose them. Please answer all the questions.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Partially Agree	Partially Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. when the teacher tells me the instruction, I understand better.						
2. I prefer to learn by doing something in class.						
3. I got more work done when I work with others.						
4. I learn more when I study with a group.						
5. in class, I learn best when I work with others.						
6. I learn better by reading what the teacher writes on the chalkboard.						
7. when someone tells me how to do something in class, I learn better.						
8. when I do things in class, I learn better.						
9. I remember things I have heard in class better than things I have heard.						
10. when I read instructions, I remember them better.						
11. I learn more when I can make a model of something.						
12. I understand better when I read instructions.						
13. when I study alone, I remember things better.						
14. I learn more when I make something for a class project.						
15. I enjoy learning in class by doing experiments.						
16. I learn better when I make drawings as I study.						
17. I learn better in class when the teacher gives a lecture.						
18. when I work alone, I learn better.						
19. I understand things better in class when I participate in role-playing.						
20. I learn better in class when I listen to someone.						
21. I enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates.						
22. when I build something, I remember what I have learned better.						
23. I prefer to study with others.						
24. I learn better by reading than by listening to someone.						
25. I enjoy making something for a class project.						
26. I learn best in class when I can participate in related activities.						
27. In class. I work better when I work alone.						
28. I prefer working on projects by myself.						

Appendix B: Metacognitive Listening Awareness Questionnaire

Self-report items on metacognitive awareness about L2 listening (Based on the original MALQ by Vandergrift et al.2006)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Partially Agree	Partially Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.						
2. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.						
3. I find that listening in English is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in English.						
4. I translate in my head as I listen.						
5. I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.						
6. When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration right away.						
7. As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.						
8. I feel that listening comprehension in English is a challenge for me.						
9. I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.						
10. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.						
11. I translate key words as I listen.						
12. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.						
13. As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.						
14. After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.						
15. I don't feel nervous when I listen to English.						
16. When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.						
17. I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't understand.						
18. I translate word by word, as I listen.						
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.						
20. As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.						
21. I have a goal in mind as I listen.						