PJEE

Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics
e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345
https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english
DOI: 10.24127/pj.v15i1.15414

ASSESSING PRESERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS AND ITS RELATION TO THEIR TEACHING PERFORMANCE

by

Sri Wahyuni*
English Education Department, State Islamic University Syekh Wasil Kediri, Indonesia
sriwahyuni@uinkediri.ac.id

Nabil Al-Awawdeh
Department of Modern Languages, Faculty of Arts, Yarmouk University, Jordan
n.awawdeh@yu.edu.jo

Nurul Aini
English Education Department, State Islamic University Syekh Wasil Kediri, Indonesia
florida_aini@uinkediri.ac.id

Corresponding author

(Article History: Received:01-09-2025;Reviewed1:12-01-2026;Reviewed2:01-03-2026: Accepted:30-03-2026;Published:01-04-2026).

Abstract:

Metacognition has become one of the most psychological concepts that is the important domain in any teaching and learning process. It is assumed that students with high levels of metacognitive awareness tend to have high academic achievement. However, the relation of metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of pre-service teachers are still questionable. This study aims at investigating the preservice English teachers' metacognitive awareness and its relation to their teaching performance in UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri. By employing correlational research design, thirty-three preservice English teachers joined this study. Metacognitive awareness inventory (MAI) adopted from Schraw and Dennison (1994) was used to collect data on metacognitive awareness level, and teaching practicum checklist to evaluate teaching performance. In analyzing the data, descriptive statistics and Pearson Bivariate correlation analysis through SPSS were used. The finding shows that there was no significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of preservice English teachers. The significant value obtained was higher than the significant level (0.557 > 0.05). Furthermore, when both types (metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive regulation) were analyzed separately, there was no significant relationship between metacognitive knowledge and teaching performance (.532 > .05), and between metacognitive regulation and teaching performance (.584 > .05. It implied that metacognitive awareness may not become the main determinant factor in teaching performance of preservice English teachers; other factors such as linguistics competence may influence more on teaching performance.

Keywords: *metacognitive awareness, teaching performance, preservice English teacher*

Abstrak:

Metakognisi menjadi salah satu konsep psikologi dan domain penting dalam proses pembelajaran. Diasumsikan bahwa siswa dengan level kesadaran metakognitif tinggi cenderung mempunyai presetasi akademik yang tinggi. Namun, relasi kesadaran metakognitif dan kinerja mengajar calon guru Bahasa Inggris masih menjadi pertanyaan. Penelitian ini bertujuan menginvestigasi kesadaran metakognitif calon guru bahasa Inggris dan hubungannya dengan kinerja mengajar di Uin Syekh Wasil Kediri. Dengan menerapkan desain penelitian korelasi, 33 calon guru Bahasa Inggris mengikuti penelitian ini.

How to cite this article:

Wahyuni, S., Al-Awawdeh,N.,Aini,N, (2026). **Assessing preservice English teachers'metacognitive awareness and its relation to their teaching performance**. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 250–267. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v15i1.15414

Kesadaran metakognitif inventory diadopsi dari Schraw and Dennison (1994) digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data level kesadaran metakognitif, dan ceklis praktek mengajar digunakan untuk mengevaluasi kinerja mengajar. Untuk menganalisis data, deskriptif statistik dan Pearson bivariate analisis korelasi melalui SPSS digunakan di penelitian ini. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada korelasi yang signifikan antara kesadaran metakognitif dengan kinerja mengajar calon guru bahsa Inggris. Nilai signifikansi yang diperoleh lebih tinggi dari level signifikansi (0.557 > 0.05). Bahkan, ketika dua tipe (metakognitif pengetahuan, dan metakognitif regulation) dianalisis sendiri-sendiri, tetap tidak ada hubungan yang signifikan antara metakognitif pengetahuan dengan kinerja mengajar (.532 > .05) dan antara kesadaran mengajar dengan metakognitif regulasi (.584 > .05). Implikasinya, kesadaran metakognitif mungkin tidak menjadi faktor penentu utama dalam kinerja mengajar calon guru bahsa Inggris ketika mereka melaksanakan praktek mengajar, factor lain seperti kompetensi linguistik mungkin lebi berpengaruh pada kinerja mengajar.

Kata kunci: *Kesadaran metakognitif, kinerja mengajar, calon guru bahasa Inggris*

INTRODUCTION

Metacognition as one of psychological concepts becomes an important aspect in any teaching and learning process. This important position makes researchers investigate more on its relation to academic achievement. Metacognition is thinking about thinking (Abdellah, 2015; Flavell, 1979), individuals' cognitive abilities; mechanism and strategies used to manage and correct the learning (El-Hindi, 2016; Mohamed et al., 2020), the ability to regulate cognitive processes and self-realization (planning, monitoring and evaluating) (Abdellah, 2015; Sadler-Smith et al., 2014). Metacognition is higher order thinking involving active control over the cognitive processes engaged in learning (Abdellah, 2015), and learning success is primarily predicted by metacognition in the problem-solving domain (Jacobse & Harskamp, 2012; Mohamed et al., 2020). Hence, it assumes having positive relationship on many academic aspects including pre-service teachers' teaching performance.

Several experts investigate metacognitive awareness and its relation to learning. As an individual's knowledge about his/her metacognitive skill (Yorulmaz et al., 2021), the act of acquiring and using the metacognitive thinking skill needed in learning moreover in throughout life (DemirsÖz, 2014), metacognitive awareness seems to be a strong aspect in students' learning. It is individual's self-understanding or knowledge of his/her metacognitive mechanism; it reflects individual's awareness of his/her own capability examines (Mohamed et al., 2020).

Studies on relation between metacognition and academic achievement have been conducted; however, the findings are still conflicting. Some studies revealed positive relationship between students' metacognitive awareness and their achievement. Students with high level of metacognitive awareness tend to have high academic achievement (Coutinho,

2007); students with good metacognition outperformed on academic achievement than students with poor metacognition (Kocak & Bayaci, 2010; Uwazurike, 2010; Young & Fry, 2008). Students who have good metacognitive awareness and often use metacognitive strategies will be successful on their learning (Goctu, 2018; Iwai, 2011; Ramadhanti & Yanda, 2021).

However, other studies revealed different results. They found that there is negative correlation between students' metacognition and their academic achievement (Justice & Dornan, 2001). There is no significant difference among the groups (taught using metacognitive strategies) on students' achievement; fair and underachievers use the metacognitive strategies frequently as well as high achievers, then having study habit and self-regulated strategy becomes more prominent factors influencing the achievement (Cubukcu, 2009).

Not only in learning process, the use of metacognitive awareness should also be used by teacher in his/her teaching performance. Teaching is guiding and facilitation learning and enabling the learners to learn and set the condition for learning (Brown, 2007). With these complex duties, therefore, teachers need to prepare many things related to their teaching and learning process. Teacher teaching performance refers to the effectiveness of a teacher in delivering instruction, facilitating student learning, and managing the classroom environment, the work of teachers towards their assigned duties in educational context to achieve organizational objectives (Suib et al., 2022). It is assumed that teacher's teaching performance in the classroom is also influenced by his/her metacognitive awareness. It is better when s/he has good metacognitive awareness. It is in line with the teacher's duties. Teacher not only delivers knowledge in class, but s/he needs to plan, implement the plan, and evaluate the implementation. S/he needs to use their metacognitive teaching, a process of controlling the students' learning process (Yorulmaz et al., 2021).

In the process of metacognitive teaching, teachers need to ask students to demonstrate some metacognitive skills such as task analysis, planning, monitoring, evaluating/controlling, summarizing and interpreting. This metacognitive teaching process will support the development of students' metacognitive thinking skills which involve the students' evaluation on their learning process (Wilson & Bai, 2010). Metacognitive regulation has positive correlation with academic achievement as well as teaching performance of pre-service female teachers in Ajman university in UAE; however, it is not with metacognitive knowledge (Abdellah, 2015).

The different result of the previous studies initiates the researchers to investigate more on the relation between metacognition and teaching performance. Moreover, previous studies have focused on the relationship between metacognition on academic achievement; however, the relation of metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of pre-service teachers especially in Indonesian context are still scarce. Therefore, the present research assesses and correlates the preservice English teachers' metacognitive awareness and their teaching performance in UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri. By investigating these variables, it will give more insights for teachers in developing pre-service English teachers' teaching performance. The research question of this study is formulated as follow: ***"Is there any significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of preservice English teachers at UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri?*** "

METHOD

Design

The purpose of this study is to assess and correlate the preservice teachers' metacognitive awareness and their teaching performance. To achieve this purpose, quantitative research using correlational research design was employed. This research design was chosen since the researcher wanted to relate the two variables to see whether they influence each other. Correlational research design provided an opportunity to predict scores and explain the relationship among variables; it is a statistical test to determine the tendency or pattern for two (or more) variables or two sets of data (Creswell, 2012). The variables in this research were variable X (the metacognitive awareness), and variable Y (teaching performance).

Participant

The participants of this study are thirty-three students in the sixth semester of preservice English teachers at State Islamic University (UIN) Syekh Wasil Kediri. They were taking *PLP* (*Pengenalan Lingkungan Persekolahan*) courses as part of internship program including teaching assistance at schools. The students were taking *PLP (Pengenalan Lingkungan Persekolahan)* courses consisting of 8 courses which had total 16 credits. Those courses were School Management (*Manajemen Sekolah)*, Curriculum Analysis (*Analisis Kurikulum)*, Lesson Plan Development (*Pengembangan Rencana Pembelajaran)*, Learning Materials Development (*Pengembangan Bahan Ajar)*, Learning Media Development (*Pengembangan Media*

Pembelajaran), Learning Assessment (*Assessmen Pembelajaran)*, School Program Development (*Pengembangan Program Sekolah)*, and Classroom Action Research *(Penelitian Tindakan Kelas)*. Each course had some students' tasks/worksheets to be fulfilled. Their metacognitive awareness and teaching performance were assessed to see the relationship of both variables.

Instrument

There were two instruments used in this study. Those were Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) adopted from Schraw and Dennison to collect the data on preservice English teachers' metacognitive awareness level (Schraw & Dennison, 1994), and preservice teachers teaching practicum checklist to observe and evaluate preservice teachers' teaching performance. MAI consisted of 52 statements with a 5-Linkert scale from "Never (1), Rarely (2), Frequently (3), Generally (4) to Always (5)". The inventory had two main dimensions namely metacognitive knowledge (knowledge of cognition) and metacognitive regulation (regulation of knowledge). Metacognitive knowledge consisted of three sub-dimensions: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and conditional knowledge. Then metacognitive regulation consisted of five sub-dimensions: planning, monitoring, evaluation of learning, debugging strategies and information management strategies. Teaching practicum checklist consisted of 25 items with 4 scales, 1-4. The metacognitive awareness was categorized low when the mean score was lower than 2.5; it would be categorized high if the mean score was higher than 2.5 (Akin et al., 2007). The blueprint of the MAI was presented in Table 1.

Table 1 The Questionnaire blueprint

Dimensions	***Sub-dimension***	***Items number***	***Total Items***
Metacognitive Knowledge	*Declarative Knowledge*	*5,10,12,16,17,20,32,46*	*8*
	Procedural Knowledge	*3,14,27,33*	*4*
	Conditional Knowledge	*15,18,26,29,35*	*5*
Metacognitive Regulation	*Planning*	*4,6,8,22,23,42,45*	*7*
	Monitoring	*1,2,11,21,28,34,49*	*7*
	Evaluation of Learning	*7,19,24,36,38,50*	*6*
	Debugging Strategies	*25,40,44,51,52*	*5*
	Information Management Strategies	*9,13,30,31,37,39,41,43,47,48*	*10*
		Total	*52*

The next instrument, the teaching practicum checklist of students' teaching performance consisted of twenty-five items. Those items were divided into three components: pre-teaching

(2 statements), whilst teaching (19 statements) and post teaching (4 statements). All the statements reflected how preservice English teacher should perform the teaching and learning process in the classroom. The scale of scoring was 1 into 4; the higher of the score was more proficient in the teaching performance.

Both instruments were analyzed to see the validity and reliability of the instruments. The summary result of validity analysis for Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) was presented in Table 2. From the table, it shows that from fifty-two items there were two items that were invalid (items number 9 and 37). The R counts of both items were below R table (.-078 and .062 < .344). Therefore, the data from those two items were excluded and not used for further data processing.

Table 2 Validity analysis summary result of MAI

Items No.	***R Count***	***R Table***	***Decision***	***Items No.***	***R Count***	***R Table***	***Decision***
1	*.763*	*.344*	*Valid*	*27*	*.718*	*.344*	*Valid*
2	*.583*	*.344*	*Valid*	*28*	*.609*	*.344*	*Valid*
3	*.420*	*.344*	*Valid*	*29*	*.766*	*.344*	*Valid*
4	*.549*	*.344*	*Valid*	*30*	*.445*	*.344*	*Valid*
5	*.502*	*.344*	*Valid*	*31*	*.652*	*.344*	*Valid*
6	*.535*	*.344*	*Valid*	*32*	*.514*	*.344*	*Valid*
7	*.433*	*.344*	*Valid*	*33*	*.739*	*.344*	*Valid*
8	*.547*	*.344*	*Valid*	*34*	*.397*	*.344*	*Valid*
9	*.-078*	*.344*	*Invalid*	*35*	*.707*	*.344*	*Valid*
10	*.523*	*.344*	*Valid*	*36*	*.636*	*.344*	*Valid*
11	*.576*	*.344*	*Valid*	*37*	*.062*	*.344*	*Invalid*
12	*.581*	*.344*	*Valid*	*38*	*.602*	*.344*	*Valid*
13	*.603*	*.344*	*Valid*	*39*	*.609*	*.344*	*Valid*
14	*.380*	*.344*	*Valid*	*40*	*.578*	*.344*	*Valid*
15	*.541*	*.344*	*Valid*	*41*	*.692*	*.344*	*Valid*
16	*.391*	*.344*	*Valid*	*42*	*.798*	*.344*	*Valid*
17	*.653*	*.344*	*Valid*	*43*	*.664*	*.344*	*Valid*
18	*.445*	*.344*	*Valid*	*44*	*.681*	*.344*	*Valid*
19	*.461*	*.344*	*Valid*	*45*	*.438*	*.344*	*Valid*
20	*.537*	*.344*	*Valid*	*46*	*.442*	*.344*	*Valid*
21	*.505*	*.344*	*Valid*	*47*	*.520*	*.344*	*Valid*
22	*.679*	*.344*	*Valid*	*48*	*.653*	*.344*	*Valid*
23	*.780*	*.344*	*Valid*	*49*	*.731*	*.344*	*Valid*
24	*.740*	*.344*	*Valid*	*50*	*.619*	*.344*	*Valid*
25	*.504*	*.344*	*Valid*	*51*	*.380*	*.344*	*Valid*
26	*.470*	*.344*	*Valid*	*52*	*.521*	*.344*	*Valid*

The second validity analysis was conducted for the observation and evaluation checklist of students' teaching performance which consisted of twenty-five items. The summary result was presented in Table 3. From the table, it shows that all items in the checklist (twenty-five items) were valid since all R count obtained were above R table. Therefore, all data obtained can be used for further data processing.

Table 3 Validity analysis summary result of the checklist

Items No.	*R Count*	*R Table*	*Decision*	*Items No.*	*R Count*	*R Table*	*Decision*
1	*.699*	*.344*	*Valid*	*14*	*.876*	*.344*	*Valid*
2	*.501*	*.344*	*Valid*	*15*	*.713*	*.344*	*Valid*
3	*.564*	*.344*	*Valid*	*16*	*.798*	*.344*	*Valid*
4	*.670*	*.344*	*Valid*	*17*	*.803*	*.344*	*Valid*
5	*.587*	*.344*	*Valid*	*18*	*.820*	*.344*	*Valid*
6	*.746*	*.344*	*Valid*	*19*	*.749*	*.344*	*Valid*
7	*.798*	*.344*	*Valid*	*20*	*.770*	*.344*	*Valid*
8	*.811*	*.344*	*Valid*	*21*	*.769*	*.344*	*Valid*
9	*.842*	*.344*	*Valid*	*22*	*.729*	*.344*	*Valid*
10	*.869*	*.344*	*Valid*	*23*	*.834*	*.344*	*Valid*
11	*.832*	*.344*	*Valid*	*24*	*.839*	*.344*	*Valid*
12	*.729*	*.344*	*Valid*	*25*	*.764*	*.344*	*Valid*
13	*.867*	*.344*	*Valid*				

After analyzing the validity, the next step was analyzing the reliability of the instruments. It was the consistency of the scores obtained; how consistent they were for everyone from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The classification of reliability test used in this study was based on Cohen's classification(Cohen et al., 2007) as presented in Table 4.

Table 4 The classification of the reliability coefficient

Reliability Coefficient	*Classification*
> 0.90	*Very highly reliable*
0.80 – 0.90	*Highly reliable*
0.70 – 0.79	*Reliable*
0.60 – 0.69	*Minimally reliable*
< 0.60	*Unacceptable low reliability*

The reliability analysis result of MAI was presented in Table 5; it was 0.955. Based on the Cohen's classification, it was included in very highly reliable research instrument. Then the result of reliability analysis of teaching checklist was presented in Table 6. Based on the

Cohen's classification, it was included in very highly reliable research instrument. Therefore, both instruments could be categorized as good instruments for further data processing.

Table 5 reliability result of MAI

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,955	52

Table 6: reliability results of the teaching checklist

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,970	25

Data collection

In collecting the data, there were some steps conducted by the researcher. The first was distributing the Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) to the preservice English teachers to get the data on their metacognitive awareness level. The inventory was distributed through a Google Form to the sample. Next, teaching practicum checklist results were collected from the results of the teaching assistance program in which the preservice English teachers directly taught junior or senior high school students at their school under teacher guidance. They needed to make a video teaching practice in the classroom and upload the video to YouTube. The collection of videos on YouTube became the data of the study.

Data analysis

After the data were collected, the next step was to analyze the data. In analyzing the data, descriptive statistics and Pearson Bivariate correlation analysis through SPSS were used in this study. However, before going further to hypothesis testing, normality data distribution testing was conducted**.** This test was used to determine whether the data collected was normally distributed or not. Normality test was a procedure used to determine whether data came from a normally distributed population (normal distribution), a symmetrical distribution with the mode, mean, and median being created, or a certain distribution that has the characteristics of being shaped like a bell if it is formed into a histogram. The measurement used to test the normality distribution in this study was the Kolmogorov-Smirnov. The basis for deciding whether the data was normal or not was as follows:

- If $\rho_{value} > 0.05$, it means that the data was normally distributed.

- If $\rho_{value} < 0.05$, it means that the data was abnormally distributed.

For testing the hypothesis of the study, if the data were normally distributed, Pearson correlation data analysis was used; however, if the data were not normally distributed, the Spearman Rank test was used. According to Anwar, the use of Spearman's rank is for samples with small numbers and data in the form of ordinals and intervals (Anwar, 2009). While the use of *Kendall's Tau-b Correlation* is for larger samples. The criteria of the hypothesis rejection are as follows:***[If ρ value < 0.05 = H0 is rejected, and if ρ value > 0.05 = H0 cannot be rejected].*** Correlation coefficient values varied from -1 to 1. If the correlation coefficient was close to one, the two variables had a strong positive association. A score near -1 implied a strong negative association, while a value near 0 suggested no significant linear relationship between the variables. The interpretation of the coefficient correlation was presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Standard of coefficient correlation

No	*Coefficient Correlation*	*Description*
1	*.00 - .199*	*Very Low Correlation*
2	*.20 - .399*	*Low Correlation*
3	*.40 - .599*	*Enough Correlation*
4	*.60 - .799*	*High Correlation*
5	*.80 – 1.000*	*Very High Correlation*

(Anwar, 2009)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

As stated previously, to obtain the data on metacognitive awareness of the preservice English teachers, Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) adopted from Schraw and Dennison (1994) is used. The summary result or descriptive statistics of Metacognitive Awareness Inventory result (MAI) and teaching performance (TP) checklist for the total score is presented in Table 7.

Table 7 The descriptive statistic of MAI and TP checklist result

	N	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
MAI total	*33*	*129*	*247*	*194.76*	*26.905*
TP total	*33*	*52*	*98*	*76.91*	*13.130*
Valid N (listwise)	*33*				

From the table, the minimum score got by the preservice English teacher is 129 with mean for each item 2.48, and the maximum score is 247 with mean for each item 4.74. Next,

the mean score of the whole preservice English teachers' metacognitive awareness is 194.76 with mean for each item 3.75, and it is categorized as high level of metacognitive awareness. Then for TP, the minimum score got by the preservice English teacher is 52 with mean for each item 2.08, and the maximum score is 98 with mean for each item 3.92. Next, the mean score of the whole preservice English teachers' teaching performance is 76.91 with mean for each item 3.076, and it is categorized as good teaching performance.

Before going to test the hypothesis, the assumption that should be fulfilled before going further analysis is normality distribution test. This test is used to decide whether parametric or non-parametric test should be used for further analysis. The summary results of normality distribution test for both variables are presented in Table 8. Based on the table, both data, metacognitive awareness data and teaching performance data are normal, since the significance values obtained for both variables exceeded the significance level (.200 > 0.05). Therefore, parametric test is used for further data analysis by using Pearson correlation analysis.

Table 8 The normality test results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	Statistic	**df**	**Sig.**
MA	.124	33	.200
TP	.109	33	.200

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The result of Hypothesis testing is presented in Table 9. In the table, the significant value obtained (ρ value) is 0.557. It is higher than the significance level 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis (H_o) cannot be rejected. In other words, there is no significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of preservice English teachers at UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri.

Correlations

		performance	MAI
performance	Pearson Correlation	1	,106
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,557
	N	33	33
MAI	Pearson Correlation	,106	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,557	
	N	33	33

Table 9 The result of correlation between MA and TP

This research also tries to check whether certain types of metacognitive awareness (knowledge and regulation) have relationship with the teaching performance of preservice English teachers. The result of correlation analysis for both types of metacognitive awareness is presented in Table 10 and Table 11. From Table 10, the significant value obtained (ρ value) is 0.532. It is higher than the significance level 0.05. It means that there is no significant correlation between metacognitive knowledge and teaching performance of pre- service English teachers. Then from Table 11, the significant value obtained (ρ value) is 0.584. It is higher than the significance level 0.05. It means that there is no significant correlation between metacognitive regulation and teaching performance of pre-service English teachers.

Table 10. Result of correlation between MA-knowledge and TP

Correlation

		T. Performance	*M. Knowledge*
T. Performance	*Pearson Correlation*	*1*	*.113*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		*.532*
	N	*33*	*33*
M. Knowledge	*Pearson Correlation*	*.113*	*1*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	*.532*	
	N	*33*	*33*

Table 11. The result of correlation between MA-regulation and TP

Correlations

		T. Performance	M. Regulation
T. Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.584
	N	33	33
M. Regulation	Pearson Correlation	.099	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.584	
	N	33	33

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to investigate the preservice English teachers' metacognitive awareness and its relation to their teaching performance in UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri. Based on the result of the analysis on the data collected, there is no significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of preservice English teachers. The significant value obtained was higher than the significant level (0.557 > 0.05). The insignificant relationship between the metacognitive awareness as a whole and teaching performance of preservice English teachers is also happened for each type of metacognitive

awareness (metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive regulation). When both types are analyzed separately, nonetheless there is no significant relationship between metacognitive knowledge and teaching performance (.532 > .05), and between metacognitive regulation and teaching performance (.584 > .05). All the significant values obtained are higher than the significant level.

There are some possible reasons of the insignificant relationship of this study. First, metacognitive awareness may not become the main determinant factor in teaching performance of preservice English teachers when they conducted teaching practice. It is in line with studies conducted by Usuludin and Aulia which found that metacognitive awareness does not have significant correlation with language learning (Aulia, 2024; Usuludin, 2019). There is no significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening skill of the tenth-grade students at MAN 2 Kota Kediri (Usuludin, 2019). Metacognitive awareness does not influence reading comprehension skill of senior high school students; their metacognitive awareness cannot be a determinant factor of students' success in comprehending passages or reading skill (Aulia, 2024).

Furthermore, situation, experience, anxiety and motivation of preservice English teachers may affect more on their teaching performance. Moreover, their teaching practice is taken video; they may become awkward when they perform in front camera. This condition makes them not able to use their metacognitive awareness appropriately; their cognition become blank because of the situation, teaching English in front of students. It becomes worse when they do not prepare their teaching performance well. Preservice English teachers may have good metacognitive awareness; however, they do not want to apply it or cannot use it since the situation or its difficulty. Even though students have good metacognition, they still have difficulty in use it (Aulia, 2024).

In addition, preservice English teachers' English proficiency level may cause the use of metacognitive awareness in teaching performance. Although they have good metacognition, the less proficiency in English makes them unable to use their metacognition in the teaching process. Students' lack of knowledge and language make them unable to use their metacognitive awareness well (Aulia, 2024). Cubukcu revealed that there is no significant difference among the groups (taught using metacognitive strategies) on students' achievement (Cubukcu, 2009). Fair and underachievers use the metacognitive strategies frequently as well

as high achievers, then having study habit and self-regulated strategy becomes more prominent factors influencing the achievement.

The finding of this study contrasts with some previous studies (Abdellah, 2015; Rosnaeni et al., 2020). Abdellah found that there is positive correlation between metacognitive regulation and academic achievement as well as teaching performance of pre-service female teachers in Ajman university, UEA. However, there is no significant correlation between metacognitive knowledge and academic achievement as well as teaching performance for both groups (Abdellah, 2015). This finding is like the present study in which there is no significant correlation between metacognitive knowledge and teaching performance of preservice English teachers. Rosnaeni et al. found that there is significant correlation between students' metacognitive awareness and their reading comprehension. The better students' metacognitive awareness is the better their reading comprehension (Rosnaeni et al., 2020).

Some previous studies have contradict finding with the present study. They found that metacognitive awareness was not to be varying significantly by gender, and there was positive, medium and significant correlation between the preservice primary school teachers' metacognitive awareness and beliefs about mathematical problem solving (Yorulmaz et al., 2021). Furthermore, metacognitive awareness significantly predicts the belief variable. Good metacognitive awareness students often use metacognitive strategies, and they will be success on their learning (Goctu, 2018; Iwai, 2011; Ramadhanti & Yanda, 2021). Furthermore, Ramadhanti and Yanda revealed that there are significant and very strong relationships between metacognitive awareness variables and the ability to write explanatory text with the correlation values 0.812. The variables affect the writing skill by 66%, and the remaining 44% is affected by other factors (Ramadhanti & Yanda, 2021).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Conclusion

In accordance with the research findings and the discussions of the study, it can be concluded that there was no significant relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance of preservice English teachers. The significant value obtained was higher than the significant level (0.557 > 0.05). The insignificant relationship between the metacognitive awareness as a whole and teaching performance of preservice English teachers is also happened for each type of metacognitive awareness (metacognitive knowledge and

metacognitive regulation). When both types are analyzed separately, no significant relationship was found between metacognitive knowledge and teaching performance (.532 > .05), and between metacognitive regulation and teaching performance (.584 > .05). All the significant values obtained are higher than the significant level. Therefore, teaching performance of pre-service English teachers is not primarily determined by their metacognitive awareness.

Limitation

This study is limited to assess preservice teachers' metacognitive awareness and its relation to their teaching performance. In addition, only thirty-three preservice English teachers joined this study. Considering the limitations of the study, further researchers could expand the scope by incorporating more student characteristics, such as competence level and enlisting more participants. Ultimately, a deeper understanding of the result may lead to a theoretical advancement of the corpus of knowledge about the relationship of metacognitive awareness and teaching performance.

Implication

The findings of this study imply that metacognitive awareness may not become the main determinant factor in teaching performance of preservice English teachers. Other factors such as linguistics competence may influence more on teaching performance. Therefore, EFL instructors should consider individual learner factors independently rather than assuming the relationship between metacognitive awareness and teaching performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was financially supported by the DIPA of the State Islamic University (UIN) Syekh Wasil Kediri through the fundamental research program in 2024. The researchers also appreciate LPPM UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri for facilitating this research project.

BIO-PROFILE:

Sri Wahyuni is an associate professor in the English Education Department at State Islamic University (UIN) Syekh Wasil Kediri, Indonesia. She got her undergraduate degree from STAIN Kediri in 2007. She earned her master's degree in 2010 and her doctoral degree in 2016 from the State University of Malang, majoring in English Language Education. In 2017, she received a scholarship from the Ministry of Religious Affairs to attend a short course on

research methodology at Leiden University, the Netherlands. Some of her interests are teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), language assessment, and teaching material development. Corresponding Email: **sriwahyuni@uinkediri.ac.id**

Nabil Al-Awawdeh earned his master's degree from the University of Potsdam, Germany, in foreign languages and linguistics and his doctoral degree from the University of Missouri, Columbia, USA, in 2018 in romance languages (translation). He is currently working as an assistant professor at Yarmouk University in Jordan. His areas of specialization are linguistics and translation. He developed various courses for his students, including phonetics, translation, and linguistics. He is a reviewer and part of the editorial board of several journals, such as the Register Journal, the Journal of Applied Social Science (JASS), and Al-Lisan. He is also a translator of several languages, including Arabic, German, French, and English. He published several articles on translation studies and linguistics in various journals.

Email: n.awawdeh@yu.edu.jo

Nurul Aini is an English teacher at Faculty of Tarbiyah, English Education, UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri, Indonesia. She holds a doctoral degree in the Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang (UM). Her research interest is in English teaching methodology and artificial intelligence in Education. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7929-0512

Email: florida_aini@uinkediri.ac.id

REFERENCES

Abdellah, R. (2015). Metacognitive awareness and its relation to academic achievement and teaching performance of pre-service female teachers in Ajman University in UAE. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *174*, 560–567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.707

Akin, A., Abaci, R., & Çetin, B. (2007). The validity and reliability of the Turkish Version of the Metacognitive Awareness Inventory. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *7*(2), 655–680. https://tr-scales.arabpsychology.com/wp-content/uploads/pdf/metacognitive-awareness-inventory-toad.pdf

Anwar, A. (2009). *Statistika untuk penelitian pendidikan dan aplikasinya dengan SPSS dan Excel[Statistics for educational research and its applications with SPSS and Excel]*. Kediri: IAIT Press.

Aulia, K. (2024). *Correlation among metacognitive awareness, reading strategy and reading comprehension skill of the tenth graders of SMAN I Plemahan Kediri*. [Unpublished Thesis.]. Kediri: State Islamic Institute of Kediri.

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching. Fifth edition.* San Francisco: Pearson education, Inc.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (sixth). London: Routledge Falmer.

Coutinho, S. (2007). The Relationship between Goals, Metacognition, and Academic Success. *Educate Journal*, *7*(1), 39–47. https://educatejournal.org/index.php/educate/article/view/116/134

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Cubukcu, F. (2009). Metacognition in the classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 559–563. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.101

DemirsÖz, E. S. (2014). Metacognitive awareness and its developing. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4, 112–123.

El-Hindi, A. E. (2016). Connecting reading and writing: College learners' metacognitive awareness. *J DevEduc.*, *21*(1), 9–10. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajnr-8-2-19

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

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). San Francisco: Mc Graw Hill.

Goctu, L. (2018). Metacognitive strategies in academic writing. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, *2*(2), 82–96. https://doi.org/10.31578/jebs.v2i2.44

Iwai, Y. (2011). The effect of metacognitive reading strategies: Pedagogical implications for EFL/ESL Teachers. *The Reading Matrix*, *11*(2), 150–159. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1030894062?sourcetype=Scholarly%20Journals

Jacobse, A. E., & Harskamp, E. G. (2012). Towards efficient measurement of metacognition in mathematical problem solving. *Metacognition Learning*, *7*, 133–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-012-9088-x

Justice, E. M., & Dornan, T. M. (2001). Metacognitive differences between traditional age and non-traditional age college students. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *51*, 236–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/07417130122087269

Kocak, R., & Bayaci, M. (2010). The predictive role of basic ability levels and metacognitive strategies of students on their academic success. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 767–772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.099

Mohamed, H. M., Mohamed, A. I., & Abdeen, M. A. (2020). The impact of metacognitive skills educational program on metacognitive awareness, self-efficacy, and problem-solving skills among nursing students. *American Journal of Nursing Research*, *8*(2), 289–296. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajnr-8-2-19

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

Rosnaeni, M. Z. D., Zuhri, M., & Nur, H. (2020). Students' metacognitive awareness and reading comprehension of narrative texts. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *7*(1), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v7i1.17027

Sadler-Smith, E., Evans, C., Bostrom, L., & Lassen, L. M. (2014). Unraveling learning, learning styles, learning strategies and metacognition. *Edu Train*, *48*(2), 178–189. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910610651809

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. . *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *19*(4), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1994.1033

Suib, A. F., Ghazali, P. L., Halim, B. A., Ariffin, Y., & Razak, R. A. (2022). Proposing a theoretical framework for teacher's job performance. *The Journal of Management, Theory and Practice*, *3*(1), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.37231/jmtp.2022.3.1.205

Usuludin, M. A. (2019). *The correlation between metacognitive awareness, listening self-efficacy and listening comprehension achievement of the tenth-grade students of MAN 2 Kediri* [Unpublished Thesis.]. Kediri: State Islamic Institution of Kediri.

Uwazurike, N. R. (2010). Metacognition and achievement goals as correlates of academic success. *Continental Journal of Education Research*, *3*, 1–6.

Wilson, N. S., & Bai, H. (2010). The relationship and impact of teachers' metacognitive knowledge and pedagogical understanding of metacognition. *Metacognition and Learning*, *5*(3), 269–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-010-9062-4

Yorulmaz, A., Uysal, H., & Çokçaliskan, H. (2021). Pre-service primary school teachers' metacognitive awareness and beliefs about mathematical problem solving. *JRAMathEdu (Journal of Research and Advances in Mathematics Education)*, *6*(3), 239–259. https://doi.org/10.23917/jramathedu.v6i3.14349

Young, A., & Fry, J. D. (2008). Metacognitive awareness and academic achievement in college students. *Journal of Scholarship or Teaching and Learning*, *8*(2), 1–10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228345722_Metacognitive_Awareness_and_Academic_Achievement_in_College_Students