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Abstract

As a primary framework for understanding and teaching reading comprehension, metacognition has been on the pulse of educational scholarship since the 1970’s. Yet, discourses into how metacognition can be incorporated in the Secondary English classroom are limited. The recent inclusion of metacognition as an overall expectation in the Ontario Secondary English curriculum prompts this qualitative study to examine how teachers can use metacognitive strategies in the high school English classroom to increase student’s awareness as readers. Data has been collected through one-on-one interviews of two exemplary teachers. Findings suggest that metacognitive strategies need to be explicitly integrated into daily instruction, and are most effective when used collaboratively between students. These findings signify a shift from a view of metacognition as being a predominately individual process to a process that should be socially mediated.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

“We imagine that thinking is something that can be achieved without any training. But again it’s a matter of practice. How well we can think depends on how much of it we have already done. Most students need to be taught, very carefully and patiently…”
-Northrop Frye

Introduction to the Research Study

Northrop Frye’s words distinctly resonate with educators—teaching students how to think effectively is critical. However, while many educators have adopted Fry’s axiom, they don’t understand that students need to learn to capitalize on, and become cognizant of their ability to introspect, or think critically about their own thoughts. Thinking about and regulating one’s own thought process, or metacognition, is a skill that addresses this pedagogical void.

Metacognition has recently gained prominence in educational scholarship due to the strong correlation between metacognition and academic achievement, increased self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and the development of autonomous learners (Rolheiser & Ross, 2000). These findings have prompted a bureaucratic movement to incorporate metacognition in the English classroom. In 2007, the Ontario Ministry of Education revised the English curriculum to include metacognition, defined as reflecting on skills and strategies, as an expectation in each strand, marking a significant deviation from previous expectations. The standardization of metacognition across Ontario challenges the traditional curricular objectives and requires an investigation into how to effectively apply these strategies to enhance student learning and development.

While the use of metacognitive strategies in the classroom is not a new practice, the frequency and consistency of metacognition’s implementation is sporadic and varies by teacher and school. Explicitly introducing metacognition in the English classroom demands that
educators make significant modifications to classroom practice and pedagogy. Scholarship and
government policy have aligned to stress the importance of teaching students how to critically
evaluate their own thinking, problematizing current practice, as many educators are unfamiliar
and unaware of how to properly develop metacognitive ability in their students. As Frye
eloquentely posits, thinking requires development, and these new curriculum expectations are
evaluating students on skills in which they have not been properly taught.

Metacognition, first expounded by developmental psychologist John Flavell in 1976, as
the knowledge and regulation of one’s own cognition has simultaneously influenced both
cognitive and child developmental psychology, and has been used in fields ranging from mental
health to education. Of particular interest to this study are the implications of metacognition, not
only to education, but specifically to reading comprehension. Metacognitive ability is a primary
framework for understanding and teaching reading comprehension as it guides the judgments
made about reading ability and content and also assists in predicting necessary strategies to use
in the future (Maki & McGuire, 2002).

In high school, metacognitive knowledge becomes particularly significant, as higher-
order thinking is necessary to move reading beyond simple decoding of words to a much more
complex process of understanding and making meaning from text (Schoenbach, Greenleaf,
Cziko, & Hurwitz, 1999). If students are to employ increasingly sophisticated ways of thinking,
the hidden cognitive dimensions of reading must be uncovered, and made explicit by educators
in order to demonstrate effective practices (Schoenbach, et al., 1999). The process of making the
implicit explicit is the essence of metacognitive ability, making it an essential component for
reading development.
Purpose of the Study

While the significance of metacognition is widely appreciated among scholars, it is frequently overlooked in the classroom. For many teachers, especially in secondary schools, metacognition is neglected in lieu of a focus on content knowledge, or is used as a brief supplementary activity after reading. Moreover, many secondary teachers operate under the assumption that thinking about mental processes and reading strategies is only required for novice readers to comprehend the subject (Joseph, 2009). Metacognition is most commonly conceived in the classroom as self-directed reflections in reading journals, or answering a series of “metacognitive questions” independently. Examples of “metacognitive questions” from the grade nine Ontario English Curriculum (2007) include: “How did previewing text features help you read that section of the textbook?” “How did this graphic organizer help you find the answers you needed from the textbook?” (p.47). While these questions address metacognitive knowledge, they do not attend to metacognitive instruction — or how metacognition can be taught to students. In recent scholarship, there is an strong consensus that to access the positive benefits of metacognition for learning, metacognitive strategies must become an integral part of literacy instruction, alongside content knowledge. This scholarship contends that metacognition must take place during reading (Wilson & Bai, 2010; Veenman, Van Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 1998; Joseph, 2009; Koriat, 2002). In order to reap the benefits of metacognition, possessing metacognitive knowledge is not sufficient— one needs to effectively implement strategies and monitor their performance (Snyder, Nietfeld, & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2011). Wilson and Bai (2010) advance this argument claiming that, “metacognition is not just a skill to be taught, but a disposition of what it means to think and learn” (p.272).
According to Lev Vygotsky’s theory which positions learning as a social-cognitive interactive process, where development is socially mediated, and all higher psychological functions develop in social interaction, metacognitive development is greatly effected by the surrounding classroom environment (Day, French & Hall, 1985; Schoenbach et al., 1999). Research has shown that social, collaborative, forms of learning can enhance metacognitive processes and learning in the classroom (Whitebread, Almeqdad, Bryce, Demetriou, Grau, & Sangster, 2010).

Reading in the classroom is inherently a socialized process as it involves relationships among people and acquiring, “culturally appropriate ways of thinking, problem solving, valuing and feeling” (Bloome, 1985, p. 1). As Gee (2001) contends individuals are, “simply the meeting point of many, sometimes conflicting, socially and historically defined discourses” (p.3). The classroom is a site where these multiple discourses come in contact with one another and thus offers a rich environment for students to learn these discourses, or the ways in which other people think (Gee, 2001). Mary Louise Pratt refers to this phenomenon as the “contact zone,” where cultures meet and clash with one another. The outcome of this conflict is a deeper understanding and analysis of the complexity of the social world (1991). Metacognitive collaboration allows for a negotiation of these discourses, and for them to become explicit in the classroom. By making the ways in which students think explicit, it will not only offer deeper insight about content, but the students sitting in the room, and the world outside the classroom.

This understanding of metacognition as a social process is at odds with the English curriculum expectations. In the English curriculum for grade eleven university English courses, the recommended metacognitive strategy is to, “use a log to keep track of decisions made at various stages in the design and production process, review the log to evaluate the efficiency and
effectiveness of their production process, and determine how to apply this learning to another production” (2007, p.57). To what extent does the Ministry’s approach to metacognition limit its effectiveness and role in the classroom?

**Research Questions**

The disjuncture between how the Ontario curriculum and scholarly research position metacognition is cause for examining how effectively the current expectations develop metacognitive awareness. The Ministry states that the purpose of the English curriculum is to, “help students to see that language skills are lifelong learning skills that will enable them to better understand themselves and others, unlock their potential as human beings, find fulfilling careers, and become responsible world citizens” (2007, p.5). To achieve these aims, metacognition must assume a more central and prominent role in high school English classrooms, as it directly impacts self-awareness, both as a student and an individual.

This research project endeavours to answer the question: how can teachers use metacognitive strategies in high school English classrooms to increase student’s understanding of themselves as readers? This examination will then investigate the effectiveness of the current curriculum expectations on metacognition for fostering self-awareness as readers well as examining how the classroom as a social construct can be utilized to develop metacognitive ability.

This study will employ the reading apprenticeship framework of Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko & Hurwitz (1999) as a theoretical framework. Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko & Hurwitz contend that four key dimensions that are necessary to support adolescent reading development (social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge-building) and critically that metacognitive
conversation is at the nucleus of these dimensions, binding them together. Metacognitive conversation is an, “ongoing conversation in which teacher and students think about and discuss their personal relationships to reading, the social environment and resources of the classroom, their cognitive activity, and the kinds of knowledge required to make sense of text” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 22). Furthermore, this conversation is carried on both internally and externally, as teachers and students talk about their reading, becoming consciously aware of their mental activity and being able to describe and discuss it with one another. Schoenbach et al.’s (1999) noteworthy belief that metacognitive conversation should exist at the centre of all reading development encouraged this study to further investigate the current role of metacognition in the English classroom and how metacognitive strategies can be most effective in eliciting student self-awareness.

This reading framework along with other literary theorists such as Gee and Bloome, offer an understanding of metacognition as a socio-linguistic process, where metacognitive thoughts are expressed in language and developed in dialogue with others. This positioning eschews the original understanding of metacognition, which is based in cognitive psychology, where an individual is able to “train” or improve their brain processing. This socially mediated understanding of metacognition emphasizes how students can use metacognitive strategies to better access their thinking in order to make meaning of texts, but also gain an understanding of the multiple ways others think and make meaning. This ability to reflect upon multiple ways of thinking can be readily applied to other contexts outside the classroom, in order to understand the world around them. By positioning metacognition as a way to access meaning and prompt deeper comprehension rather than a brain process that can be trained and developed, this study will
examine how metacognitive strategies can be used to assist students in fostering self-awareness as readers within the English classroom.

**Background of the Researcher**

My interest in metacognition is deeply rooted in personal experience and in my background as a researcher and student. As a lover of literature and an amateur bibliophile, reading was always a source of enjoyment. My identity as a proficient reader was nurtured early on by my mother who introduced me to my first book diary—a place to not only document what I read, but how I felt about what I read. I have diligently kept a book diary since elementary school, and while my entries have gained complexity, it is clear that I have been practicing metacognition from a young age. I was also fortunate to have a space where the discussion of reading was encouraged. I was constantly sharing the exploits from novels with my parents, and even throughout high school my mother frequently read my assigned course texts alongside me so we could debate over the dinner table. The metacognitive conversation that was missing in the classroom luckily existed in my home.

From this experience, I developed a strong sense of self-awareness as a reader and it greatly influenced my ability to read effectively for academic purposes and for leisure. My experience in school stood in marked contrast to my experience at home. I did not participate in literature discussions until grade twelve, and English class was predominantly focused on chapter-by-chapter simple comprehension questions. Even in my PACE, or gifted English classes, there was never any focus on how we were reading or on class discussions regarding various interpretations of texts; lessons were teacher-centred and preoccupied with the monologic transmission of content. My metacognitive awareness has greatly impacted not only
how I read literature, but also how I understand myself in relation to the world around me. This experience has led me to question the implications for students who are not exposed to the same reading experience, and how (or if) metacognition is developed in the classroom.

My experience in secondary-school classrooms has also reinforced the importance of metacognition. I have observed a growing number of students who are disinterested in reading and have difficulty with basic literacy skills, such as synthesis or inference. During a practicum in a grade twelve university level history classroom, I introduced a selection of primary source documents, which required the students to access their previous content knowledge, and use inference to work through unfamiliar language, in order to come to a conclusion about the relevance of the document. I was surprised by the struggles of these soon-to-be high school graduates to employ reading strategies on a new text. These students were also deficient in articulating what was challenging or unclear about the texts. Many gave up as they, “just didn’t get it,” and “nothing could be done about it.” These students clearly had no familiarity in metacognitive strategies, or discussing how they think.

My goal as an educator is to foster critical, reflective, life-long learners. My philosophy of education is predicated on the belief that students should develop the adequate skills during their elementary and secondary education to become proficient and inquisitive learners. The development of metacognition is an integral component of this vision, as it allows students to become more aware of themselves and the world around them. Due to current curriculum expectations, metacognition is a necessary component in every English classroom, but further research must be done to investigate what strategies are the most effective in developing metacognition, and students self-awareness.
Overview

In chapter 1, I have identified my topic, the rationale and impetus for my study, along with an explanation of my specific research questions and sub-questions. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature where the research question is placed in conversation in the broader field of current scholarship on metacognition. Chapter 3 provides the methodology and procedure used in this study including information about the sample participants and data collection instruments. Chapter 4 describes the data collected. Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the data as it relates to the research question and includes the implications of the study for further research and practice. References and a list of appendices follow.
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Extensive scholarship has been authored about metacognition as a result of its influence on developmental and cognitive psychology. Yet, the literature surrounding the use of metacognition in the classroom, particularly the secondary classroom, is sparse and varied. A contributing factor to this fragmentation is that the conceptual clarity of metacognition has become conflated with other terminology such as self-regulation and self-regulated learning (Alexander, 2008). In her introduction to the Educational Psychology Review’s special issue on metacognition, Alexander clearly remarks on the nascent interest in metacognition within educational scholarship, as well as problematizing its cross-fertilization with other terminology (2008). Kaplan (2008) in response to this trend, in Clarifying Metacognition, self-regulation, and self-regulated learning: What’s the Purpose? reframes the problem by proposing that boundaries between metacognition and self-regulated learning are not necessary and they should be categorized under general self-regulated processes which are aimed towards creating engagement.

The amorphous definition of metacognition exists not only in literature, but also within teacher practice. Although many classroom educators may implement metacognition, by prompting their students to reflect on their own thinking, or by teaching skills like drawing upon previous knowledge to infer meaning of texts, these teachers do not explicitly state and acknowledge that they are using metacognition within their own pedagogy or with their students. This disconnect becomes problematic as the Ontario Secondary English curriculum has recently included metacognition an expectation in every strand, meaning that it must be assessed and evaluated on the Ontario report card. The Ministry explains the inclusion of metacognition
alongside the traditional expectations of oral and written communication because, “students learn best when they are encouraged to consciously monitor their thinking as they learn” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2007 p. 9). Teachers are encouraged to “think out loud” and students are asked to question the way they think and read to help them become reflective, critical, and independent learners while developing higher-level thinking skills.

The inclusion of metacognition in the curriculum parallels findings in current scholarship that argues that metacognitive aptitude significantly improves students’ ability to learn and think about content, and also about themselves (Schoenbach et al., 1999; Joseph, 2009). Yet this inclusion requires teachers to become explicit in their use of metacognition, and to become successful in teaching metacognition to their students.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate how teachers can use metacognitive strategies in a high school English classroom to increase student’s understanding of themselves as readers. Through a review of current literature, I will offer a reconceptualization of metacognition and discuss the central tensions surrounding metacognition and the classroom: can metacognition be taught?; its unique role in the high school classroom; the relationship between metacognition and reading comprehension; the interaction between metacognition and student collaboration; and current metacognitive approaches.

**What is Metacognition?**

Metacognition can be defined as “thinking about thinking,” but this general definition can severely limit the complexity of the process. John Flavell’s (1976) definition, as the knowledge and regulation of one’s own cognition has become the standard upon which most scholars base their understanding. Despite the lasting legacy of Flavell’s definition, focus has increasingly
been placed in scholarship on metacognitive regulation, or metacognitive monitoring. Indeed, Clauss and Geedey in their 2010 study of knowledge surveys, define metacognition as, “people’s abilities to predict their performances on various tasks... and to monitor their current levels of mastery and understanding” (p. 14). Whitebread et al., (2010) also references a theoretical model of metacognition that is an “explicit and declarative set of processes that depend upon the respondents ability to give reliable reports of their own mental experiences” (p.234).

The dominance of monitoring, also frequently referred to as control, (Perfect & Schwartz, 2002) can be attributed to the belief that to improve learning and realize benefits, students must effectively implement their metacognitive knowledge and monitor its performance (regulate cognition) (Snyder et al., 2011). This aspect of metacognition allows learners to grow through experience, and develop a thoughtful practice (Schoenbach et al., 1999). It is also the emphasis placed on metacognitive monitoring that draws comparisons and confusion with self-regulation and self-regulated learning.

Self-regulation is the degree of effort that an individual decides to exert on a particular task. The students’ beliefs about the value of the task, and their affective response (i.e. feelings of difficulty) constitute how they will self-regulate their learning (Whitebread et al., 2010). Paris and Paris define self-regulated learning as the, “fusion of skill and will” (In Whitebread et al, 2010). There is a clear inter-relationship between self-regulation and metacognitive monitoring, as one’s self-regulatory beliefs influences how they perceive and value metacognition.

The interconnectedness of metacognition and self-regulation explains some of the theoretical confusion, and also helps support Kaplan’s (2008) aforementioned assertion that these concepts should be grouped together under self-regulatory processes. But for the classroom educator, who is saddled with explaining metacognition to parents and students, a clear and
concrete definition is imperative for introducing metacognition successfully into the classroom. Schoenbach et al., (1999) offers a clear point of departure in her definition of metacognition: “a conscious examination of what you are understanding and what you are not understanding while you are reading or thinking” (p. 55). This definition operates under the assumption that a student who monitors their level of comprehension will take corrective, regulatory action when they don’t understand a concept (Kinnunen & Vauras, 2010). While the assumption that a student will automatically take corrective steps is tenuous, Schoenbach et al. (1999) maintains that by teaching students metacognitive skills and creating an engaging classroom community that scaffolds these regulatory actions, students can begin to lead their own learning.

Constructivism, the belief that the student can construct their own meaning from texts and other sources, is central to understanding metacognition. Metacognition relies on the constructivist principles by acknowledging a learner’s existing knowledge and building upon it (Bartimote-Aufflick, Brew, & Ainley, 2010). Constructivist principles and the theories of Vygotsky are threaded throughout nearly all scholarship on metacognition. This is significant as to facilitate metacognitive development, educators must relinquish monologic control and place greater value on their students ability to construct knowledge. Constructivism is also central to this study as it reinforces the need for teachers to use metacognitive strategies to create a framework through which students can effectively develop their own thinking.

Can Metacognition be taught?

Perhaps the most prominent tension within current literature on metacognition is the issue of whether or not metacognitive ability can be learnt. Metacognition is considered one of humans’ most sophisticated cognitive processes, as it requires one to reflect on and evaluate their
own thought processes, and to seek additional further information if necessary (Efklides & Misailidi, 2010). But research does not support the notion of a general metacognitive ability (Maki & McGuire, 2002). Individuals’ metacognitive abilities vary greatly, and no similarities are found across tasks. Among academic literature, the current consensus is that metacognitive skill is only moderately related to intelligence, but there is still a large subset of research looking at the connection between metacognition and giftedness.

Hannah & Shore (1995) claim that metacognition is a defining quality of intellectual giftedness. Their study, *Metacognition and High Intellectual Ability* reveals that students both at the elementary and secondary levels, who were identified as gifted, exhibited more metacognitive knowledge (Hannah & Shore, 1995). Snyder et al., (2011) make a similar assertion, reasoning that gifted individuals are more “expert-like” in their understanding and therefore are more proficient in using metacognition. However, Snyder et al.,’s (2011) study found that although gifted students might have slightly better metacognitive awareness or knowledge, they do not regulate or control their cognition anymore than “typical” students. These findings are in agreement with Greene, Moos, Azevedo and Winter’s (2008) who argue that there is no difference in metacognitive monitoring between gifted and typical students.

Intellectual ability only gives students a head start in metacognition, but does not drastically affect its developmental course. Veeman et al. (2006) discusses how most students are able to pick up metacognitive skills from parents, and peers, but gaining these skills is wholly dependent on growing up in favourable conditions and being privy to those types of opportunities. This brings into question the practice of metacognitive instruction and explicitly teaching metacognitive strategies. Is it possible to teach metacognition and how should educators go about doing so?
Academic consensus confirms that metacognitive instruction is effective and beneficial for enhancing learning, especially for students who struggle academically (Veenman, 2006). Hannah & Shore’s (1995) study elicited positive results, where teaching lower achieving students metacognitive strategies enabled them to be “more active and efficient in their learning” (p.96). Borkowski, Estrada, Milstead, & Hale (1989) similarly contend that teaching metacognitive strategies has improved learning disabled students’ strategic processing and problem solving skills. Wilson and Bai (2010) attribute students’ low metacognitive ability to the lack of instruction in the classroom, and multiple scholars such as Veenman et al., (2006); Joseph, (2009); Koriat, (2010); Schoenbach et al., (1999) all discuss the necessity of bringing metacognitive instruction into the teachers repertoire and daily pedagogy. This discussion is of particular importance to my study, as I wish to investigate how to best incorporate these teaching strategies into the English classroom.

While the research suggests the benefits and significance of metacognitive instruction, scholarship complicates this point by discussing the age at which one can properly monitor their metacognition. It was previously believed that metacognitive skills emerge around the age of eight to ten, but it is increasingly recognized that even younger children can benefit from metacognitive instruction (Whitebread et al., 2010). Furthermore, findings also demonstrate that the older and more skilled a person is increases the chances they will possess stronger metacognitive knowledge.

For the purposes of my high school study, Kolic-Vehovec, Bajanski, & Roncevic-Zubkovic (2010) discuss how metacognitive activities become more pronounced and refined during this period, as it is only at higher developmental levels that learners can regulate their learning processes independently. Schoenbach et al. (1999), agrees with Kolic-Vehovec et al.,
(2010) that adolescence is the ideal period for allowing students to develop metacognitively, not only because it is imperative for deciphering more difficult texts, but it is a period where they are intensely self-absorbed, and focused on individual identity, “self-absorption was our ally” (1999, p.57). This assumption regarding adolescent psychology is particularly interesting as it posits certain possibilities for metacognitive inquiries: In what ways are they interested in themselves, and how do they see themselves interacting with social concerns? In what ways can educators use students’ metacognitive thoughts to interrogate various issues in the classroom?

These findings reinforce the necessity of an inquiry into how best teach metacognition, as it is clear high school students are readily capable of developing these critical skills.

**Metacognition and the Secondary English Classroom**

Building upon the research that states adolescence is a key period for metacognitive development, the secondary English classroom is a particularly relevant space for the teaching of metacognition and therefore an inquiry into how to do so effectively. One of the predominant concerns in literature regarding metacognition in the secondary English classroom is the current practice of privileging the content of texts over strategies used to read and understand them: “for many teachers, especially secondary teachers, thinking about the mental processes a novice learner needs to comprehend the subject area material is not a natural activity” (Joseph, 2009 p. 100). Also, many secondary teachers find teaching reading challenging because they do not view themselves as ‘reading teachers’ (Lawrence, Rabinowitz, & Perna, 2009). In many cases, students are expected to have sufficient reading skills upon entering grade nine, while in practice when introduced with more challenging secondary texts, the sophisticated material challenges their comprehension ability (Kinnunen & Vauras, 2010). Kolic-Vehovec, et al., (2010) argue that
metacognition is instrumental in high school English as it helps students access and build upon their previous knowledge from their long-term memory. A National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) research study found that adolescent literacy has been increasingly marginalized, with most English classes being a monologic transfer of the content of texts (Lawrence et al., 2009). The study also notes that English curriculum does not keep up with “new literacies” such as media studies, leaving students without the requisite schemas to access the foreign texts encountered in schools (Lawrence et al., 2009).

Perhaps the most compelling reason for an emphasis on metacognition in the secondary English classroom is providing students with a skill they will use permanently, in their lives beyond school. A focus on metacognition in high school allows students to develop a strong reader identity before entering post-secondary education, or the workforce (Schoenbach et al., 1999). A reader identity includes being conscious of one's own thinking processes and “reflectively turning around on their own thought and actions and analyzing how and why their thinking achieved certain ends or failed to achieve others” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 29). This identity grows through experience, and is believed to become automatic with practice, calling upon its integration in the classroom. Overall, there is limited research done on high school metacognitive reading strategies, prompting my study to investigate further into how metacognition functions in this unique circumstance.

**Metacognition and Reading Comprehension**

Comprehension is a metacognitive act; or as Maki and McGuire (2002) argue, metacognition is a primary ability in comprehension. To effectively learn from a text, one must: identify relevant information, retrieve relevant background knowledge and monitor these
strategies to create a text that simply makes sense (Kolic-Vehovec, et al., 2010, p. 328). There is a popular misconception that reading is just saying the words, or decoding, yet this does nothing to help students master complex comprehension processes to access the knowledge within texts that good readers rely on (Schoenbach et al., 1999). Maki and McGuire (2002) assert that a students academic welfare depends on how well they retain information from reading, and it is metacognition that allows students to make judgements about their own levels of comprehension and learning of the text, and to imagine a future need for the material.

Differences in metacognitive strength have been consistently observed in comparisons between between poor and sophisticated readers. Kolic-Vehovec, et al.’s (2010) study on metacognition and reading comprehension illustrates that the more skilled the reader, the more likely comprehension monitoring is found, while poor readers tend to, “skim, reread, integrate information, and make inferences to a lesser extent to their skilled counterparts” (p. 329). Moreover, these metacognitive skills are unlikely to develop by virtue of reading, and should be explicitly taught within an authentic literacy environment where the students can practice employing them (Kolic-Vehovec et al., 2010).

In opposition to the finding that metacognitive skills are unlikely to develop on their own, research suggests that when the majority of teachers provide class time to read, they commonly just read independently (Lawrence et al., 2009). It has also been found that when students are given the opportunity to read and discuss with their peers they are more engaged and interact with the text on more meaningful levels (Lawrence et al., 2009). A 2002 study by Mokhtari and Reichard on the metacognitive skills of good readers identifies three categories readers use: global, problem and support. Global strategies include prediction, skimming, and context clues, where problem solving includes visualization, and guessing meaning. Support strategies were
activities like note-taking, asking questions, and employing reference materials. The Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) surveyed 800 students, finding that good readers used mainly global and problem-solving strategies, over support strategies, and that weaker readers relied more heavily on support strategies (Lawrence et al., 2009).

To create competent readers, teachers must work to make conscious their own reading processes in order to explain them to their students. While the strategies outlined by Mokharti and Reichard (2002) may seem intuitive, most students are deficient in employing them, or even realizing they exist. Research on the effectiveness of metacognitive instruction in improving students’ reading comprehension has shown that this type of instruction leads to significantly stronger understanding. Metacognitive strategies must be taught to assist in reading comprehension and further research must be undertaken to examine how to teach metacognitive strategies efficaciously.

Metacognition as a Social Practice

Investigating the relationship between metacognition and the classroom as a social space is an emerging trend within metacognitive discourse. Traditionally, metacognition has been positioned as a solitary endeavour, where students are asked to self-report in reading logs, or journals before or after reading, but several studies are beginning to analyse the potential of collaboration on metacognitive development.

Schoenbach, et al.’s (2002) Reading for Understanding strongly adopts the belief of metacognition as a social process by claiming that “metacognitive conversation” should be the centre of an approach to reading. Metacognitive conversation is defined as an ongoing discussion
in which the teacher and students: “think about and discuss their personal relationships to reading, the social environment and resources of the classroom, their cognitive activity and the kind of knowledge required to make sense of the text. It is carried on both internally and externally”(Schoenbach et al., 1999 p. 22). Metacognition is ongoing, it is oral, it is discussed, and it is explicit, in addition to written private reflections. The rationale behind this approach to reading is that it creates a safe social environment, one that lends itself to openness and reflection as metacognition is intensely personal Schoenbach et al., 1999). In these classrooms, “its cool to be confused!” (p. 55).

This understanding of metacognitive collaboration is supported by Gee’s (2001) conception of the classroom as a site where multiple discourses, or socially defined identities come together and “speak” to one another through students. According to Gee (2001), the metacognitive conversation espoused by Schoenbach et al., (1999) would be incredibly personal as it reveals our “discourses:” the way one uniquely uses language, thinking, and acting to identify themselves. These “discourses” are distinguished from the simple act of communicating, and are a predisposed way of understanding and identifying oneself in the world (Gee, 2001). Metacognition, when done in collaboration, allows these “discourses” to be made explicit. Students are then able to then not only learn the “discourse” they have acquired, but the “discourses” which operate around them. This would allow students the opportunity to learn to articulate the lens in which they view the world, but also learn from their peers about the multiple ways people make meaning; ideally expanding, challenging, and deeping one’s comprehension of texts and the world.

Goos, Galbraith and Renshaw (2002) also discuss the social aspect of metacognition in their study, *Socially mediated metacognition: creating collaborative zones of proximal*
development in small group problem solving. They reconceptualize metacognition as a social practice, where students are organized into groups based on their similar zone of proximinal development (ZPD) (Goos et al., 2002). Through discussion and collaboration, the students worked towards improving their problem solving ability (Goos et al., 2002). While this study is situated within a mathematics classroom, their approach to metacognition can be readily applied to an English classroom. This study also offers a metacognitive framework to interpret how peer collaboration can develop metacognitive ability as well as content skills. To demonstrate their metacognitive knowledge, students comment in peer discussions, where their remarks are classified into three categories: self-disclosure, feedback request, and other monitoring (Goos et al., 2002, p. 199). Self-disclosure statements are self-orientated statements that clarify, elaborate, evaluate, and justify one’s own thinking while feedback requests are self-orientated questions that invite a partner to critique one’s own thinking (Goos et al., 2002). Other-monitoring are statements about peers that represent an attempt to understand a partner’s thinking (Goos et al., 2002). Using a mixture of these three approaches in a collaborative environment allows students to not only flush out and verbalize their own thought processes, but also critique others and thereby reevaluate their own thinking. Socially mediated metacognition is an important way for students to discuss and evaluate their reading ability in the English classroom and to develop metacognitive awareness and control.

**Proposed Metacognitive Strategies**

While the majority of scholarship points towards the necessity of teaching metacognitive strategies, few offer a tangible approach for classroom implementation. As previously mentioned, Schoenbach et al. (1999) offer a rare framework for conceptualizing metacognition in
the classroom. The focus on metacognitive conversation is actualized through the strategies of silent sustained reading, where students are given instructional time to read and reciprocal teaching where the teachers and students engage in a dialogue which questions, clarifies, summarizes and predicts the texts they were previously reading. This is also accompanied by various written assignments, including learning logs, double-entry journals, letters and essays (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 52).

Joseph (2009) agrees with Schoenbach et al., (1999) that one of the central instructional strategies for developing metacognitive awareness is reciprocal teaching. Joseph (2009) explains this process as one where students must generate questions based on the text, clarify misunderstandings, summarize and predict the content of the next section of text. Teachers would instruct the type of thinking required for each strategy and would encourage students to support each other and move independently through the steps of questioning, clarifying, summarizing and predicting (Joseph, 2009).

Veenman et al., (2006) in their study on methodological considerations of metacognition and learning offers three fundamental principles of metacognitive instruction: metacognitive instruction must be embedded in content to ensure connectivity, informing learners about the usefulness of metacognitive activity, and prolonged teaching to maintain the application of metacognition (p. 9). Simply, the authors refer to these principles as the WWW&H rule: What to do, when, why and how (Veenman et al., 2006).

Another proposed strategy was developed by Taffy Raphael in order to clarify how students can approach the task of reading texts and answering questions (2007). The framework entitled QAR (Question, Answer, Relationship) prompts students to provide a metacognitive relationship for how and why they offer the answers that they do. Designed to teach children
how to seek answers to questions, it relies heavily upon accessing previous knowledge and seeking context clues. Most commonly used in primary and junior grades, this framework can be modified for the secondary English classroom by proposing more difficult questions and by using more sophisticated texts.

Ultimately, the existing research on metacognitive strategies is limited, but strongly points towards the effectiveness of teaching metacognition for increased comprehension ability. This places the onus on the classroom teacher to familiarize themselves with metacognition and how to best teach metacognitive strategies in their classroom. This research project will further investigate strategies that are effective for teaching metacognition and improving student comprehension.
Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY

This research study investigates how teachers can use metacognitive strategies in high school English classrooms to increase students’ self-awareness as readers. As a qualitative study, it aims to find practical suggestions that can be utilized in teacher practice. This study was conducted by collecting a survey of current literature, interviewing two secondary teachers, and analyzing this data to uncover significant themes and trends. The following chapter will outline each stage of the research process and the limitations of this study.

Procedure

Literature review.

The literature review was conducted prior to the data collection in order to gain relevant background knowledge and familiarize myself with the current themes and controversies surrounding metacognition. The limited research on metacognitive strategies for reading, and metacognition in the English classroom prompted an examination of a broad survey of literature looking at metacognition’s role in cognitive psychology as well as metacognition’s role in other educational contexts such as additional subjects or grade levels. The majority of sources were found in edited texts on metacognition as well as peer-reviewed academic journals. Other literature included practical frameworks written by research practitioners. The literature has been organized into prominent themes within the metacognitive discourse by looking for areas of repetition and contention between the sources.

Instruments of data collection.

Data was collected through two semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with two high school English teachers. Face-to-face interviews of experienced teachers were used for my data collection because interviewing would allow me to best access the teachers’ beliefs and rationale
for their practice, as well as the current strategies they employ. For my study, it was imperative to understand what strategies the teachers used in the classroom and to understand how and why these strategies are effective. Only by gaining this knowledge, can I effectively evaluate current practice and create a set of recommendations for future use.

For each of my interviews, we scheduled a private meeting in a quiet location to facilitate conversation. Each interview was tape-recorded with my participants’ consent. I framed my interviews as a conversation with my participants in order to create an open and honest dialogue. I wanted to focus on my interviewee’s beliefs and attitudes and an informal and friendly attitude was essential for eliciting frankness and honesty.

When crafting my interview questions, I maintained my conversational approach and intentionally organized my questions with a logical flow and natural progression. I organized my questions into four themes to facilitate conversation as well as to assist in the transcription process. These themes also correlated with my research questions: background information, teacher practice, beliefs and values, and next steps. I strived to balance substantive questions, on teaching practice, with theoretical questions, on beliefs and values. The majority of my questions were open-ended and concerned with process and meaning, rather than cause and effect, for instance: “Have you encountered any difficulties in implementing metacognition? Including planning, execution, and evaluation; Do your students recognize, or understand what metacognition is? If possible, please give an example?” While I closely followed the predetermined order for the majority of my interview questions, I allowed the opportunity to elaborate on certain questions or clarify interesting points. Conversely, I also omitted questions I felt had been previously covered.
Preceding the interview, I restated my research question, sub-questions, and also my four organizational themes. I reiterated that I wanted the interview to be a conversation on the topic and that I would interact with their responses. I also explained that they could ask further questions, especially if they were unclear about a specific question or topic.

**Data analysis.**

I began data analysis by typing a verbatim transcription with the free online software Audacity. I used this software strictly to slow down the speed of the audio. Afterwards, I listened to the original recording multiple times to check and maintain veracity. I then read and reread the transcribed data in hard copy and began underlining common trends in the form of practices and beliefs that were relevant to my research questions. I also kept a separate set of notes where I made remarks on insightful quotes or possible connections. After noting these trends, I compared the data with the literature review looking for areas of agreement and dissonance. Ultimately, findings from both interviews could be organized under a set of four themes, which correlated with the literature review. A discussion of these findings, as well as their implications for professional practice can be found in Chapter 4 (Findings) and Chapter 5 (Discussion).

**Participants.**

For my study, I interviewed two female participants who are both currently teaching secondary English in Toronto. Both teachers have taught more than ten years in the independent school system. These participants were selected because they stated that metacognition is a deliberate and valuable aspect of their pedagogy. These teachers were well versed in the Ontario English curriculum and its requirements.
Ethical Review Procedures

To ensure the privacy of my participants, I kept all correspondence and our meetings private. I provided a letter of consent and reviewed the terms of our agreement before meeting for the interview. I asked if the participant had any questions or concerns with the letter, and reviewed it with them. I told them that they have a right to withdraw and that I could provide them with a copy of the transcripts and final project. I also ensured that the participant was given a copy for their records. Each of my participants was given a pseudonym that employs a generic name. Anonymity is assured, as no one other than myself knows the original names of my participants and all names and institutions were removed from my transcripts.

Limitations

The primary limitation of my study is the small sample size of my interviews. Furthermore that both my participants are female, and teach in the independent board could impact their responses. Despite the narrow scope necessitated by a study looking for specific metacognitive strategies, this research can still inform various classroom practice and further research. There are also several limitations inherent with my approach to qualitative research. Firstly, my emphasis on conversation does not allow each interview to be consistent and thereby elicited a different set of answers from each participants. Also, only interviewing each teacher once affects the reliability of my research as I did not conduct interviews with students, focus groups or perform other forms of data collection. Consequently, the study is limited in its scope as it is only able to address what the teachers have been able to observe and not what the students themselves have experienced.
Chapter 4: FINDINGS

During the qualitative interviews with my two participants, Alex and Jaime, many themes were discussed regarding effective metacognitive strategies, and their implications for the secondary English classroom. While discussing their best practices, beliefs and values, and questions and concerns regarding metacognition, the two teachers provided significant insights that both substantiate current research and introduce new possible directions. I will be organizing these findings into four themes: Defining Metacognition and its Role in the English classroom, Positioning and Implementing Metacognitive Strategies, Curriculum Expectations, and Student Perceptions.

Defining Metacognition and its Role in the English Classroom

A debate surrounding a concise and comprehensive definition of metacognition is currently being waged in scholarship, and this ambiguity of definition is also reflected in current teacher beliefs and practices. While both of my participants have a basic knowledge of metacognition, their vision for how metacognitive strategies should operate in the classroom was representative of their definitions and understandings of metacognition.

Does vision equal actualization?

When asked to define metacognition, my first participant, Alex, simply responded, “thinking about thinking—in order to get students to improve.” Although this definition acknowledges the crux of metacognitive thinking, it overlooks the nuances evident in current academic research (Kaplan, 2008; Snyder, 2011). My second participant Jaime elaborated upon her definition, using many rich metaphors to convey her thinking. She articulated a similar definition to Alex’s, arguing that metacognition is, “like seeing yourself in a mirror.” She then
supplemented this understanding with explaining how metacognition is what differentiates humans from animals: “It’s not just I can pick up the acorn, it’s I know I’m picking up the acorn, and what did I do with the acorn? Did I eat it, did I store it, or did I go back to it later?” This sequential questioning parallels the process of questioning one’s thinking that is inherent in sophisticated metacognitive thinking.

The definitions each of the participants proposed directly parallels their subsequent responses over the course of their respective interviews. This implies that an educator’s vision of metacognition is crucial as it directly affects the ways in which metacognition is manifested in the classroom. Indeed, all practices have underlying beliefs and theories. In keeping with her definition, Alex focused predominantly on metacognition as a skill that students can use to reflect on their work in order to improve. Whereas Jaime viewed metacognition as a questioning and instructional strategy very much like the series of metaphorical questions she included in her definition.

Jaime further reinforced the significance of defining metacognition later in the interview, when expressing that a central difficulty with metacognition is not that it is new, but that it is viewed as unclear; a “mythical beast”: “[Metacognition] hasn’t been pulled out the fabric much. Now that you’re pulling it out, let’s make sure everyone has the same threads.” This is a salient point, as a greater understanding of metacognition could be achieved, if the “mythical beast” was demystified. This is particularly relevant if ones’ definition is directly connected to classroom practice.

While Jaime emphasizes the need for everyone to have “the same threads,” it is interesting to consider whether it is more important for everyone to have the same “threads”, or to just understand the “beast.” Both my participants had different definitions of metacognition,
yet they believed they employed strategies effectively. What is illuminated in the importance of having a clear conception of metacognition is how it will guide strategies are actualized in the classroom. To begin thinking about the use of metacognition in the classroom, an educator must begin with a clear vision, or definition, of metacognition that will guide their practice.

**Role of metacognition in the English classroom: fighting the “myths” of English.**

As previously mentioned, the participants had a different conceptualization of metacognition and this affected how they viewed the role of metacognition in the English classroom. Despite these differences, some similarities emerged, specifically, the importance of “consciousness” and allowing students to become more aware of their own thinking and learning. But most prominently, metacognition emerged in the interviews as a skill that students can use to make their own meaning from text, and prompt deeper comprehension.

Alex clearly articulated that she believed the role of metacognition was to try to get students to improve. She cites the feeling of frustration that students frequently experienced in English class where they can’t seem to “push through” or “achieve what they feel they are capable of.” She explains that there is something about English class specifically that makes students feel like their marks are subjective, and moreover that they do not understand where meaning comes from. Alex describes understanding sophisticated texts in English class as a, “mystical alchemy.” Jaime echoes these sentiments when referencing how students create “myths” around their writing. They experience difficulties “replicating” their work, and attribute success to ‘myths’ like working last minute, and then if their, “initial foray into not working under the gun falls apart, the myth gets bigger.” To counteract these claims, each educator attributes metacognition as a possible solution to the feeling of uncertainty in literacy, but they do so in different ways.
Alex again, explains metacognition as a way for students to become, “super conscious about what they’re doing, so they can change their results” and as a way to, “pay close attention to their own practice and the feedback [from teachers].” For Alex, metacognition’s role in English is to reflect upon assessments or assignments and to then work to improve. Jaime was also concerned with students becoming more conscious of what they are doing, but emphasized *teaching* metacognitive strategies and skills that will lead to improvement.

The use of the word “consciousness,” by both of the participants is particularly interesting as it is used to describe paying attention and being thoughtful. Their use of consciousness also implies that students are not regularly “conscious.” Jaime quips later in the interview that she frequently jokes with her students, asking if any of them had read the text at all during discussion, and claiming that students frequently can read, but not understand a word on the page. To what extent are metacognitive strategies just vehicles that allow teachers to see students’ thoughts, and in what ways do they have the possibility to prompt student inquiry?

While it is difficult to truly gauge student “consciousness,” Jaime also explicitly uses metacognitive strategies to teach her students to mobilize meaning in text. She predicated her discussion of the role of metacognition in the English classroom by condemning the practice of teaching texts like “icons,” where there are certain facts every student must glean from the novel in order to understand it. Jaime believes that this teaches students that they cannot think on their own:

[sarcastically] Only when I unveil it, can you understand the wonder of this work! It’s so easy sometimes, or we’re in danger of teaching, I want you to know these things about this novel as opposed to, this is the way you pry open anything, and if you teach them that, then they’ve got a skill.

It is this focus on skills, or strategies that most concerns Jaime, as she uses metacognition as a way to enable students to negotiate strategies to access multiple texts. The “strategies” that Jaime
references are the use of formal literary theory like feminist, Marxist, and reader-response theory, as well as reading strategies like inference, predicting, and summarizing. These forms of analysis ask students to explicitly state the ways in which they read text and the interrupt the assumptions they make by filtering information through multiple lenses. These frameworks require an explicit analysis of ones’ thinking, and a cognitive deftness that only comes with being conscious of ones thought process. Deborah Appleman, explains in her text, *Critical Encounters in High School English: Teaching literary theory to adolescents*, (2009) how literary theories provide lenses that, “sharpen one’s vision and provide alternate ways of seeing” (p.4). Moreover, literary theory, “recontextualizes the familiar, making us reappraise [these assumptions]” (Appleman, 2009, p.4). This reappraisal of the familiar is what allows literary theory to be metacognitive, as it requires students to critically analyze the ways in which they are accustomed to thinking. Looking at theory allows students to, “realize what we are really doing when we study literature” (Appleman, 2009, p.5).

By offering students these strategies, Jaime wants to give students skills that they can transfer to different works, media forms, such as movies or comic books, as well as in their daily lives. Appleman supports this assertion arguing that after understanding the beliefs which shape their own worldview, they can apply this understanding to other situations in order to evaluate the perspectives of others (Appleman, 2009). Furthermore, Jaime’s perspective aligns with Schoenbach et al., (1999) which states that metacognition will grant students a strong reader identity before leaving school, where they will be required to read more challenging texts, or enter the workforce. Developing students’ metacognitive awareness through literary frameworks, provides students with an ability they can continue use to be critical and thoughtful world citizens.
While both my participants cite metaocognitions potential for making their students more “conscious,” this increased thoughtfulness may actually be an articulated response signifying deeper comprehension. Perhaps students may seem “tuned-out” because they are unable to engage with the texts, and metacognition provides a way for students to discover meaning on their own.

**Positioning and Implementing Metacognitive Strategies**

When examining how to incorporate metacognitive strategies in the classroom, the practical considerations of what these “look” like in the classroom is paramount. The participants offer multiple findings regarding where and when metacognition should be placed, with what organization of students, as well as specific strategies found to be effective. What emerges is an emphasis not on specific temporal placement, but on the ability to integrate metacognition thoroughly in content and frequently enough to develop continued practice. This research also positions the classroom as a fertile environment for developing deep and valuable metacognitive conversations, and suggests effective collaborative metacognitive strategies.

**Placement of metacognition in instruction: Does where matter?**

A current academic discussion is being waged on the extent to which metacognition should be incorporated into the English classroom, and how best to do so. When asking my participants where they placed metacognition in instruction, their two responses followed their initial conceptions of the role of metacognition. Alex responded that she only used metacognition at the beginning and end of any assessment. Interestingly, she expressed a desire to incorporate metacognition in a, “routine, daily way,” but she exclaimed, “she had no idea how to do that”.

Jaime was confident that she incorporated metacognition into each of her classes. She stated that she frequently embeds metacognition at the beginning and the end of each class by
asking questions as a class about the material. For instance: “what were your initial responses?; why did you respond that way about a certain event?; what in the text led to these assumptions?”

At the end of the class, or for homework, Jaime often asks the students to create a “key question” about the material they studied, or reflect further on information they read the night before: “So what did you think about it now that you’ve had 12 hours since you thought about it? Do you think the same thing? Why or why not? “ Jaime’s strategy to bookend instruction with metacognitive questions and prompts is instructive as it provides an achievable way to allow students to reflect upon their own thinking. This practice works to support Mokharti and Reichard’s (2002) research that claims that teachers must work to make conscious their own reading process for students who may not even know they exist. Jaime asserts, even as a new teacher figuring these things out, [metacognition is] so integral to the way I read, its’ always been there one-way or another. By making explicit the ways in which she makes meaning from text, and sharing it with the students, Jaime aims to teach students that there is no point in reading, if, “you’re not thinking about what you’re reading.”

The trend that emerges from each of my participants is that metacognitive instruction should be consistent and frequent, so that the instruction gives students prolonged practice. This is consistent with one of Veenman et al.’s (2006) three fundamental principles of metacognitive instruction, which is that it must be consistently embedded, so it becomes familiar, and students have the understanding to begin to do it independently. These findings suggest that the exact placement of metacognition instruction is not as significant as the metacognitive process being treated as a meaningful and frequent part of the classroom routine.
Metacognition and collaboration.

Another trend that emerged through discussion with my participants is the relationship between metacognition and the social environment of the classroom. Significantly, current research is also beginning to analyze the potential of collaboration for metacognitive development. Within academic research, metacognition has typically been positioned as a solitary endeavour, but Schoenbach et al., (1999) challenge this assumption with their central thesis, which claims that “metacognitive conversation,” should be central to learning to read. My two participants unknowingly echo these sentiments, as they both found that metacognition was more effective when the students had the chance to discuss and work together.

Alex, when speaking of how the students communicate with one another expresses how metacognition changes the “culture” of the class: “when the students are into it, it’s part of the culture, and it is effective…we’ve shared an experience, we’ve all been reading the same text, and then brought it together, our understanding.” This explanation, touches upon how students feel when they are given an opportunity to share what they are thinking, and then are encouraged to build upon these understandings with their peers. This example parallels the social aspects of reading articulated by Bloome (1985) and expanded on by Gee (2001) who makes the case that language has no meaning outside of a social context. The understanding of metacognition as a social process is a significant departure from the view of metacognition that regards individuals as, “brains in boxes,” where metacognitive thinking is primarily an independent process. Alex’s use of “our” was particularly meaningful, as it embodies the idea that metacognition constructed within a group moves the discussion from you and me, to “our.” It is this idea of shared understandings that advances metacognitive ability and leads to deeper, more substantive comprehension.
Jaime cited the same feeling in her interview: “Do you ever notice how students do that? ‘Oh my God, I do this!’ ‘Oh my God I do that too!’ All of a sudden there is strand there, that was always there, but its only visible because of the conversation. If you remain in your journal [referring to solitary metacognitive activities] you never get further than you alone.” Jaime frequently referenced the belief that students can achieve more as a group, than on their own, and privileges the thinking of a group over the thinking of one student. This is particularly evident in her activity where she “constructs a perfect reader:”

What does the perfect grade 11 reader think? That person is formed from the knowledge everyone at the table has. As a collective, you know everything about the novel, or close to everything. You are the perfect reader with everyone around the table.

This collective environment, or knowledge community, not only privileges the individual thoughts that each student has, but also supports their weaknesses. Through metacognitive collaboration, students can validate their own thinking as well as prompt further inquiry in others and themselves.

**Specific strategies.**

Continuing with the theme of collaboration, the specific strategies both teachers referenced were predominantly activities done in groups, or in class discussion. For Alex, the specific strategy she favoured was peer editing. She believed the students engaged in a high degree of metacognitive conversation when discussing each other’s work: “how I approached it, how you approached it, what were your strengths, what were mine?” Alex felt this was beneficial for not only improving student work but making students think further about their ideas than self-assessment, or having to answer these metacognitive prompts independently.
The strategies that Jaime uses most frequently in her classroom are literary frameworks and critical theories. In our discussion, she references Northrop Frye’s Four Locations, and how she teaches students to analyze their thinking by learning to apply and view texts through multiple critical lenses:

I also like to bring in strategies for reading and do that explicitly. You have this much information; you don’t know what to do with these characters, how are we going to interpret it? Let’s take this framework, let’s take Frye’s four locations. If you’re going to do that, what happens to this novel, what do you see, what’s pulled out?

Jaime believes that frameworks are a key piece to metacognition; the practice of bringing an external set of ideas to a text to create meaning teaches students a skill that can be applied both in and out of the classroom. Frameworks develop students’ ability to monitor why you think the way you do about texts. This allows students to engage in a dialogue with texts, creating greater self-awareness and a strong reader identity.

Jaime has created a “9 patch” chart of literary theories that includes frameworks like reader-response, feminist, Marxist, and Freudian. By giving her students these resources, she allows them to choose which one works best for them, or to use multiple theories and compare the results. This practice is reiterated in Appleman, as studying theory not only helps you discover elements of your own ideology, but being able to evaluate different theories means, “no authority can impose a truth on you in a dogmatic way” (Bonnycastle, 1996, In Appleman, 2009, p.4). This is a strong testament to how metacognitive awareness allows students to create their own understandings from text.

To use this strategy collaboratively, Jaime employs a discussion-based classroom, where the students are seated around one table and openly discuss with each other about their assumptions and thinking. She also uses various groupings either based on ability or a mix of
abilities to analyze and interpret sections of text using different literary theories. This is similar to Goos, Galbraith and Renshaw’s (2002) study regarding collaborative zones of proximal development, which promotes students working in mixed ability groupings in order to develop stronger metacognitive knowledge, but Jaime does not believe in just grouping students of the same ability. She thinks it is valuable to structure opportunities for stronger students to teach to weaker students, and weaker students to learn from their peers.

Another strategy that Jaime found successful was collaborative reading that focused specifically on reading strategies, like predicting and inference. She scaffolds instruction that gradually transfers responsibility to the students. This establishes the reciprocal teaching relationship which Schoenbach et al., (1999) supports in their research: “So if I’m reading a short story with them, and I stop at these points to ask them to predict and so forth, the next short story, then their job is to as a class, stop me when I ought to stop.”

Alex’s reading instruction is also centered around collaboration and group work. Her favourite strategy is based on the Jewish tradition of Hevruta, which places students in partnerships where they break down small segments of text and focus on close textual analysis. The partners share their thinking with one another, and reflect on why they have certain understandings of the text. These mutually created understandings are then shared with the entire class. Alex also uses the practice of annotating text as a metacognitive reading strategy. By providing handouts of sections of text or poetry, her students are required to write commentary on why certain elements are significant and identify poetic and literary devices. This practice very clearly makes the reading process explicit, and requires students be conscious of how they think about a text.
The final strategy uncovered in discussion with my participants was Jaime’s use of “flying note cards.” She uses note cards for students to record any questions or key understandings they may have made during a class, and collects them everyday. She keeps a file of each student’s cards, and then gives them back before an assessment, so they can see how their thinking has developed over time. She maintains that this is the best way for students to reflect on their own work because it is “ephemeral.” Jaime contends that typical reflection in journals, “makes students very uncomfortable” because they feel that they must always “say something profound” and it resembles more typical assessments.

Many of these strategies currently take place in classrooms and are employed for various purposes, but what makes them metacognitive is the level of introspection and analysis the students must undertake to be successful. By using metacognitive strategies in collaboration, both my participants cited a benefit for the classroom community their students’ metacognitive ability. Interestingly, all of these strategies require the student to explicitly communicate their thinking to others, which privileges a certain type of learner and classroom. But they also are very student-centered and place the onus on the student in investigating and looking for meaning. Jaime evocatively states: “you have to let them have some autonomy in their thinking, otherwise they don’t think their thinking is worth thinking.” By developing metacognitive ability, we begin to privilege students’ thinking and grant them the autonomy where they can begin to see themselves as critical readers with the power to uncover meaning in multiple texts.

**Curriculum Expectations**

The Ontario English curriculum offers teachers a set of guidelines and expectations to implement metacognition in the classroom, but these recent additions to the curriculum are not
comprehensive and are quite vague. Both participants commented on the current curriculum expectations and discussed its shortcomings. While both participants felt that the descriptions of metacognitive activities were, “quite general,” they did not think they were more vague than the other curriculum expectations, for instance those for reading or oral communication. The problem then lies in the reality that metacognition, as Jaime states, is, “not deeply enough embedded in the consciousness’ of teachers, that the way it’s placed in there, is going to mean something, or the same thing to everyone.” Alex similarly found the expectations unhelpful, especially if the teacher does not have any previous knowledge of metacognition, or metacognitive strategies.

The participants found the recommended strategies problematic. For instance, the curriculum suggests that you perform a reflective activity such as journaling, or portfolios at the end of each unit to gauge ones’ strengths and weaknesses. Jaime’s concern is that this strategy is concerned with too much material: “you have just done a whole series of activities around this novel. Unless you are a very good teacher, can you tie them together so well to evaluate all in one?” This perspective is substantiated in scholarship of Veenman et al., (2006) which asserts that metacognition should become a daily, continued practice by embedding it in content, and exposing students to a prolonged training to maintain its application. Furthermore, how can a student substantially evaluate their thinking about so many activities, so long after the fact? When reflecting upon a whole unit, activities and thoughts become muddled, which may explain students’ hesitancy to do these activities, and also why they find these activities redundant.

**Student Perceptions: What is “buy in?”**

When asked to reflect upon student perceptions of metacognition and the reception of “metacognitive activities,” both Alex and Jaime spoke of “buy in.” Alex and Jaime felt that their
students initially did not have “buy in,” and for metacognition to work successfully “buy in” is crucial. Both participants used the term “buy in” to relate to student engagement, or how they perceive student engagement. That both teachers used this phrase is significant, as engagement can take on multiple forms. Does this mean that students will just willingly do the activity, or do they find a more intrinsic value in the activity? Furthermore, the notion of “buy in” places metacognition as something that the teachers are trying to sell to the students. This idea is particularly elucidating, as it speaks to the level of uncertainty, and unfamiliarity students have with metacognition. Similar to how the teachers spoke of the curriculum expectations, metacognition has not become embedded in the consciousness of teachers and students enough, to grant it the same legitimacy as other learning skills and strategies. This may make the students skeptical, and places the teachers in the role of “salesperson,” needing to demonstrate and prove why it is so important. This is a significant tension that educators are faced with when attempting to implement metacognitive strategies.

Alex bluntly stated that her students “hate” reflecting on their work because they do not find it immediately gratifying: “they don’t recognize any output or gain from doing it.” Jaime echoed this impression, but felt that by teaching students to think about what they did well, you can create more “buy in.” I think for at least a proportion of the students, it will gain some respect. Especially if you’re careful to come back to that right before they do the next piece [assessment].”

The other factor that the participants argued affected students’ engagement with metacognition, particularly metacognitive reading strategies, is that many students do not have an awareness of their reading ability. Jaime believes that students are more likely now to read a great deal, especially outside the classroom, but lack the ability to truly understand what they are
reading in school. This argument is echoed in Lawrence et al., (2009) whose NCTE study found
that due to the emergent “new literacies,” and lack of reading strategies taught at the secondary
level, texts seem foreign and difficult to understand. Jaime credits these difficulties to the current
structure of English classes where students aren’t typically granted enough autonomy in their
thinking, and as a result, become used to receiving themes and importance from their teachers.
To be able to become critical, thoughtful readers, educators must explicitly structure
opportunities to teach students how to evaluate meaning in multiple texts, without relying on
outside perspectives, whether it be the teacher or the internet.

The findings reveal that the teachers perceive students to be “weak” at employing
metacognitive thinking, and that students are reluctant to employ metacognitive strategies. What
implications do these assumptions regarding student ability have for the ways teachers present
and implement metacognition in the classroom? This dearth of metacognitive understanding and
student aversion to using metacognition presents a challenge for the classroom educator. In what
ways can metacognition become relevant and valuable to the student beyond surface “buy in?”
Chapter 5: DISCUSSION

Current scholarship confirms the significance of metacognition in the high school English classroom for developing thoughtful, critical readers. Yet a gap still exists between these beliefs and classroom implementation, because teachers lack a clear vision of what metacognition should look like and what strategies can be used to develop comprehension and strong reader identities. The findings extrapolated from the interviews of two exemplary high school teachers, not only illustrated current tensions, but offered useful implications for educators to successfully integrate metacognitive strategies in the high school English classroom.

The Power of Definition

To use metacognition effectively, these findings suggest that at a foundational level, the educator must have a clear definition of what metacognition means to them and to their classroom. Both of my participants had a vision of what metacognition entailed, and these conceptualizations were clearly aligned with the way metacognition was approached and utilized in their classrooms. As Alex believed metacognition is predominately an evaluative activity, she focused on metacognitive strategies like peer editing, and reflections before and after assessments. Conversely, Jaime believed metacognition was an instructional strategy and a skill that could improve students reading. In Jaime’s classroom, metacognition was ongoing and embedded into daily lessons and reading activities.

While these two definitions capture different elements of metacognition, they maintain the fundamental principles discussed in research; that metacognition is an explicit, embedded
and ongoing process whereby both the teacher and student are actively discussing not only what they think, but also how they think (Schoenbach et al., 1999; Veenman, 2006).

Usefulness of Curriculum

Despite their ability to articulate metacognition in a meaningful way for their own practice, both educators argued that their initial challenge with implementing metacognition was finding a clear definition of what it was, and what was expected of them. The lack of clarity around metacognition and expectations for the classroom illustrates the secondary objective of this study, which is to analyze the usefulness of the current curriculum expectations. Both participants found the curriculum guidelines for metacognition unhelpful in guiding their practice. While the expectations are no more vague than the expectations for other strands, the lack of a common understanding regarding metacognition means that the curriculum offers little to no assistance to teachers who may be unclear or unsure of metacognition to begin with.

An additional element of the curriculum expectations that was found problematic by the participants is that many of the strategies recommended are not optimal for helping students who struggle using metacognitive strategies in classrooms. Many of the suggestions require students to reflect upon a large section of curriculum, such as a unit, or group of assessments, which makes deep introspection difficult and ineffective. The participants also found that the current curriculum expectations positioned all metacognitive tasks to be done in isolation, or independently, with the students relying solely upon their own thought processes. These independent strategies fail to offer support for students who do not possess a strong understanding of metacognition, and also offers no possibility to learn from the practices and thoughts of their peers. This is problematic as my participants and current scholarship, agree
that students are not only more engaged in collaborative metacognitive activities, but that these activities are more effective for learning and development. This gap in understanding indicates that further support is required for teachers to effectively implement metacognition in the classroom.

**Beyond “Buy In”**

Another prominent trend among my participants when discussing metacognitive strategies was the issue of student engagement referred to as, “buy in.” This phrasing is significant as it illustrates the current climate of metacognition in the classroom, where the teacher is the “salesperson” and the student is the reluctant consumer. Current scholarship clearly articulates that for metacognition to be useful and meaningful for students it must be made explicit—so the students know exactly why and when they are doing something metacognitive. Schoenbach et al., (1999) explain this claim, as students need to be cognizant of strategies and why they are performing said strategies in order to continue to apply them in the future. To reach a state of meaningful introspection, students need to find merit and derive significance from classroom activities. In order for students to find intrinsic value in metacognitive tasks, the approach of Schoenbach et al., (1999) and other practitioners needs to be considered. A shift needs to be made in student perception towards metacognition. Students need to be able to explain the importance of metacognition and through this explanation, accept it as an integral part of reading and understanding.
Metacognition to Make Meaning

The findings suggest that the significance of metacognition in the English classroom lies in its ability to support students in reaching a level of self-confidence wherein they identify themselves as strong readers and where they feel empowered to make their own meaning from text. Both my participants discussed how metacognition helps students become stronger English students, in particular, improving their reader identities or ability to understand the ways they interpret texts and their strengths and weaknesses. Jaime addressed this issue by speaking of the “myths” of English, including the notion that each text is an icon, where there is a specific set of themes or issues of importance you must glean, in order to “know it.” The dominant trend in English instruction is that teachers teach and provide these themes for their students, and test their students on their subsequent knowledge of these themes rather than teaching their students how to find these ideas on their own (Lawrence et al., 2009). Jaime refutes this practice, and believes that metacognition empowers students to begin to read texts in order to discover this meaning on their own. Similarly, Alex finds that metacognitive reading strategies remove the subjectivity from English. She notes that students frequently wonder how people figure out what major symbols or motifs are, and metacognitive reading is a way to say to the students, “you can do it too.” In order for students to become strong readers, they must be able to make critical evaluations, and understand the rationale behind those evaluations. It is this skill that allows them to adequately address the sophisticated texts encountered in high school, and university and also apply these understandings to interpret a variety of texts through their lives.
A Community of Collaboration

One of the most prominent findings from the interviews was the important role collaboration played in successful metacognitive activities. Both participants found that when students worked in pairs, or discussed literature as a class, they were more engaged and participated in deeper metacognitive conversations and questioning than when working alone. This aligns with a current trend in research that is examining how the classroom as a social space contributes to metacognitive ability. This exposure to others’ metacognitive thinking further develops ones’ critical ability, as you can learn alternate ways of thinking and analyzing. Both teachers spoke about how metacognitive discussions created a culture, or community in the classroom, where students felt encouraged to take risks and make critical judgements because their peers were frequently experiencing similar difficulties. Jaime strategically incorporates metacognitive conversation in her classes by making the assertion that even though the student may not be the perfect reader, around the table in her classroom, everyone together is able to create the perfect reader. The belief that as a class, students can work through any text is powerful, and reinforces how in metacognitive conversation, students are given the skill to form rich conclusions and understandings.

When interpreting these findings through Gee’s (2001) understanding of literacy, metacognition can be viewed as a valuable way to make explicit the multiple discourses that are operating in the classroom, and to begin to make students aware of how language, thinking and acting are socially mediated. Not only can students begin to see how their understandings of texts differ and are thereby informed by a certain set of beliefs and values, but they can see how these are challenged or supported by their peers. This will allow students to extend their thinking beyond English texts, and give them the skills to be able to interpret the discourses which operate
in the world around them, especially after having a heightened knowledge of one’s own perspectives.

**Metacognitive Strategies**

The power of collaboration is evident when evaluating the metacognitive reading strategies discussed by the participants. The success of these strategies is that they incorporate a high level of classroom discussion, or group work, where the teacher and students both clearly articulate their metacognitive knowledge and work together to build upon these understandings. The participants found these strategies used metacognitive ability to build students self-awareness and identities as readers.

The most thorough metacognitive strategy proposed was the use of multiple literary theories. Jaime created a “9 patch” grid of prominent literary theories, for instance feminist, reader-response, and Marxist theory. Jaime teaches each of these lenses, and then structures opportunities for students to choose whichever lens they prefer, or decide which is the best for certain texts. Discussion over these decisions is a large component of her metacognitive framework as it not only prompts students to think about the ways in which they view text, but why they favour certain ways of understanding over others, and so on. Jaime finds these strategies integral for developing metacognition, because they force students to be conscious of the rationale behind their assumptions, and to think critically in a variety of different ways that can simultaneously be applied to the world around them.

Another integral strategy for metacognitive thinking was the explicit instruction of reading strategies such as inference, prediction, summarizing, or finding textual clues. By modeling these reading strategies, students can learn how to effectively read, and mobilize these
strategies as the difficulty of texts increase throughout high school. The participants frequently used these strategies in discussion, or in group conferences, where the students discussed how they read and compared with one another.

The strategy of annotating textual passages was another favourite of my participants. This strategy prompts the student to actively dialogue with a text by responding to questions that arise while reading, and documenting one’s thinking as one reads. This is an illuminating experience for students, especially when these understandings are shared and developed in collaboration. Similarly, the participants employed the practice of Hevruta, based on the practice of Jewish scholarly close reading, where students were put into partnerships or small groups and intensively interrogated sections of text or a certain idea. This activity not only engages metacognitive thinking, but also allows students to understand how different people can come to different conclusions in a straightforward and accessible manner.

Another effective strategy cited was collaborative reading employed in tandem with reciprocal teaching. To gauge student thinking, the participants asked metacognitive question prompts in discussion and then worked to have students ask and begin to replicate the questions on their own. A strategy Jaime uses is a gradual release of responsibility, where she begins asking the class questions and then expects the students to eventually adopt this responsibility. Another way to implement metacognitive instruction in a collaborative environment is the strategy Jaime calls, “flying note cards” where students are instructed to write down either challenges or successes they encountered in their reading. These cards are retained, and then returned to the students before major assessments, and the students can see how their thinking has developed or changed over the course of the unit. This strategy can also be used to address
content. For instance, to analyze how impressions of characters change throughout a text or to predict events.

The ability to monitor and analyze your own thinking is vital to comprehension. In order to fully understand texts, you must have an understanding of your own thinking and biases as they directly impact how you form your beliefs. By teaching metacognitive strategies, students begin to have a greater awareness of themselves as a reader, but also in learning to understand how their thinking is shaped. This greater “consciousness,” is a key skill for learning to read more sophisticated texts as well as reading the “discourses” that operate in the world around you (Gee, 2001). Through this study, important considerations have emerged that will assist educators in effectively using metacognitive strategies in the classroom.

The importance of having an intentional, comprehensive definition of and vision for metacognition is essential for its implementation. This vision will guide the extent and the types of metacognitive strategies that are used. Currently, the Ministry does not provide clear expectations to support teachers in this process, prompting this investigation to recommend successful strategies in order to foster metacognitive reading ability. An enduring trend is the importance of collaboration. By sharing ones’ thoughts about a text, and also the rationale or strategies used to formulate those thoughts, this metacognitive collaboration supports and extends an entire class’ thinking. This collaboration can occur in many different ways, be it a whole class discussions, groups sorted by ability, or mixed ability, or partnerships, but in every case, it is essential for students to be entered into a dialogue where they have the opportunity to not only share what they think, but how they think. Furthermore, teachers must be an integral role in this process, modeling, and sharing their own strategies and methods of reading. Specific
strategies that are useful in collaboration are activities that make thinking explicit, such as using literary theory, text annotations, or discussing particular reading strategies.

To return to Northrop Frye, teachers cannot assume that thinking can be achieved without instruction, “most students need to be taught carefully and patiently.” To successfully integrate metacognition into the high school English classroom, it must be embedded deliberately and explicitly into instruction, and in ways that support a dialogue not only between student and text, but also between all members of the classroom so that students think about their own thinking.

**Implications and Further Study**

Although this study was intended to inform educational practitioners, specifically my own practice, the findings also have broad implications for further research and educational policy. For my own practice, this study has reiterated the importance of having a clear vision of how metacognition should be structured within the classroom. As a teacher, when creating long-term or unit plans, I will be cognizant of integrating these metacognitive strategies into each lesson. By intentionally embedding metacognition into daily instruction, it will become an explicit and integral part of my students reading instruction.

The recommendation of deliberately structuring metacognitive activities also has implications for the broader educational community. English departments need to begin to provide support for teachers who might be unclear of curricular expectations, or unsure how implement metacognitive activities. A greater effort must be taken in schools to provide professional development and resources which address metacognitive thinking in English. Furthermore, it is a topic that should be touched upon in pre-service English education, so
teachers have a basic understanding of metacognition and how it can be used to support reading instruction.

This study also has implications for educational policy, as current Ministry expectations are unclear and limited in their understanding of metacognitive strategies. Furthermore, the expectations predominately address metacognition that evaluates student work, and is done on an individual basis. These expectations should begin to take into consideration collaborative opportunities as well the ability of metacognition to enhance and develop reading ability and comprehension.

The role of metacognition in the English classroom is a rich topic that lends itself well to a wide array of further study. This study has prompted further inquiry into looking at how pre-service programs, or schools can support their teachers in learning how to use metacognition. Moreover, what types of resources are required for teachers to effectively bring metacognition into their classrooms? Another significant area of research would be to look at how students value metacognitive activities. Both my participants reference student engagement, and a study regarding the validity of these teacher assumptions would clarify and consolidate what strategies are useful in the classroom.

Metacognition is predicated on making the invisible, visible. In order for students to make visible their thinking, and develop their own comprehension and reading ability, teachers must begin to make metacognition a visible and explicit part of English instruction. By integrating deliberate, collaborative activities that push students to be conscious of why they think the way they do, students can begin to dialogue with others and learn multiple ways of understanding and making meaning. This practice will enable students to deftly navigate more complex texts as well as the world around them.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LETTER OF CONSENT FOR INTERVIEW

November 15, 2011

Dear Participant,

I am a graduate student at OISE, University of Toronto, and am currently enrolled as a Master of Teaching candidate. As part of my degree requirement, I am studying teaching philosophies and how they relate to teaching practices for the purposes of a graduate research project. As we have discussed, your knowledge, expertise, and experience will provide me with a rich source of information about the beliefs and practices of an excellent teacher.

In order for me to conduct the research with you, I request your permission for the following:

To conduct an interview with you that will take about 45 minutes. It will take place in a private location and will be tape-recorded.

I will arrange for the interview to take place at a time and location that is convenient to you. The interview can take place in any quiet place where we are not likely to be interrupted, such as in an empty room or office in the school, or in a location of your choice.
I will write a report on this study to submit as a research paper to my supervisors. My research supervisor is Rob Simon. I will be pleased to give you a summary of my final research paper. In addition, the transcripts of the recording made of the interview will be available to you to read, if you wish to do so.

Confidentiality. The information you provide will be used for my research project, which will include a final research paper, as well as informal presentations to my classmates and/or potentially at a research conference or publication. I will not use your name or any information that might identify you, your school, colleagues, or any student in my written work, oral presentations, or research paper. This information remains confidential. The only people who will have access to my assignment work will be my research supervisor and my course instructor.

Right to withdraw. If you decide to withdraw from the study, you may do so at any time, up to the submission of the final paper. The tape of our interview will also be erased at the end of the project. There are no known risks or benefits to you for assisting in the project, and I will share with you a copy of my notes to ensure accuracy.

Please sign the attached forms, if you agree to the interview. Return one to me and keep the second copy for your records.

Thank you very much for your help.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher name: Samantha Scheepers
Phone number, email:  905-716-0759, s.scheepers@utoronto.ca

Research Supervisor Name: Rob Simon

Email: rob.simon@utoronto.ca

Consent Form

I acknowledge that the topic of this interview has been explained to me and that any questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can withdraw at any time without penalty.

I have read the letter provided to me by Samantha Scheepers and agree to participate in an interview for the purposes described.

Signature: ________________________________

Name (printed): ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Statement of Intent:
Over the course of this interview, I will be asking you questions related to the use of metacognition in the high-school English classroom and their corresponding curriculum expectations. The questions will be divided into four sections: background information, teacher practices, beliefs and values, and next steps. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Section 1: Background Information

1. What is your educational background?
   a. Which university (ies) did you study at?
   b. Which disciplines did you pursue?
   c. What are your teachables?
   d. Do you have any other experience working with literature, reading, or relating to English outside of the education system?

2. How long have you been teaching?

3. Are you currently teaching an English course? If so, what grades and sections?

4. Have you taught any English courses previously?

5. How long have you been teaching the Ontario English curriculum?

Section 2: Teacher Practices

1. To begin, what is your understanding of metacognition?

2. What do you think is its role in the English classroom?

3. Could you walk me through how you typically execute a novel or literature study? For instance, what is the structure of the activities you use, and in what sequence?
   a. Where do you place metacognition in this process?
   b. Why do you find this placement effective, (or not effective)?
   c. What are the different metacognitive strategies you use, if any?
   d. How do you know if your students are effectively using metacognition?
   e. Do you explicitly teach different reading strategies? Why or why not?

4. Have you ever explicitly taught metacognitive skills in the classroom?
   a. Do your students recognize, or understand what metacognition is? If possible please give an example.
   b. Have you found students to be receptive to metacognitive activities? Why do you think so, or why don’t you think so?

5. Have you observed any difference in student reading comprehension after employing metacognition?
   a. How do you account for these differences?

6. In your experience, do you find the curriculum expectations for metacognition clear?
   a. Do you closely follow these expectations in the classroom?
   b. Have you encountered any difficulties in executing these expectations?
   c. If it were up to you, how would you modify these expectations for classroom implementation?
7. The curriculum documents generally position metacognition to be an individual process (reading logs, journals). Have you ever used metacognition collaboratively as a class? ie discussing different ways to read a text?
   a. If so, was the class receptive?
   b. Could you discern any effect on students reading comprehension?
8. David Bloome describes reading as a social process. Do you agree or disagree? In your classroom, does reading take on a social dimension? What activities are put in place to allow this to happen?
10. What resources have you found useful in helping incorporating metacognition in your classroom?
11. If you could give one piece of advice to other teachers for using metacognition effectively, what would it be?

Section 3: Beliefs and Values

1. Why do you incorporate metacognition in your classroom?
   a. Who or what influenced you to do this?
2. How do you think your students feel about your use of metacognition?
3. What value do you think metacognition has in the English classroom?

Section 4: Next Steps

1. What would you still like to learn about metacognition to better incorporate it into your lessons, if necessary?
2. Any further comments?

Thank you