

Guide for Authors

Each Word of the Title Is Capitalized except Prepositions, Bolded, and Centered

[1]Author First and Last Name

[2]Corresponding Author's Name*

IJEAP- code (follows the Second Author's Name)

[3]The Last Author

Abstract (Bolded, Left, 11 Times New Romans)

Abstract text
Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text
Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text
Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text Abstract text
Abstract text Abstract text . You can copy and paste your abstract here, but when pasting the
text, you should right-click and choose the option "Merge formatting. (150-200 words)

Keywords: Metacognitive Strategies, Metacognitive Instruction, TBLT (Times New Romans, 11, Separated by Comma)

1. Introduction

The role of English as one of the world's international languages results in efforts to find more effective ways of teaching it as a second language. The role of listening comprehension (L.C.) in second language learning was taken for granted for a long time, little research was done and it was given little pedagogical attention. L.C. was not seen as a specific methodological issue (Goh, 2010; Graham, Santos and Vanderplank, 2011). Teaching L.C. to second language learners has changed considerably over the last few decades, yet learners still struggle with it. L2 learners continue to face challenges inside and outside the classroom as they try to improve their L.C. abilities (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

Listening is a highly complex skill, involving both linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge includes phonology, vocabulary, syntax, semantics, discourse and pragmatics (Buck, 2001). Further complexity with regard to listening arises from the way in which the type of knowledge outlined above is applied to the incoming aural input. Indeed, the processing of different types of knowledge does not occur in a fixed linear way. Instead, various types of processing can occur simultaneously, or at any convenient sequence. Thus, for instance, syntactic knowledge might be applied to recognize words, or knowledge of the context might be used to interpret the meaning (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Task-based Teaching and Learning (Each Word Capitalized, Italic, 11, Times New Romans)

TBLT constitutes an innovative way of language teaching which promises flourishing opportunities for second and foreign language acquisition and enjoys promising growth of interest, because as Ellis (2003) puts it, the primary focus of a task is on meaning, tasks engage learners in drawing on their cognitive and linguistics resources, and their

accomplishment requires learners to use language to perform a real-life activity. It is the inherent life-like qualities of task that make TBLT an ideal medium for teaching, assessing and researching into learning processes (Ahmadian, 2016).

It seems that the definition of task and its difference with activity and exercise depends on who defines it. As Richards (2015) suggests, task is need-relevant and meaning-focused performance on the part of the learner that urges them to interact with others in a strategic fashion while providing them opportunities to reflect on their language use. He defines exercise as a teaching procedure that involves controlled, guided and open-ended practice on some aspects of language, like a drill, while activity is the more general term referring to any kind of purposeful classroom procedure that relates to the goals of the course, like having a group discussion. Widdowson (1998) also attributes the difference between task and exercise to the necessity of pragmatic communicative meaning and propositional content for an activity to be a task while exercise has its focus on linguistic form and semantic meaning.

2.2. Metacognitive Strategies and Listening Comprehension

Listening strategies are activities or techniques which directly contribute to the comprehension of listening input and its recall (National Capital Language Resource Center, 2004). In line with general learning strategies categorized by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), listening strategies can be classified into three types: cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective (Vandergrift, 2003). Bacon (1992) further classified metacognitive strategies into three types that are used before, during, and after listening. Before listening, the learners prepare for listening through manipulating the environment, focusing attention, applying an advance organizer, selective attention, and deciding to think in English. In a basically similar way but in different terms, Goh (2008) generally classifies these strategies into planning, monitoring, and evaluating one's listening in general. However, Vandergrift et al. (2006) consider metacognitive strategies as a part of metacognitive awareness that also includes person knowledge.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

Sixty-three EFL learners (29 females and 34 males), studying general English at different institutes in Isfahan participated in this study. They were all Iranian native Persian speakers and ranged in age from 22 to 38, with two 49 and 50-year-old outliers. They were chosen and grouped using true random sampling method out of a pool of one hundred seventy-two volunteers who registered to take part in the study and took Oxford Placement Test (OPT).

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1 Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

Developed and standardized in 2004, OPT was used to select the participants who display similar levels of listening proficiency to start the research with. OPT is calibrated against IELTS and TOEFL and can provide a reliable source of information based on language performance of the test takers. OPT comes in two parts: Use of English and Listening. Each part consists of 100 questions and the test takers are leveled in each of 0-9 OPT bands based on what they score out of 200. The researchers found Cronbach's alpha of .94 for internal consistency of the scores and reliability index of .95 was obtained using Intra-class Correlation Coefficient.

3.2.2 Preliminary English Test (PET), Listening Section

The listening section of Preliminary English Test (PET) was used as L.C. pre- and post-tests of this study. It consists of 25 L.C. questions arranged in 4 parts. Cronbach's alpha reported on the internal consistency of PET scores was .86 and thus they were highly reliable.

Figure 1: Integrated Experiential Learning Task (IELT)

4. Results

To answer the research questions, the collected data was subject to ANCOVA, where the level of significance was set at $p < .05$. Before running the test, the general assumptions of normality of distribution were checked for PET listening section, FCE listening section and Self-regulation in L.C. pre and post test scores. The values of skewness and kurtosis of the total scores of all tests were limited to ± 1.814 so normal univariate distribution on all of them was proved. Also, homogeneity of regression slopes was not violated on any of the aforementioned scores so normal distribution of all pre- and posttest scores was confirmed. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics on all scores of the 4 groups.

Table 1: ANOVA Test on Self-regulation in L.C. by Covariate

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
group	29267.848	3	9755.949	17.690	.000	.478
a. R Squared = .567 (Adjusted R Squared = .537)						

This study explored the efficacy of task-based strategy-nonintegrated (IELT) and strategy-embedded (MPC) metacognitive instruction models of L.C. in inducing self-regulation of L.C. and development of L.C. performance in an experiment against two control groups receiving traditional product-based L.C. instruction. The finding suggests that IELT and MPC as superior to sole explicit metacognitive strategy instruction in inducing self-regulation in L.C. attainment and L.C. performance of B1 level Iranian EFL learners, while strategy-nonintegrated metacognitive instruction outperformed strategy-embedded one in both areas and it was the only model to help learners transfer the strategies to a more difficult test.

5. Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the significant contribution of two task-based models of metacognitive instruction (IELT and MPC) on self-regulation in L.C. and L.C. performance of B1 level Iranian EFL learners. The results of ANCOVA, run to answer the research questions, indicated that compared to both control groups, both models significantly improved Iranian EFL learners' self-regulation in L.C. while IELT had a larger effect size compared to MPC. The metacognitive instruction models also caused EG1 and EG2 to outperform both control groups on L.C. posttest and again IELT led into larger effect size. Besides, it was only IELT that could help learners transfer their metacognitive knowledge when taking the more difficult transfer test.

6. Conclusion and Implications

This study explored the efficacy of task-based strategy-nonintegrated (IELT) and strategy-embedded (MPC) metacognitive instruction models of L.C. in inducing self-regulation of

L.C. and development of L.C. performance in an experiment against two control groups receiving traditional product-based L.C. instruction. The finding suggests that IELTS and MPC as superior to sole explicit metacognitive strategy instruction in inducing self-regulation in L.C. attainment and L.C. performance of B1 level Iranian EFL learners, while strategy-nonintegrated metacognitive instruction outperformed strategy-embedded one in both areas and it was the only model to help learners transfer the strategies to a more difficult test.

References

1. Journal example:

Pishghadam, R., & Motakef, R. (2012). Narrative intelligence and learning languages. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1, 13-20. (No page number is needed if all the issues are paginated in row and the next issue does not start from page 1)

Ahmadian, M. J. (2016). Task-based language teaching and learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 377-380. (If each issue starts from page 1, the issue number is given in parenthesis).

Jacoby, W. G. (1994). Public attitudes toward government spending. *American Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), 336-361.

Poiger, U. G. (1996). Rock 'n' roll, female sexuality, and the Cold War Battle over German Identities. *The Journal of Modern History*, 68(3), 577. doi:10.1086/245343

2. Book example:

Last, F. M. (Year Published) *Book title*. City, State: Publisher.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Last, F. M. (Year Published) *Book*. Retrieved from URL

James, H. (2009). *The ambassadors*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>

3. Chapter in a book:

Last, F. M. (Year Published). Title of chapter In F. M. Last Editor (Ed.), *Title of book/anthology* (pp. Pages). Publisher City, State: Publisher.

Ramsden, P. (1984). The context of learning. In Marton, F., Hounsell, D., & Entwistle, N. (Eds.), *The experienced of learning*. (pp. 100-112). Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Last, F. M. (Year Published). Section title. In F. M. Last (Ed.), *Book/anthology* [E-reader version, if used] (pp. Pages). doi:# or Retrieved from URL

Bellow, S. (1999). A silver dish. In J. Updike & K. Kenison (Eds.), *The best American short stories of the century*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>

4. Introduction, Preface, Foreword, or Afterword

Last, F. M. (Year Published). Section title [Section Type]. In F. M. Last & F. M. Last (Eds.), *Book/anthology* (pp. Pages). City, State: Publisher.

Sanders, S. R. (2007). [Introduction]. In L. Williford & M. Martone (Eds.), *Touchstone anthology of contemporary creative nonfiction: Work from 1970 to present* (pp. 148-151). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Masur, L. P. (2011). Preface. In *The Civil War: A concise history* (pp. Iv-Xii). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

5. Theses and dissertations

Callaghan, S. J. (2018). *The mechanics of front leg loading during cricket fast bowling: Delivery variations, spell demands, and the effects of strength training* (Doctoral dissertation). Perth, WA: Edith Cowan University.

Zarei, R. (2017). *Developing enhanced classification methods for ECG and EEG signals* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Knight, K.A. (2011). *Media epidemics: Viral structures in literature and new media* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from MLA International Bibliography Database. (Accession No. 2013420395)

Last, F.M. (Date published). *Title* (Doctoral dissertation or master's thesis). Retrieved from database name. (Accession or Order no.)

6. Websites and Blog posts

Last, F. M. (Year, Month Date Published). *Article title*. Retrieved from URL

Cain, K. (2012, June 29). The Negative effects of Facebook on communication. *Social Media Today RSS*. Retrieved from <http://socialmediatoday.com>

Last, F. M. (Year Month Date Published). *Article title* [Type of blog post]. Retrieved from URL.

Schonfeld, E. (2010, May 3). Google throws \$38.8 million to the wind [Web log post]. Retrieved May 4, 2010, from <http://techcrunch.com>

China, The American Press, and the State Department [Web log post]. (2013, January 3). Retrieved from Schonfeld, E. (2010, May 3). Google throws \$38.8 million to the wind [Web log post]. Retrieved May 4, 2010, from <http://techcrunch.com>

7. Newspaper article

Last, F. M. (Year, Month Date Published). *Article title*. *Newspaper Title*, pp. Page(s).

Bowman, L. (1990, March 7). Bills target Lake Erie mussels. *The Pittsburgh Press*, p. A4.

Meier, B. (2013, January 1). Energy Drinks Promise Edge, but Experts Say Proof Is Scant. *New York Times*, p. 1.

Last, F. M. (Year, Month Date Published). *Article title*. *Newspaper Title*, pp. Page(s). Retrieved from URL.

Bowman, L. (1990, March 7). Bills target Lake Erie mussels. *The Pittsburgh Press*, p. A4. Retrieved from <http://www.pittsburghpress.com>

Meier, B. (2013, January 1). Energy drinks promise edge, but experts say proof is scant. *New York Times*, p. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>

8. Magazine articles

Last, F. M. (Year, Month Published). *Article title*. *Magazine Title*, volume(issue), pp. Page(s).

Rothbart, D. (2008, October). How I caught up with dad. *Men's Health*, 108-113.

Jaeger, J. (2010, August). Social media use in the financial industry. *Compliance Week*, 54.

Rothbart, D. (2008, October). How I caught up with dad. *Men's Health*, 108-113. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>

Folger, T. Higgs: What causes the weight of the world?" *Discover Magazine*,. Retrieved from <http://discovermagazine.com>

Explanations: The details of the formatting are provided below.

1. The first part is the **header**. Copy the header from this file, then paste it in the top of your file, but click on the “keep source formatting” to remain the same.
 2. The second part is the **title**. The specifications of the title is as below.
 3. The next part is the **names of the authors**. Just type the names, no degree or rank is needed. You can copy the original names and paste them as source formatting like header. Then replace them with yours. The specifications are as below. They should be numbered from 1 to 3. Their affiliations should appear in the footer. The manuscript ID follows the second name, but on the left side, not centered. If there are three authors, add the last one, then leave one space.
 4. The next part is **abstract**. The word abstract is typed separate from the text. The abstract text appears just below it, 150-200 words. It is indented, just like the rest of the paragraphs. The details of the main text paragraphs and abstract are given below. Format all the text paragraphs and abstract like this. However, you don't need indentation for the paragraphs following headings, subheadings, figures, and tables. Even paragraphs starting a page do not need indentation. The rest of the details are the same, just the indentation is not needed.
 5. The **keywords** immediately follow the abstract text. There must be at least 5 key words or phrases. Separated by commas and their first letters be capitalized.
 6. The first section of the body is **introduction**. It is usually followed by **review of literature, methodology (design, participants, data collection, and data analysis), results, discussion and conclusions**. All these headings must follow this format. The next level headings are shown in the text. We do not encourage many levels of headings.
 7. **Figure captions** should be below the figure. Do not use other formats. Just the below one. Followed by :, first letters capital, and 10 Times New Roman.
 8. **Table captions** appear above the tables, 10, Times New Roman, followed by :, the first letters are capital, captions should be short and centered. Do not break the captions in 2 lines.
 9. **Tables** use font 10, times new roman, they have top and bottom border and horizontal borders, but vertical borders, right border, and left border are not needed. An example is provided. They should be almost the same as SPSS tables.
 10. **References** should appear on a new page. Use hanging heading, an example is given. For each category of references, one example is given.
-

The last point is related to the copyright of the manuscripts.

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes

In order to publish your article, you need to accept the following conditions. Please take a moment to read the terms of this license. It should be mentioned that by submitting your article to our journal, you and all co-authors of your submission agree to the terms of this license. You do not need to fill out a copyright form for confirmation.

After submitting your article, you grant us (the publisher) the exclusive right to both reproduce and/or distribute your article throughout the world in electronic, printed, or any other medium, and to authorize others to do the same.

You agree that we may publish your article, your full name, title, affiliated institute(s), your telephone/fax number(s), and email address.

You agree that the article is your original work, has not been published before, and is not currently under consideration by any other journal.

You also promise that your paper does not contain anything that is libellous, illegal, and does not violate anyone's rights.

If your text includes material that is someone else's copyright, it means you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner.

You also allow us to make all the necessary editorial changes we see necessary.

You declare that research involving human subjects was performed following all the requirements of ethics of research.

By submission of a manuscript, the corresponding author declares that all the co-authors have seen, approved the validity of the contents, and have actively participated in (1) data design, analysis, or interpretation, and the (2) writing or critiquing of drafts of the manuscript.

This is the corresponding author who must take complete responsibility for the submission and its correspondence. Thus, we cannot be held responsible for any incomplete or incorrect manuscript submitted by the corresponding author(s).

It must be noted that no authors can be added or removed post submission, unless all the co-authors email the journal editor and inform the editor of such a decision. Then, the editor decides on this issue.

The corresponding author is responsible for the payment of the publication fee and taking all the required steps up to the online publication of the manuscript.

On the other hand, we will respect your rights as the author(s). For example, we will make sure that your name is always clearly associated with the article. However, we will not make any substantial alterations to your article without consulting you. Copyright remains yours, and you retain the right to use your own version in the following ways. You are free to post your version of the article on your personal, your institute's, your company's, and your funding agency's website (by inserting a citation). You can use the article, partly or completely, in your own further publications or spoken presentations.