



ISSN: 1994-4217 (Print) 2518-5586(online)

## Journal of College of Education

Available online at: <https://eduj.uowasit.edu.iq>Asst.Prof.Faris  
Kadhim (Ph.D.)

Hadyah J. Salman

Wasit University,  
College of Education  
for Human Sciences

Email:

falattabi@uowasit.edu.iq

Keywords:

Metalinguistic  
Awareness and Non ,  
Native Speakers.

## Article info

Article history:

Received 15.Oct.2022

Accepted 17.Dev.2022

Published 1.Feb.2023



## EFL Speakers' Metalinguistic Awareness of Written English

## A B S T R A C T

Metalinguistic awareness, also called metalinguistic knowledge, indicates the capacity that is consciously depended on the language itself. The notion of "metalinguistic awareness" is helpful in elaborating the transfer and execution of linguistic consciousness across languages. Metalinguistics deals with the branches of linguistics including morphology, semantics, pragmatics, phonology as well as syntax. The aims of the current study are finding out non-native speakers' metalinguistic awareness of written English. The method adapted in this study is a quantitative research type for collecting and analyzing. A sample of (10) learners who study English at the English department, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Wasit is selected. It has been concluded that non-native speakers have some sort of the ability to identify most components of meta-linguistic awareness. Based on the findings, a number of suggestions and recommendations have been proposed for university instructors and learners in order to improve the non-native speakers' metalinguistic awareness and language skills.

© 2022 EDUJ, College of Education for Human Science, Wasit University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/eduj.Vol50.Iss1.3455>

الوعي اللغوي للغة الإنجليزية المكتوبة لمتحدثي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

أ.م.د. فارس كاظم طعيمة م.م. هدية جميل سلمان

جامعة واسط / كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

## المستخلص

يشير الوعي اللغوي الفوقي ، المعروف أيضًا باسم المعرفة اللغوية ، إلى القدرة على الاعتماد الواعي على اللغة نفسها. إذ إن فكرة "الإدراك اللغوي" مفيدة في تطوير نقل وتنفيذ الوعي اللغوي عبر اللغات. حيث تتعامل اللسانيات الفوقية مع فروع علم اللغة، أي علم الصرف، علم الدلالات، البراغماتية، علم الأصوات وكذلك علم بناء الجملة. إذ تتمثل أهداف الدراسة الحالية في معرفة الوعي اللغوي الفوقي للمتحدثين غير الناطقين باللغة الإنجليزية المكتوبة. كما ان الطريقة المتبعة

في هذه الدراسة هي نوع بحث كمي يستخدم في تحليل البيانات المجمع. أما العينة فتتضمن (10) متعلماً يدرسون في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية جامعة واسط. توصلت هذه الدراسة إلى أن المتحدثين غير الناطقين بها لديهم نوع من القدرة على تحديد معظم مكونات الوعي اللغوي الفوقي. بناءً على النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها ، تم اقتراح عدد من الاقتراحات والتوصيات لكل من المدرسين والمتعلمين في الجامعة والتي من المتوقع أن تؤخذ بنظر الاعتبار من أجل تحسين الوعي اللغوي والمهارات اللغوية لدى المتحدثين غير الأصليين

الكلمات الأساسية: الوعي اللغوي الفوقي ، المتحدثون غير الأصليين.

## 1.0 Introduction

English language may be regarded as a channel in which speakers interact with each other. In this regard, Richard and Schmidt (2010) described language as the system of human communication which consists of the structured arrangement of sounds (or their written representation) into larger units, e.g. morphemes, words, sentences, utterances. Nevertheless, the present study is mainly related to writing; the proficiency of the language which is counted as an important pillar of communication.

On this occasion, Crystal (2011) mentioned that writing may be seen as system of linguistic expressions. Besides, writing may improve students' proficiencies and their capabilities in terms of the whole curriculums; teachers will require to permit students frequent opportunities discussing among themselves what ideas denote as well as how these ideas may be adopted through their writing, (Al-Atabi, 2015).

It is worthy to mention that university learners have a little capacity to write in English due to their lack for the ability to use different devices and tools which let them write properly from metalinguistic awareness in their written English. This truth is confirmed by a number of previous studies, such as, "Metalinguistic and Linguistic Knowledge in Foreign Language Learners" proposed by Alipour (2014).

## 2.0 Literature review

A particular impetus was given to the function of promoting linguistic awareness in 1990s, when new attitudes on language in educational institutions came to be adopted in several countries. Tavakoli (2012) explained metalinguistic knowledge (also called metalanguage awareness) as knowledge of the structures, forms, and other matters of a language, which learners arrive at through reflecting on as well as investigating the language.

The current study explores issues regarding metalinguistic awareness and its types namely, i.e. phonological, morphological, semantic, pragmatic and syntactic awareness. It uncovers and explains terms such as, "native speaker, non-native speaker and native alike". Also it deals with the importance and the role of written English. Both of "awareness" and "knowledge" can be used alternatively in the present study. Thus, Crystal (2011) defined MLA as a term which is used particularly within educational linguistics indicating sensitive, informed and critical answer to the usage of language by oneself and others including the consciousness of relevant terminology (metalinguistic awareness).

Tavakoli (2012) added that metalinguistic knowledge means one's capacity to treat language not only as a device of communicating or expressing notions, but also as a field of inquiry. Thus, making puns suggests a capacity to interpret language in contrast to solely using it for meaningful purposes. Furthermore, Tavakoli (2012) mentioned that the major interest in second language acquisition has focused on whether metalinguistic awareness predicts better acquiring of rule-systems than no metalinguistic awareness.

## 2.1 Metalinguistic Awareness (MLA) and Its Types

(James, 1998). Alderson et al. (1997) argued that the concepts "metalinguistic knowledge" and "knowledge about language" are considered as part of "language awareness". In this respect, Carter (1995) suggested the following factors of "language awareness" concerning written form:

- (a) Awareness of some features of language; productivity and playfulness; its double meanings;
- (b) A greater self-consciousness regarding aspects of the given language;
- (c) Consciousness of the close relations between ideology and language.

### 2.1.1 Phonological Awareness (PA)

Phonology according to (Crystal, 2011 & Trask, 1999). is a field of linguistics that studies sound patterns of languages. Trask (1999) illustrated that the basic concept in modern phonological method was the phoneme principle. Furthermore, the current type of awareness is counted being the most significant prediction for better writing competence. It is primarily described as the recognition the words in terms of the sound norms of letters. The goal is to motivate learners have capacity for decoding written forms into their phonemic forms that can be produced by uttering words. This goal cannot be performed if the students are taught via the whole-language method.

For Fernández and Cairns (2010),. Phonemes are literally hiding within speech sign that is continuous and highly variable due to the way by which speech may produce. If a learner learns to read, he should acquire letter–sound (grapheme–phoneme) correspondence in order to decoding written words. Field (2004) mentioned that Portuguese adults have been proved to be weak at tasks that include investigating the phonemic construction of a word (though they performed better at classifying rimes and syllables).

#### 1-Syllable Awareness (SA)

The concept syllable is a unit of pronunciation usually larger than a single sound and smaller than a word. A word can be produced syllable at a time, like; *ne-ver-the-less*, and good dictionaries specify where syllabic divisions exist in writing, therefore supplying data about how words can be linked.

#### 2-Onset-Rhyme Awareness

Carr (2008) assumes that "syllables" consisting of no coda are called as "*open syllables*", such as, *bee* (/bi:/). Besides, syllables having one or more coda are called *closed syllables*, such as, *but*. Additionally, syllables which have no onset are named an empty onset, such as, *eye* (/ai/). Empty onsets are included in the phenomenon of resyllabification, whereby consonant which might otherwise take coda occupation comes next to onset position, like the sequence *green eye*, syllabified as /gri:.nai/ (where the full stop stands for syllable boundaries), (Carr, 2008).

### 3-Phonemic Awareness (PA)

A phoneme is not a single sound, but a representation for certain sounds. Ladefoged (2011). For instance, there is a cluster of /t/ segments and a cluster of /l/ segments that exist in English. Consequently, Bybee (2001) denoted that "phonemes" regard as sets of phonetically similar variants. Such variants, or allophones, are clustered in groups, such that one analyzes as allophones constitute salient contextually determined prototypes. Katamba (1989) describes phonemes as sounds cluster that is similar in the concerned language. Jurenka (2005) indicated that "phoneme awareness" is essential for a learner's capacity to employ the graph phonic cueing system to recognize a word. Such awareness is employed to develop with the meaningful contexts.

#### 2.1.2 Morphological Awareness (MA)

Morphology is concerned with linking morphemes to yield words Haspelmath and Sims (2010). It is somewhat more abstract definition (is the survey of systematic conversation in the meaning and form of words) will seem being more satisfactory. Furthermore, Apel (2014) claimed that such awareness has started receiving attentions as one of the linguistic knowledge which influences written language capacities. Morphological consciousness is crucial for development of written languages.

#### 2.1.3 Syntactic Awareness

Tavakoli (2012) claimed that judging if a given sentence is structural in one's mother tongue or translating from a language to another requires believing of language in contrast to engaging in pure usage of it. Syntactic consciousness denotes having the capacity to monitor the relations between the words in sentences for the purpose of understanding while composing orally or reading or within writing Sedita (2020). Learners build syntactic consciousness in terms of exposing to oral languages when learners are young especially via exposure to written languages that they perceive through independent reading or read aloud.

#### 2.1.4 Semantic Awareness

Saeed (2016: 3) maintained that "semantics" denotes the study of the sense of words as well as sentences interpreted through language. Semantics can also enforces the learners' capacity to learn vocabulary actively and then use this conscious in the interactional/social context properly. Folse (2004) asserted the significance of implementing and learning the acquired vocabulary within the second language deeply associated with how /EFL instructors

tailor and design their lectures to learners' needs. Folse (2004) showed three important advices for language instructors to use vocabulary lists effectively:

First, don't crane to utilize a vocabulary list.

Second, don't depend only on a word list.

Last, "Involve learners' dislikes and likes in addition to their classroom expectation in their teaching.

### **2.1.5 Pragmatic Awareness**

Pragmatics is defined by Mey (2001) as the focus of the condition of people language employ as this is specified by the contexts of community (p. 42). To illustrate, pragmatics is associated with sense in context, (Archer and Grundy, 2011). For Kasper and Rose (2001), pragmatic consciousness increases the capacity of students to know and understand what had been written or said not solely for the presented sense but also for unuttered sense in a context. For Yule (2010), "pragmatics" refers to the invisible sense, or how one recognizes what is denoted even if it is not really written or said. It associates with the speakers' meaning, and how an individual communicated more than is said, also dealt with associative meaning that people might link with usage of words.

## **2.2 Speakers Classes of English**

Generally, there are three main classes of speakers of English language, mentioned as follows;

1. Native Speaker (NS) Richard and Schmidt (2010) described native speakers as persons who learn a language as a child and goes on using it fluently like a dominant language. An individual can solely suppose this trait to be actual if they suppose that they are creative and highly proficient in writing within their languages via many years of formal schooldays, and from an intelligent for talking creatively about themselves in terms of written language.

2. Non-Native Speaker (NNS) Mariño (2019) proposed that a non-native speaker means one who use and know a second language in any stage

3. Native-Like (NL): Native-like skill implies that an individual can speak a certain language as a native . A native-like skill indicates the capacity of NNSs speaking English language fluently like NSs of English while displaying to a native-like accent more-or- less producing grammatically sound utterances/sentences (Šišić, 2016).

## **2.3 Written Forms: An Overview**

Vachek (1976) elaborated that the spoken form of language refers to a pattern of phonically obvious language components whose task is for reacting given stimuli in dynamic ways, i.e., in an immediate and ready behavior, duly explaining not solely the simply interaction but also emotional aspects of the approaches of the language users. As for written form, Good (1973) explained that written forms refer to the capacity achieving desired witting competence with economy of effort and time in terms of the level of work accomplished.

Writing performance is persons' actual usage of linguistics (Richards, et al, 1992). The operational explanation of written performance indicate the students' actual achievement of writing in terms of:

- 1- Introduction, Body, and Conclusion;
- 2- Content;
- 3- Grammar;
- 4- Punctuation, Spelling, and mechanics
- 5- Style and feature of expression, (Richards, et al, 1992).

For Vachek (1976), the written form denotes a pattern of graphically obvious language components whose function is to interact given stimuli in a stable way, i.e., in a surveyable and preservable behaviour concentrating especially on the simply communicative aspects of the approaches of the interacting language users.

Moreover, Richard and Schmidt (2010) mentioned that written language have distinct characteristics. For instance it produces great usage of subordination. French and Rhoder (1992) explained that the skill of writing can be considered as the basic area in the scope of curriculum that is related to noting, thinking that it is the basic tasks which can be questioned to perform.

### **3.0 Methodology**

This chapter is intended to describe the procedures followed for fulfilling the aims of the study. More specifically, it uncovers the following procedural steps:

1. Identifying the population and the selection a sample of the present study.
2. Designing the instrumentations and selecting its materials
3. Ensuring test validity.
4. Administering the pilot study of the test, which aims at securing the validity, the difficulty level of the test items, their discrimination power, and time needed for the final administration of test.
5. Identifying the scoring scheme and the statistical means used for analysing the results obtained.

### **3.1 Materials Selection**

The items of the spoken and the written tests are selected from materials that are common and previously studied by the students including the following:

1. An Introductory English Grammar by Stageberg (1981)
2. The Study of Language by Yule (2010)
3. Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language by Quirk, et al. (1985)
4. A Little Encyclopedia of Phonetics by Roach (2009)

### 3.2 The Construction of the Written Test

An achievement test, in a form of MCQs, has been constructed in order to measure the students' metalinguistic awareness in written English. The researcher has set the test in the light of the material selected and the aims and the questions of the study. The test includes (50) items which are distributed over the five types of MLA within (10) item each. Tests must be as valid as their instructors can state them. The test should aim to supply true measures of the special skill which intended to be measured, (Heaton, 1974).

For satisfying the concerned tests, they are submitted to a jury experts for approving their validity to measure what it is intended to measure. The pilot administration of the tests, which aims to ensure the clarity of the tests instructions, check the time that testees need to do their tasks, identify the discrimination power (DP) and the difficulty level (DL) of the test items and to estimate their reliability ,.have been carried out on Wednesday, the 13<sup>th</sup> of January, 2021.

### 4.0 Item Analysis

The process of tests item analysis means: "checking responses constructed by all students for each item included in the test" (Oliva, 1988:15). The aim of item analysis is to reveal the difficulty and easiness level of each item and to make the necessary modification or reformulate it and exclude the unsuitable one.

#### 4.1 Difficulty Level of the Test Items (DL)

If the test items are so difficult or easy, they will absent the essential power of discrimination (Madsen, 1983). The difficulty level of the written test is between (0.22) acceptable level of difficulty since "any item whose difficulty level ranges from (0) percent to (1) percent is acceptable", (Madsen, 1983; Mousavi, 1999). The following formula has been used for estimating the difficulty level of each item:

$$DL = (HC + LC) / N$$

Where: DL: difficulty level, HC: High Correct, LC: Low Correct,

N: Total number in the sample (Valette, 1967)

#### 4.2 Discrimination Power of the Test Items (DP)

According to Stanely et al. (1972) Discrimination Power refers to a measure of the extent to which an item distinguishes the more able or good testees from the less able or poor testees. After applying the formula of the DP on the test items, it has been discovered that the discrimination power of the written test is between (0.22) and (0.67) with an acceptable average of discrimination power. According to Brown (1981:104), "the item is acceptable when its discrimination power is (20) percent and above" (See Table 1).

The following formula has been used to determine the DP of each item:

$$DP = (RU - RL) / (1/2 T) \quad , \text{Where: DP} = \text{Discrimination power,}$$

RU = the number of students in the upper group who has got the item right

RL = the number of students in the lower group who has got the item right

T= total number of students included in the item analysis Gronlund, 1981).

**Table 1***The Coefficient of Difficulty, Ease and Strength of Discrimination of the Written Test*

S	correct answer		Ease Factor	Difficulty factor	Discrimination power
1	22	12	0.63	0.37	0.37
2	20	13	0.61	0.39	0.26
3	26	13	0.72	0.28	0.48
4	18	10	0.52	0.48	0.30
5	25	15	0.74	0.26	0.37
6	18	11	0.54	0.46	0.26
7	24	13	0.69	0.31	0.41
8	17	11	0.52	0.48	0.22
9	24	17	0.76	0.24	0.26
10	24	14	0.70	0.30	0.37

### 4.3 Reliability of the Test

(Gay et al, 2010) stated that reliability indicates the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it measures. The reliability coefficient of the two concerned tests has been counted in two ways:

Firstly, by using Alpha – Cronbach formula, where the reliability coefficient of the written test is found out to be (0.85)

Secondly, The split – half method has been used to count the correlation coefficient of the two "half – length tests", (Glass & Stanley , 1970). To gain the reliability coefficient of the test item, it is corrected by Spearman Formula which is considered a high stable correlation (Hedges, 1966). So, the reliability of the written test items has been extracted in two ways:

First: Cronbach's alpha method, the value of the reliability coefficient was (0.85)

Second: The half-segmentation method: where the reliability coefficient for half of the test was (0.80), and after correcting the stability with the Spearman-Brown coefficient, the reliability coefficient for the test as a whole became (0.88).

### 4.4 Results of the Students' Responses to the Written Test

The analysis of the results are presented according to the aims and the questions of the study. With the help of the statistical tables and linguistic perspective, the Iraqi EFL university students' metalinguistic awareness of written English have been identified.

**Table 2**

*The Arithmetic and Hypothetical Means of the Students' Responses in the Written Test*

Written test	The Overall scores	Number of items	Arithmetic Mean	Hypothetical Mean	Standard Deviation	T- test value	P Value	Indication
	50	50	30.73	30.5	2.86	107.5	0.000	Significant

Table (2) shows that the Arithmetic mean of the overall students' responses in the written test is (30.73) which is statistically higher than that of the hypothetical mean which is (30.5) this means that the students have metalinguistic awareness in written English. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (107.5) and to know the significance of this value the P-value which is (0.000) has been found lower than the level of significance (0.05) and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically significant. In order to find out the students' responses to each question (item) of the metalinguistic awareness in written English, the following table states each type of the five metalinguistic awareness.

**Table 3**

*Arithmetic Mean, Hypothetical Mean, T- Test Value and P-Value of the Students' Responses to Each Type of the Metalinguistic Awareness in the Written Test*

Metalinguistic Types	The Overall Grade of theLevel	Number of Items	Arithmetic mean	hypothetical mean	standard deviation	t- test value	P Value	Indication
Morphology	10	10	8.25	8	0.90	91.348	0.000	Significant
Semantic	10	10	6.63	7	1.01	65.54	0.076	not significant
Pragmatic	10	10	4.19	5	1.40	29.979	0.081	not significant
Phonological	10	10	6.01	6	1.19	50.361	0.000	Significant
Syntactic	10	10	5.65	5.5	1.30	42.285	0.000	Significant

Table (3) shows that:

1. The Arithmetic mean of the students' responses in the written test to the morphology is (8.25) which is statistically higher than that of the hypothetical mean which is (8) this means that the students have meta-linguistic awareness in morphology. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (91.348) and to know the significance of this value the P-value which is 0.000 has been found lower than the level of significance 0.05 and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically significant.

2. The Arithmetic mean of the students' responses in the written test to the semantic is (6.63) which is statistically lower than that of the hypothetical mean which is (7) this means that the students haven't meta-linguistic awareness in morphology. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (65.54) and to know the significance of this value the P-value is calculated which is 0.000 has been found higher than the level of significance 0.05 and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically non-significant

3. The Arithmetic mean of the students' responses in the written test to the pragmatic is (4.19) which is statistically lower than that of the hypothetical mean which is (1.40) this means that the students haven't meta-linguistic awareness in morphology. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (29.979) and to know the significance of this value the P-value which is 0.000 has been found higher than the level of significance 0.05 and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically non-significant.

4. Arithmetic mean of the students' responses in the written test to the phonological is (6.01) which is statistically higher than that of the hypothetical mean which is (1.19) this means that the students have meta-linguistic awareness in morphology. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (50.361) and to know the significance of this value the P-value which is 0.000 has been found lower than the level of significance 0.05 and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically significant.

5. Arithmetic mean of the students' responses in the written test to the syntactic is (5.65) which is statistically higher than that of the hypothetical mean which is (5.5) this means that the students have meta-linguistic awareness in morphology. Moreover, to confirm this result the t-value for one independent sample has been calculated which is (42.285) and to know the significance of this value the P-value which is 0.000 has been found lower than the level of significance 0.05 and this in turn means that the t-value is statistically significant.

**Table 4**

***(I-J) Values and P-values of the Source of Differences among the Students' Responses to the Written Test***

I	J	i-j	P value	Indication
Morphological	Semantic	1.62	0.000	Significant
	Pragmatic	4.06	0.000	Significant
	Phonological	2.24	0.000	Significant
	Syntactic	2.60	0.000	Significant
Semantic	Morphological	-1.62	0.000	Significant
	Pragmatic	2.44	0.000	Significant
	Phonological	0.62	0.009	Significant
	Syntactic	0.98	0.000	Significant
Pragmatic	Morphological	-4.06	0.000	Significant
	Semantic	-2.44	0.000	Significant
	Phonological	-1.82	0.000	Significant
	Syntactic	-1.46	0.000	Significant
phonological	Morphological	-2.24	0.000	Significant
	Semantic	-0.62	0.009	Significant
	Pragmatic	1.82	0.000	Significant
	Syntactic	0.36	0.329	not significant
syntactic	Morphological	-2.60	0.000	Significant
	Semantic	-0.98	0.000	Significant
	Pragmatic	1.46	0.000	Significant
	Phonological	-0.36	0.329	not significant

Table (4) shows the following:

1. Concerning morphology , The results show that they are in favour of the morphology since the calculated values of (i-j) for the morphology in comparison with the other four types namely : semantic , pragmatic , phonology , and syntax are (1.62, 4.06, 2.24, 2.60) respectively. This means that the arithmetic mean of the morphology is higher than the four other types and this in turn means that the students have a high level of morphology meta- linguistic awareness in written English. To confirm this result the p-value is calculated and has been found (0.000) which lower than the level of significance so, the results are significant and the morphology is founded the first level or the highest in the students' meta-linguistic awareness.

2. With reference to semantics , The results show that they are also favour of the semantic since the calculated value of (i-j) for the semantic in comparison with the other three types namely : pragmatic , phonology , and syntax except morphology are (2.44, 0.62 , 0.98 ) respectively. This means that the arithmetic mean of the semantic is highest than that of the other three types and this in turn means that the students have a high level of semantic meta-

linguistic awareness in written English . To confirm this result the p-value is calculated and has been found (0.000) which lower than the level of significance so, the results are significant and the semantic is founded in the second place after morphology in the students' meta-linguistic awareness.

3. As for pragmatics, the results show that they are not in favour of pragmatic since the calculated values of (i-j) for the pragmatic in comparison with the other four types namely : morphology , semantic , phonology , and syntax are in minus , i.e., ( - 4.06, - 2.44, -1.82 ,-1.46) respectively. This means that the arithmetic mean of the pragmatic is the lowest in comparison with other four types and this in turn means that the students have a low level of meta- linguistic awareness in written English regarding this level. To confirm this result the p-value

is calculated and has been found (0.000) which lower than the level of significance (0.05) so, the results are significant and this type is founded the lowest regarding the students' meta-linguistic awareness in written English.

4. Regarding phonological awareness, the results show that they are not in favour of this type of meta-linguistic awareness as compared with (morphology and semantics) since the calculated values of (i-j) for the phonology are (-2.24, - 0.62) respectively, but the results are in favour of phonology as in compared with the (pragmatic and syntax) since the calculated values of (i-j) are (1.82, 0.63) respectively. This means that the phonological is in a mid-way, i.e., the arithmetic mean of the phonology is lower than that of the morphology and semantics yet it exceeds that of the pragmatic and syntax. To confirm this result the p-value is calculated and has been found (0.000) which lower than the level of significance (0.05) so, the results are significant and this type is founded in a mid-way yet it is not significant as compared with the syntactic since the p-value is higher than the level of significance and this in turn means that the students' meta linguistic awareness is equal concerning phonology and syntax.

Concerning syntactic awareness, the results show that they are not in favour of this type of meta-linguistic awareness as compared with (morphology, semantics and phonology) since the calculated values of (i-j) for the syntactic as compared with these three types are (-2.6, - 0.98,-0.36) respectively, but the results are in favour of syntactic awareness as in compared with the (pragmatic) since the calculated values of (i-j) is (1.46). This means that syntactic is the lowest, i., e., the arithmetic mean of the syntactic is lower than that of the morphology and semantics and phonology yet it exceeds that of the pragmatics. To confirm this result the p-value is calculated and has been found (0.000) which lower than the level of significance (0.05) so, the results are significant and this type is founded in a mid-way yet it is not significant as compared with phonology since the p-value is higher than the level of significance and this in turn means that the students' meta linguistic awareness is equal concerning phonology and syntax.

## 5.0 Conclusion

Conclusions are drawn in accordance to the results achieved starting with the aims and the questions of the study which are investigated separately in the following sections:

As far as the first question is concerned, namely, "Do non-native speakers have a metalinguistic awareness of written English?" The results reveal that the students do have such a metalinguistic awareness of written English due to the arithmetic means of their responses which exceed the hypothetical ones. This results can be attributed to many reasons:

1. For morphological awareness, learners highly get excellent scores because this metalinguistic awareness is considered as simple and easy in addition to the students who are much acknowledge with morphemes which are counted as concrete and observable ones.

2. With reference to semantic awareness, learners get high scores to determine the appropriate responses of the semantic units. They highly gain excellent marks due to the simplicity's test as well as the learners store a huge words in the mental lexicon in terms of sense-relations, i.e. synonyms. However, such awareness is founded in the second place after morphology.

3. In relation to pragmatic awareness, they have failed determining the suitable answers because of its components (shared knowledge and culture) which could not be performed. This may belongs to the distinction between their mother tongue and the target language.

4. Students' level of phonological awareness are found in a mid-way since they do not train to manipulate sounds within words.

As for syntactic awareness, their responses are found in a mid-way. They do not practice to the process of word-order within sentences. The word clusters need being stored perfectly and structurally correct sentences.

In relation to the fourth and fifth questions, namely "What are the non-native speakers' meta-linguistic awareness most utilize in their written English?". The results, again, reveal that both morphological and semantic awareness are the most ones that are manipulated in their written English. This is because the strong relation existed between all aspects of morphology and semantics. That is, a non-native speaker can investigates the function of morphological consciousness in literacy improvement.

As for the answer of the second question it's concluded the following points;

- The written form is deliberately learned and taught in most cases.
- Written forms are usually carefully formulated and organized since their composer involve opportunity and time to edit them before making them available for reading.
- Writing forms are detached in space and time from their reading; the writers normally work alone, and cannot be familiar with their readers.

## References

- Al-Atabi, F. (2015). The impact of PACE and CRTs models in teaching grammar on Iraqi EFL university students' oral and written Performance. A Dissertation Submitted to the Council of the College of Education for Human Sciences Ibn-Rushd, University of Baghdad.
- Alderson, J., Caroline C. and Steel, C. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research* 1(2), 93–121.
- Alipour, S. (2014). Metalinguistic and linguistic knowledge in foreign language learners. Jahrom University, Iran. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.12.2640-2645>.
- Apel K. (2014). A Comprehensive definition of morphological awareness implications for assessment, (Vol. 34, No. 3).
- Archer, D. and Grundy, P. (2011). *The pragmatics reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bybee, J., (2001), *Phonology and language use*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Carr, P. (2008), *A glossary of phonology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Carter, R. (1995). How aware should language aware teachers and learners be? Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fernández and Cairns (2010). *Fundamentals of psycholinguistics*, Singapore: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Field, J. (2004), *Psycholinguistics: The key concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- French, N. and Rhoder, C. (1992). *Teaching Thinking Skills*. Garland Publication, INC, NY, USA, 238
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasion, P. (2010). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Person: Person Practice Hall.
- Glass, G. V. and J. C. Stanley. (1970). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Good, C. (1973). *Dictionary of education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Gronlund, N. (1981). *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching 4 th Ed*, New York : Macmillan , Publishing Co . Inc .
- Haspelmath, M. and Sims, A. (2010), *Understanding morphology*, London: CPI Antony Rowe. Hayes, B., (2009). *Introductory phonology*, Blackwell: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Heaton, J. (1974). *Writing English language tests*. London: Longman.
- Hedges, W. (1966). *Testing and Evaluation for the Science* Wordsworth, California.

- James, C. (1998). Language awareness: implications for the language curriculum. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 12(1).
- Jurenka, N. (2005). *Teaching phonemic awareness through children's literature and experiences*. London: Teachers Ideas Press.
- Kasper, G. and Rose, K. (2001). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*.
- Katamba, F., (1989), *An introduction to phonology*, New York: Longman Inc.
- Kuile, T., Grief, H., & Weldhuis, M. (2010). Bilingual education, metalinguistic awareness, and the understanding of an unknown language. *Language and Cognition* 14(2), 233–242.
- Ladefoged, P. (2011), *A course in phonetics*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.
- Madsen, Harold S. (1983). *Techniques in testing*. London: University Press.
- Mariño, C. (2019). Reflecting on the dichotomy native vs. non-native speakers in an EFL context. *Anagramas*, Volumen 10, N° 19, pp. 129-142 ISSN 1692-2522
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers.
- Oliva, P. (1988): *Developing the Curriculum*, New York: Scott, Foresmand Company.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and G. Svartvik, (1985). *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.
- Richard, J.C., and Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Great Britain: Pearson.
- Richards, J., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman Group UK limited.
- Roach, P. (2009), *English phonetics and phonology: a practical course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saeed, J. (2016). *Semantics*. Blackwell
- Sedita, J. (2020). *Syntactic awareness: teaching sentence structure Excerpts from Keys to Beginning Reading, Module 7 professional development program*.
- Šišić, E. (2016). *EFL learners' attitudes towards native-like proficiency as an achievement target*. Stela Letica Krevelj, PhD, postdoc.
- Stageberg, N. (1981). *An Introductory English Grammar*, New York: Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Stanley, J., et al. (1972). *Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation*. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.
- Tavakoli, H. (2012), *A dictionary of language acquisition: a comprehensive overview of key terms in first and second language acquisition*, Tehran :Tehran University Press.

Trask, R., (1999), *Key Concepts in language and linguistics*, London: Routledge

Vachek, J. (1976). *Selected writings in English and general linguistics*. Prague: Academia

Yule, G. (2010) .*The Study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.