

Metacognition in the Classroom: A Systematic Review of Research in Scientific Education

Oussama Boukhari

Doctoral Student, Faculty of Languages, Letters, and Arts, English

Department, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra

Morocco

Abstract

This article presents a comprehensive analysis of metacognition in educational settings, synthesizing research findings from multiple studies conducted across various educational levels and disciplines. Drawing on a compilation of doctoral research, this review examines the theoretical foundations, practical applications, and empirical evidence regarding metacognitive strategies in classroom environments. The investigation encompasses studies in Physics, Biology, Mathematics, Geometry, and Vocational Education, involving participants from elementary through higher education. Results demonstrate that explicit metacognitive instruction significantly enhances student learning outcomes, promotes intellectual autonomy, and develops self-regulation capabilities. Key findings indicate that metacognitive interventions—including conceptual maps, KWLH charts, reflective questioning, portfolios, and learning diaries—effectively activate students' awareness of their cognitive processes and their capacity to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own learning. The research further establishes that metacognitive thinking can be systematically developed through intentional pedagogical design, with implications for teacher training and professional development. This article contributes to the growing body of literature on metacognition in science education by providing empirical evidence across diverse

educational contexts and proposing practical frameworks for classroom implementation.

Keywords: metacognition, self-regulated learning, science education, cognitive strategies, teacher training

1. Introduction

The contemporary educational landscape presents persistent challenges for educators and researchers in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Social, cultural, and technological transformations have fundamentally impacted how individuals learn and interact with knowledge, demanding innovative and contextualized pedagogical practices (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026). Within this context, metacognition has emerged as a powerful theoretical and practical framework for understanding and enhancing learning processes across all educational levels.

Metacognition, first conceptualized by John Flavell in the 1970s, refers to the knowledge individuals possess about their own cognitive processes and their capacity to regulate them (Flavell, 1971, 1976). The term, derived from the Greek prefix "meta" meaning "beyond," encompasses both awareness of one's cognitive processes and the executive control mechanisms that enable individuals to plan, monitor, and evaluate their learning strategies (Rosa, 2011, 2014). This dual nature of metacognition—comprising both knowledge about cognition and regulation of cognition—has significant implications for educational practice.

Research consistently demonstrates that metacognitive abilities distinguish high-performing students from their peers, particularly in complex problem-solving situations (Chi, Glaser, & Rees, 1982; Zohar & Barzilai, 2013). However, despite its recognized importance, metacognitive thinking is rarely spontaneously activated by students without explicit instructional guidance (Rosa & Meneses Villagr , 2018). This gap between potential and practice underscores the critical need for intentional pedagogical interventions that explicitly incorporate metacognitive strategies into classroom instruction.

The present article synthesizes research conducted across multiple educational contexts—from elementary through higher education, encompassing scientific disciplines including Physics, Biology, and Mathematics, as well as vocational and teacher education.

This comprehensive review addresses the following central research questions:

1. How can metacognitive strategies be effectively integrated into classroom instruction across different educational levels and disciplines?
2. What evidence exists for the activation and development of metacognitive thinking through pedagogical interventions?
3. What are the implications of metacognitive research for teacher training and professional development?

By examining empirical findings from diverse educational settings, this article aims to contribute to the theoretical understanding of metacognition in educational contexts while providing practical guidance for classroom implementation.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Conceptual Foundations of Metacognition

The construct of metacognition has evolved significantly since its initial introduction by Flavell (1971, 1976). Flavell initially associated the concept with metamemory—the knowledge individuals possess about their own memory processes and their capacity to monitor and regulate memory functions. This foundational work established the critical insight that effective learning depends not only on cognitive capacity but also on awareness and control over one's cognitive resources.

Flavell and Wellman (1977) elaborated the knowledge component of metacognition, identifying three interconnected variables that constitute metacognitive knowledge:

Person variables encompass the beliefs and convictions individuals hold about themselves as learners, including their understanding of how their thinking functions, how they process information, and how they compare to others. This includes what Flavell, Miller, and Miller (1999) term "mnemonic self-concept," which develops over time as individuals become increasingly capable of understanding their capacities and limitations.

Task variables relate to individuals' identification and understanding of task characteristics, including the scope, demands, and requirements involved in task completion. This includes awareness of task difficulty, the nature of required information processing, and the specific challenges posed by different task types.

Strategy variables concern knowledge about when, where, how, and why to apply particular strategies. This includes awareness of which strategies are most appropriate for achieving specific cognitive outcomes and the ability to justify strategic choices.

Brown (1987) extended Flavell's framework by emphasizing the executive control and self-regulation dimensions of metacognition. Brown identified three fundamental operations:

Planning involves predicting steps and selecting strategies in relation to intended objectives, establishing goals for how to proceed with task completion. This requires understanding the overall problem and initiating solution-seeking processes.

Monitoring entails controlling actions and verifying whether they are appropriate for achieving proposed objectives, evaluating deviations from goals, recognizing errors, and correcting them when necessary.

Evaluation involves assessing outcomes achieved in relation to intended goals, potentially defined by specific evaluation criteria. This includes reflecting on the learning process and identifying possible process failures.

2.2 Metacognition and Learning

The integration of metacognitive components—knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition—creates the conditions for what Rosa (2014) terms "learning about learning." This metacognitive learning process enables students to recognize their cognitive resources, identify gaps in their understanding, plan appropriate strategies, monitor their progress, and evaluate their outcomes.

Research consistently demonstrates that metacognitive awareness is associated with improved academic performance across disciplines (Schraw & Dennison, 1994; Veenman, Van Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 2006). In science education specifically, Zohar and Barzilai (2013) found that metacognitive strategies are particularly effective for developing conceptual understanding, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills. Studies by Akyol, Sungur, and Tekkaya (2010) and Oliveira, Boruchovitch, and Santos (2009) further indicate that systematic use of metacognitive strategies enhances self-regulation and improves academic achievement.

The transferability of metacognitive skills represents a particularly significant educational advantage. Unlike content-specific knowledge that may have limited applicability, metacognitive strategies can be applied across multiple contexts, enabling students to develop learning competencies that extend beyond particular disciplines (Rosa, 2014). This transferability aligns with the broader educational goal of developing autonomous, self-directed learners capable of "learning how to learn."

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This article synthesizes findings from a comprehensive research program investigating metacognition in educational contexts. The studies reviewed employed qualitative and mixed-methods approaches, including Design-Based Research (DBR), action research, and case study methodologies. These approaches were selected for their capacity to examine complex educational phenomena in

authentic classroom settings while enabling iterative refinement of pedagogical interventions.

The Design-Based Research methodology adopted by several studies (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026) is particularly noteworthy for its integration of scientific rigor and practical applicability. DBR enables collaborative, iterative investigation in which teachers, students, and researchers work together in the conception, implementation, analysis, and redesign of educational interventions (Matta, Silva, & Boaventura, 2014).

3.2 Participants and Settings

The reviewed studies involved diverse participant populations across multiple educational contexts:

1. **Elementary Education:** Students in the 4th and 7th years of Brazilian fundamental education, investigating geometry and microbiology respectively.
2. **Secondary Education:** High school students in Physics, Biology, and integrated Science classes, ranging from 1st to 3rd year levels.
3. **Vocational and Technological Education:** Students and teachers in Brazilian technical education programs.
4. **Higher Education:** University students and continuing education participants in teacher training programs in Spain and Brazil.

This diversity enables cross-contextual analysis of metacognitive phenomena while controlling for developmental and disciplinary differences.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

Data collection across studies utilized multiple instruments:

- **Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI):** Adapted from Schraw and Dennison (1994), this instrument assessed students' metacognitive awareness across six elements: person, task, strategy, planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

- **Structured Observation Protocols:** Trained observers documented student behaviors during experimental activities using predetermined criteria aligned with metacognitive components.
- **Reflective Questionnaires:** Including self-assessment instruments (Quadro KWHL, "Autoavaliação," "Após avaliação") that prompted students to articulate their understanding and learning processes.
- **Learning Diaries and Portfolios:** Students maintained written records of their learning experiences, difficulties, and strategies.
- **Audio Recordings and Discourse Analysis:** Classroom interactions were recorded and analyzed for evidence of metacognitive thinking.
- **Student Artifacts:** Concept maps, experimental reports, and other student-generated materials provided evidence of conceptual understanding and strategic thinking.

3.4 Metacognitive Interventions

The interventions examined across studies incorporated various metacognitive strategies:

- **Explicit metacognitive questioning** embedded within activity guides, prompting students to reflect on their knowledge, task requirements, and strategies.
- **KWHL charts** (Know, Want to know, How to learn, Learned) structured students' reflection before, during, and after learning activities.
- **Conceptual mapping** activities that required students to identify and organize relationships between concepts.
- **Portfolio development** encouraging ongoing self-reflection on learning processes.
- **Reflective journals and learning diaries** documenting students' cognitive and affective experiences.
- **Collaborative problem-solving** and peer dialogue facilitating shared metacognitive processes.

- **Experimental activities** with embedded metacognitive prompts, enabling students to plan, monitor, and evaluate their hands-on investigations.

4. Results

4.1 Activation of Metacognitive Components

Analysis of the synthesized studies reveals consistent activation of metacognitive components across interventions. The following section presents findings organized by metacognitive elements.

4.1.1 Person Component

The person element—students' awareness of their own cognitive characteristics, beliefs, and capabilities—was consistently activated across studies. In experimental physics activities, students demonstrated increasing capacity to identify their knowledge, recognize their learning characteristics, and compare themselves to peers (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026). This activation was particularly evident when explicit questioning prompted students to consider what they knew and needed to learn.

In geometry instruction, the KWLH chart's first two columns ("What I Know" and "What I Want to Know") effectively stimulated students' self-reflection. Students progressed from initial claims of having no knowledge about geometric solids to recognizing prior familiarity and articulating specific learning goals (Bianchini, Gadagnin, & Quartieri, 2026).

Interview data revealed variation in students' metacognitive awareness, with some demonstrating clear understanding of their learning preferences while others had never consciously reflected on this question. This finding aligns with Flavell, Miller, and Miller's (1999) observation that metacognitive knowledge develops progressively through experience and intentional reflection.

4.1.2 Task Component

The task element—awareness of task characteristics, demands, and requirements—showed variable activation across contexts. In biology instruction incorporating mathematical concepts, students demonstrated task awareness by identifying the specific mathematical operations required and recognizing similarities to previous activities (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026). However, many students initially failed to establish connections between parallel activities, suggesting limited task awareness development.

In physics interventions, task awareness was activated more effectively when activities incorporated explicit comparisons between current and previous experimental tasks. Students who could identify task similarities demonstrated more strategic approaches to problem-solving (Biazus & Rosa, 2026). This finding supports Rosa's (2011) contention that the task variable is essential for retrieving prerequisite knowledge and connecting new learning to prior experience.

4.1.3 Strategy Component

The strategy element—knowledge of when, where, how, and why to apply particular approaches—showed significant activation across studies. In vocational education, teachers reported that explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies (concept maps, portfolios, KWL, metacognitive questioning, self-assessment, and learning diaries) enabled students to develop more sophisticated learning approaches (Vieira & Rosa, 2026).

In biology instruction, students employed various strategies: some constructed physical representations, others created written outlines, and some collaborated with peers to check their understanding. The Emojikon instrument, designed to capture students' strategy awareness, revealed that students who could articulate their strategies demonstrated better comprehension outcomes (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026).

However, students often required extensive explanation and modeling to understand what constituted a "strategy" and why strategic thinking matters. This finding underscores the importance of explicit instruction and reinforcement in developing strategic awareness.

4.1.4 Planning Component

The planning element—anticipating steps and selecting strategies—was activated through structured reflection activities. In experimental physics, explicit planning questions ("What do you need to do? Where will you begin? What resources are required?") prompted students to organize their thinking before beginning activities (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026).

In geometry, students' KWLH responses to "How should I learn?" revealed nascent planning awareness. While most suggestions were general ("study," "research on Google"), the mere articulation of learning approaches indicated emerging metacognitive planning (Bianchini et al., 2026).

The 4Ex2 instructional model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Extend, Reflect, Assess) provided particularly structured planning opportunities in vocational education, guiding students through systematic learning cycles (Vieira & Rosa, 2026).

4.1.5 Monitoring Component

The monitoring element—tracking execution and checking alignment with objectives—was activated less consistently than other elements. In physics experimental activities, students demonstrated increasing capacity to evaluate equipment availability and procedural adequacy, but difficulty monitoring conceptual understanding in real-time (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026).

Similarly, in biology instruction, some students demonstrated monitoring awareness by reviewing their work, identifying errors, and making corrections. However, others, particularly those with lower metacognitive awareness, tended to overestimate their performance quality, failing to recognize conceptual errors (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026).

This finding aligns with research by Nelson and Fyfe (2019), who found that elementary school children's confidence and knowledge are often poorly calibrated, with a tendency toward overestimation. The studies reviewed suggest that explicit

monitoring instruction can improve students' capacity to accurately assess their understanding, though this development requires sustained practice.

4.1.6 Evaluation Component

The evaluation element—reflecting on outcomes and processes—showed substantial activation when activities incorporated structured reflection. In experimental physics, final reflection questions prompted students to examine whether their results aligned with their hypotheses, identify procedural errors, and articulate what they had learned (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026).

In geometry, the KWLH final column ("What I Learned") effectively captured students' learning achievements and prompted evaluation of their knowledge development. Students articulated both conceptual growth ("I learned that faces are walls, edges are lines, and vertices are points") and affective experiences ("It was incredible, I really enjoyed the experience") (Bianchini et al., 2026).

Vocational education research found that teacher and student perceptions of evaluation revealed a desire for assessment approaches that support conceptual growth rather than mere factual reproduction (Vieira & Rosa, 2026). This finding aligns with Monereo et al.'s (1994) recommendation that evaluation should promote elaboration and reconstruction of knowledge.

4.2 Cross-Cutting Themes

4.2.1 Developmental Progression of Metacognitive Awareness

Across studies, evidence suggests that metacognitive awareness develops progressively with experience and explicit instruction. In physics activities, students' activation of metacognitive components increased from the first to the third experimental session, with all components showing higher frequencies of activation by the final session (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026).

In biology instruction using DBR methodology, successive iterations of the pedagogical intervention led to increased student reflection and metacognitive articulation (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026). Similarly, geometry students

demonstrated greater sophistication in their reflective responses over the course of the intervention (Bianchini et al., 2026).

This pattern supports Flavell's (1979) assertion that metacognitive knowledge develops through cognitive experiences that require conscious reflection. The findings further suggest that systematic, repeated metacognitive engagement can accelerate this developmental process.

4.2.2 The Role of Explicit Instruction

Consistent across studies is the finding that metacognitive thinking does not develop spontaneously without explicit instructional support. Students rarely demonstrate metacognitive awareness unless prompted by structured activities and questioning (Rosa, 2014; Vieira & Rosa, 2026).

In vocational education, teachers reported that before participating in metacognitive training, they had not considered how to develop students' metacognitive awareness. The intervention provided both conceptual understanding of metacognition and concrete strategies for classroom implementation (Vieira & Rosa, 2026).

Teacher training research found that even when courses emphasize reflection and action-reflection principles, metacognitive thinking can remain implicit unless explicitly addressed. The FIDOP program analysis revealed that while the course structure incorporated metacognitive elements (reflective questionnaires, learning diaries), these were not always explicitly labeled as metacognitive (Boszko & Rosa, 2026).

4.2.3 Affective Dimensions of Metacognition

The reviewed studies consistently identified the importance of affective dimensions in metacognitive processes. Students' experiences of confidence, satisfaction, interest, and emotional comfort were integral to their metacognitive engagement.

In physics instruction, motivation and interest were identified as crucial for metacognitive activation. Students who were motivated demonstrated greater

engagement in planning, monitoring, and evaluating their learning (Rosa & Alves Filho, 2026). However, motivation could be negatively affected when metacognitive demands challenged students' established routines.

In geometry instruction, students expressed affective responses to metacognitive challenges. One student articulated the unusual experience of being asked to reflect on their learning: "I never thought about that before." This reflection activity itself became a metacognitive experience, prompting novel awareness of learning processes (Bianchini et al., 2026).

These findings align with Efklides' (2006) research on metacognitive experiences, which emphasizes the role of affective responses in regulating cognitive activity. Metacognitive experiences—feelings of knowing, judgments of learning, and affective reactions to cognitive challenges—provide the conative basis for metacognitive regulation.

4.2.4 Metacognition in Teacher Training

Teacher training studies examined the relationship between metacognition and reflection in professional development contexts. Analysis of the FIDOP continuing education program in Spain revealed that while the program was organized around action–reflection principles, metacognitive elements were present without being explicitly named (Boszko & Rosa, 2026).

The program incorporated tools that stimulate metacognitive awareness: reflective questionnaires, learning diaries, and planning–implementation–analysis cycles. These activities enabled teachers to reflect on their own practice, identify contradictions, and develop improvement strategies. This approach aligns with Schön's (1983, 1987) concept of the reflective practitioner and Dewey's (1933) notion of reflective thinking.

Teacher perceptions from vocational education research indicated that metacognitive training provided "possibilities for pedagogical and methodological practices specific to EPT [Vocational and Technological Education]" (Vieira &

Rosa, 2026). Teachers reported that understanding metacognition enabled them to design more effective instruction and support student autonomy.

4.2.5 Interdisciplinary Integration

Studies examining interdisciplinary contexts revealed the particular power of metacognitive strategies for integrating knowledge across disciplines. Biology instruction mediated by mathematical concepts demonstrated that students developed greater conceptual understanding when they reflected on how mathematical reasoning supported biological explanation (Reis & Strohschoen, 2026).

Similarly, physics instruction incorporating historical reading, problem-solving, and experimental activities showed that metacognitive prompts helped students connect multiple representational modes (França, Gomes, & França Júnior, 2026). The conceptual understanding of heat, for example, required students to integrate conceptual understanding with mathematical formalism and experimental observation.

The KWHL chart in geometry instruction provided a structure for integrating prior knowledge, learning goals, strategies, and evaluated outcomes, supporting interdisciplinary thinking about geometric concepts (Bianchini et al., 2026).

4.3 Practical Tools and Strategies

4.3.1 Metacognitive Questioning Protocols

The studies reviewed consistently employed structured metacognitive questioning to activate student reflection. The three-question protocol developed by Rosa and Alves Filho (2026) included:

- **Question I** (pre-experimental): Focused on awareness of knowledge, task, strategy, and planning—prompting students to consider what they knew about the content, activity requirements, and their approach.
- **Question II** (during execution): Emphasized monitoring—encouraging students to review their actions and verify alignment with objectives.

- **Question III** (post-experimental): Concerned evaluation—prompting students to examine their understanding, process, and outcomes.

These questions were incorporated into activity guides, making metacognitive reflection an explicit part of the learning process.

4.3.2 Reflective Questionnaires

Corrêa and Passos (2026) developed four complementary questionnaires to stimulate metacognitive processes:

1. **Self-Assessment:** Students rated their understanding of specific concepts, identifying which topics they had learned, partially learned, or not learned. Follow-up questions prompted explanation of their learning approaches and challenges.
2. **Post-Evaluation:** Following formal assessment, students reflected on their learning behaviors, affective experiences, and strategies for improvement.
3. **Metacognitive Inventory:** Adapted from the MAI, this instrument assessed awareness of declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge through questions about learning situations.
4. **Final Questionnaire:** At the end of an academic term, students reflected on changes in their learning and attitudes across time, considering strategies adopted or abandoned.

These questionnaires served dual functions: collecting research data and stimulating metacognitive awareness through the act of responding.

4.3.3 Instructional Models

The 4Ex2 instructional model provided a structured approach to integrating metacognitive strategies into science teaching. Developed by Marshall, Horton, and Smart (2009), this model incorporates:

- **Engage:** Activating prior knowledge and generating interest
- **Explore:** Hands-on investigation and data collection
- **Explain:** Discussion and conceptual development

- **Extend:** Application to new contexts
- **Reflect:** Conscious reflection on learning processes
- **Assess:** Evaluation and feedback

Vocational education research demonstrated that 4Ex2 provides a useful framework for designing metacognitively oriented instruction (Vieira & Rosa, 2026).

4.3.4 Collaborative and Dialogue-Based Strategies

Work in groups and peer dialogue were consistently identified as effective for activating metacognitive thinking. Students who articulated their thinking to peers—explaining their approach, justifying their reasoning, and defending their conclusions—demonstrated greater metacognitive engagement.

Research on heat concept instruction found that group discussions prompted students to confront their misconceptions, consider alternative explanations, and monitor their understanding (França et al., 2026). Similarly, biology instruction incorporating collaborative problem-solving revealed that peer dialogue supported students in recognizing knowledge gaps and adjusting strategies.

This finding aligns with Vygotskian perspectives on social learning and with research on the benefits of "thinking aloud" in developing metacognitive awareness (Brown, 1987; Palincsar & Brown, 1984).

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

The synthesized findings contribute to theoretical understanding of metacognition in several respects. First, they provide empirical support for Flavell's (1976) conceptualization of metacognition as comprising knowledge of cognition and regulation of cognition. Across diverse educational contexts, interventions activating both components demonstrated effectiveness in promoting student learning and autonomy.

Second, the research extends understanding of how metacognitive components develop and interact. Consistent activation of person, task, and strategy variables (knowledge of cognition) appeared to support the development of planning, monitoring, and evaluation capabilities (regulation of cognition). This suggests an integrated developmental process rather than sequential development of components.

Third, the findings emphasize the importance of affective dimensions in metacognitive functioning. Students' emotional experiences during learning—feelings of confidence, satisfaction, frustration, and curiosity—influenced their metacognitive engagement. This aligns with Efklides' (2006, 2008) research on metacognitive experiences and their role in shaping cognitive activity.

Fourth, the research demonstrates the transferability of metacognitive strategies across disciplines and educational levels. Strategies developed in physics instruction showed relevance for biology, mathematics, geometry, and vocational education. This supports the view of metacognition as a domain-general capability that, once developed, can enhance learning across content areas.

5.2 Practical Implications

The reviewed studies have several implications for educational practice:

5.2.1 Intentional Integration of Metacognitive Strategies

Teachers must intentionally incorporate metacognitive strategies into their instruction rather than assuming students will develop these skills spontaneously. This requires explicit modeling, guided practice, and systematic reinforcement over time. Activity guides, structured questioning protocols, and reflective instruments provide concrete tools for this integration.

5.2.2 Scaffolding Metacognitive Development

Metacognitive development is supported when teachers provide appropriate scaffolding, gradually reducing support as students internalize strategies. The 4Ex2 model (Marshall, Horton, & Smart, 2009) exemplifies this progression, with

students moving from guided engagement to independent reflection and evaluation.

5.2.3 Creating Time for Reflection

Effective metacognitive instruction requires allocating time for student reflection within class time. This may challenge teachers who prioritize content coverage, but the evidence suggests that reflective pauses enhance, rather than compromise, conceptual understanding.

5.2.4 Valuing Productive Struggle

Students benefit when they experience and recognize productive struggle—the challenge of engaging with difficult concepts and persisting through difficulty. This aligns with Dewey's (1933) view that reflection begins in states of doubt, perplexity, and hesitation. Teachers can support students by normalizing difficulty and encouraging adaptive responses to confusion.

5.2.5 Teacher Professional Development

The findings highlight the importance of teacher preparation in metacognitive instruction. Teachers need both conceptual understanding of metacognition and practical strategies for classroom implementation. Continuing education programs like FIDOP (Boszko & Rosa, 2026) provide models for how to develop teachers' reflective and metacognitive capacities.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

While the synthesized studies provide valuable insights, several limitations should be acknowledged:

1. **Sample Diversity:** Most studies focused on Brazilian educational contexts, with limited representation from other countries. Future research should examine metacognitive strategies across different cultural and educational systems.
2. **Long-term Effects:** While interventions showed positive short-term effects, evidence on long-term sustainability of metacognitive gains is limited. Longitudinal

research is needed to examine how metacognitive strategies transfer and persist across learning contexts.

3. **Developmental Trajectories:** The research provides cross-sectional evidence but limited longitudinal data on how metacognitive abilities develop over years of schooling. Understanding developmental trajectories would inform age-appropriate intervention design.

4. **Measurement Challenges:** Assessing metacognition remains methodologically challenging, as the construct is internal and only indirectly observable. Continued development of valid and reliable measurement approaches is needed.

5. **Teacher Effects:** The studies did not extensively examine how individual teacher differences—experience, pedagogical beliefs, content knowledge—influence the effectiveness of metacognitive interventions. Future research should investigate these factors.

5.4 Directions for Future Research

Based on the reviewed findings, several directions for future research emerge:

1. **Cross-Cultural Studies:** Examining metacognitive interventions across cultural contexts, investigating whether strategies require adaptation for different educational systems and values.

2. **Technology Integration:** Investigating how digital tools and artificial intelligence can support metacognitive development, including automated feedback and adaptive learning environments.

3. **Neurocognitive Foundations:** Exploring the neural underpinnings of metacognitive processes through neuroimaging studies, potentially providing insights into how metacognitive instruction affects brain function.

4. **Contextual Factors:** Examining how classroom climate, teacher-student relationships, and institutional factors moderate metacognitive intervention effectiveness.

5. **Metacognition in Teacher Education:** Extended research on how teacher education programs can better prepare teachers to develop students' metacognitive abilities.

6. **Integration Across the Curriculum:** Examining how metacognitive strategies can be systematically integrated across subjects and grade levels, creating school-wide metacognitive cultures.

6. Conclusion

This article has synthesized research on metacognition in educational contexts, examining how metacognitive strategies can be effectively integrated into classroom instruction across different educational levels and disciplines. The reviewed studies provide compelling evidence that metacognitive instruction enhances student learning, promotes intellectual autonomy, and develops self-regulation capabilities.

The research demonstrates that metacognitive thinking does not develop spontaneously in most students—it requires intentional pedagogical design that incorporates explicit questioning, structured reflection, and systematic scaffolding. Interventions including conceptual maps, KWLH charts, reflective questioning, portfolios, and learning diaries effectively activate students' awareness of their cognitive processes and their capacity to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own learning.

Teacher training emerges as a critical factor in successful metacognitive instruction. Teachers need both understanding of metacognitive theory and practical strategies for implementation. Even when course programs emphasize reflection, metacognitive thinking may remain implicit unless explicitly addressed. This suggests the need for intentional integration of metacognitive awareness into teacher education and professional development.

The findings have significant implications for educational practice. Teachers should intentionally incorporate metacognitive strategies into their instruction, create time for student reflection, and support students in productive struggle. Schools should invest in teacher professional development focused on

metacognitive instruction and consider how metacognitive strategies can be integrated across the curriculum.

In conclusion, metacognition represents a powerful framework for developing students' capacity for autonomous, self-regulated learning. By helping students understand their own cognitive processes and develop strategies for planning, monitoring, and evaluating their learning, educators can prepare them not only to master content but to become lifelong learners capable of adapting to new challenges and contexts.

References

- Akyol, G., Sungur, S., & Tekkaya, C. (2010). The contribution of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to students' science achievement. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 16(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611003672348>
- Bianchini, R., Gadagnin, M., & Quartieri, M. T. (2026). A metacognição e o ensino de Geometria nos anos iniciais. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 105–134). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Biazus, M. de O., & Rosa, C. T. W. da. (2026). Estratégias metacognitivas no ensino de Física: Uma análise de uma intervenção didática no Ensino Médio. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 135–156). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Boszko, C., & Rosa, C. T. W. da. (2026). Metacognição e formação docente: Aproximações teóricas e práticas. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 208–219). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation, and other more mysterious mechanisms. In F. E. Weinert & R. H. Kluwe (Eds.),

Metacognition, motivation and understanding (pp. 65–116). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Cardoso, M. D., & Brabo, J. C. (2026). Microrganismos em foco: Estratégias metacognitivas para aulas de Ciências no Ensino Fundamental. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 157–179). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Rees, E. (1982). Expertise in problem solving. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence* (Vol. 1, pp. 7–75). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Corrêa, N. N. G., & Passos, M. M. (2026). Metacognição em ação: A proposição de um guia. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 220–246). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. D.C. Heath & Co.
- Efklides, A. (2006). Metacognition and affect: What can metacognitive experiences tell us about the learning process? *Educational Research Review*, 1(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2005.11.001>
- Efklides, A. (2008). Metacognition: Defining its facets and levels of functioning in relation to self-regulation and co-regulation. *European Psychologist*, 13(4), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.13.4.277>
- Flavell, J. H. (1971). First discussant's comments: What is memory development the development of? *Human Development*, 14(4), 272–278. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000271221>
- Flavell, J. H. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The nature of intelligence* (pp. 231–236). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906–911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>

- Flavell, J. H., Miller, P. H., & Miller, S. A. (1999). *Desenvolvimento cognitivo* (3rd ed., C. Dornelles, Trans.). Artes Médicas Sul.
- Flavell, J. H., & Wellman, H. M. (1977). Metamemory. In R. V. Kail & J. W. Hagen (Eds.), *Perspectives on the development of memory and cognition* (pp. 3–33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- França, S. C. G., Gomes, L. C., & França Júnior, M. C. da. (2026). Estratégias de ensino metacognitivas no ensino de Física: Uma experiência com o conceito de calor no Ensino Médio. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 180–207). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Marshall, J., Horton, B., & Smart, J. (2009). 4E × 2 instructional model: Uniting three learning constructs to improve praxis in science and mathematics classrooms. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 20(6), 501–516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-009-9139-2>
- Matta, A. E. R., Silva, F. P. S., & Boaventura, E. M. (2014). Design-based research ou pesquisa de desenvolvimento: Metodologia para pesquisa aplicada de inovação em educação do século XXI. *Revista da FAAEBA: Educação e Contemporaneidade*, 23(42), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.2014/jul-dezv23n42003>
- Monereo, C., Castelló, M., Clariana, M., Palma, M., & Pérez Cabani, M. L. (1994). *Estratégias de enseñanza y aprendizaje: Formación del profesorado y aplicación en la escuela*. Graó.
- Nelson, L. J., & Fyfe, E. R. (2019). Metacognitive monitoring and help-seeking decisions on mathematical equivalence problems. *Metacognition and Learning*, 14(2), 167–187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-019-09203-w>
- Oliveira, K. L., Boruchovitch, E., & Santos, A. A. A. (2009). Estratégias de aprendizagem e desempenho acadêmico: Evidências de validade. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 25(4), 531–536. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722009000400008>
- Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117–175. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1

- Reis, E. F., & Rosa, C. T. W. da (Orgs.). (2026). *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica*. EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Reis, E. F., & Strohschoen, A. A. G. (2026). Ensino de Biologia mediado por conceitos matemáticos para o desenvolvimento do pensamento metacognitivo. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 50–72). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Rosa, C. T. W. (2011). *A metacognição e as atividades experimentais no ensino de Física* [Tese de Doutorado, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina]. <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/95261>
- Rosa, C. T. W. (2014). *Metacognição no ensino de Física: Da concepção à aplicação*. UPF Editora.
- Rosa, C. T. W. da, & Alves Filho, J. de P. (2026). A metacognição e as atividades experimentais no ensino de Física. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 13–49). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Rosa, C. T. W., & Meneses Villagrà, J. Á. (2018). Metacognição e ensino de Física: Revisão de pesquisas associadas a intervenções didáticas. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Educação em Ciências*, 18(2), 581–608. <https://doi.org/10.28976/1984-2686rbpec2018182581>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass.
- Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 19(4), 460–475. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1994.1033>
- Veenman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations.

Metacognition and Learning, 1(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-006-6893-0>

- Vieira, L. D., & Rosa, C. T. W. da. (2026). Estratégias metacognitivas aplicadas à educação profissional e tecnológica. In E. F. Reis & C. T. W. da Rosa (Orgs.), *Metacognição em sala de aula: Estudos envolvendo a Educação Científica* (pp. 73–104). EDIUPF. <https://doi.org/10.5335/9786556071251>
- Zohar, A., & Barzilai, S. (2013). A review of research on metacognition in science education: Current and future directions. *Studies in Science Education*, 49(2), 121–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2013.847261>