



## Beyond Hearing: Advanced English Language Learners' Journey Through Cognitive and Metacognitive Listening Strategy Training\*

Kübra Şık Keser<sup>1</sup>, Salim Razi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Foreign Languages, Abdullah Gül University, Kayseri, Türkiye,  
[kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr](mailto:kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-1492-5883](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1492-5883)*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Türkiye,  
[salimrazi@comu.edu.tr](mailto:salimrazi@comu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-2136-4391](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2136-4391)*

**Corresponding Author:** Kübra Şık Keser

**Article Type:** Research Article

**To Cite This Article:** Şık Keser, K., & Razi, S. (2025) Beyond Hearing: Advanced English Language Learners' journey through cognitive and metacognitive listening strategy training. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama* 21(1), <https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.1622784>

**Ethical Note:** Research and publication ethics were followed. For this research, the ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Date: 14.03.2019, Number: 2019/19).

\*This research paper was produced from the PhD dissertation of the corresponding author, which was submitted to Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University on 09.07.2021. The second author is the thesis advisor.

## Duymanın Ötesinde: İleri Düzey İngilizce Dil Öğrenenlerin Bilişsel ve Meta Bilişsel Dinleme Stratejisi Eğitimi Yolculuğu\*

Kübra Şık Keser<sup>1</sup>, Salim Razi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Yabancı Diller Yükseokulu, Abdullah Gül Üniversitesi, Kayseri, Türkiye,  
[kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr](mailto:kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-1492-5883](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1492-5883)*

<sup>2</sup>*İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programı, Eğitim Fakültesi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale, Türkiye,  
[salimrazi@comu.edu.tr](mailto:salimrazi@comu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-2136-4391](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2136-4391)*

**Sorumlu Yazar:** Kübra Şık Keser

**Makale Türü:** Araştırma Makalesi

**Kaynak Gösterimi:** Şık Keser, K., & Razi, S. (2025) Beyond Hearing: Advanced English Language Learners' journey through cognitive and metacognitive listening strategy training. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama* 21(1), <https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.1622784>

**Etik Not:** Araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulmuştur. Bu araştırma için Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'ndan etik onay alınmıştır (Tarih: 14.03.2019, Sayı: 2019/19).

\*Bu araştırma makalesi, sorumlu yazarın 09.07.2021 tarihinde Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi'ne sunduğu doktora tezinden üretilmiştir. İkinci yazar tez danışmanıdır.



## Beyond Hearing: Advanced English Language Learners' Journey Through Cognitive and Metacognitive Listening Strategy Training

Kübra Şık Keser<sup>1</sup>, Salim Razi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Foreign Languages, Abdullah Gül University, Kayseri, Türkiye,  
[kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr](mailto:kubra.keser@agu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-1492-5883](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1492-5883)*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Türkiye,  
[salimrazi@comu.edu.tr](mailto:salimrazi@comu.edu.tr) ORCID: [0000-0003-2136-4391](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2136-4391)*

### Abstract

This study aimed to develop and evaluate a cognitive and metacognitive listening strategy training program (LSTP) and examine its effects on the listening strategies of advanced English learners in Türkiye. The main research question explored whether the LSTP could enhance learners' use of cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies. After a promising pilot study, the primary study involved 10 participants, using grounded theory methodology. Data were collected through pre- and post-tests, student interviews, video recordings of instructional sessions, and weekly student diaries. Findings revealed that students significantly improved their understanding and application of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, with the LSTP fostering greater strategy use to strengthen listening skills. The program also heightened participants' awareness of declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge. This study has practical implications for English language educators and curriculum designers, suggesting that structured strategy training can support learners in developing effective listening skills, promoting autonomy, and enhancing language proficiency. While particularly useful for advanced learners, the approach may also benefit intermediate students facing complex listening tasks. Overall, these findings support a more comprehensive language learning environment, equipping students with strategies transferable across varied contexts.

### Article Info

**Keywords:** Listening Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, Strategy Instruction.

### Article History:

Received: 18 January 2025

Revised: 5 March 2025

Accepted: 20 March 2025

**Article Type:** Research Article

## Duymanın Ötesinde: İleri Düzey İngilizce Dil Öğrenenlerin Bilişsel ve Meta Bilişsel Dinleme Stratejisi Eğitim Yolculuğu

### Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı bilişsel ve meta-bilişsel dinleme stratejisi eğitim programını (LSTP) geliştirmek ve değerlendirmek ve Türkiye'deki ileri düzey İngilizce öğrencilerinin dinleme stratejileri üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektir. Ana araştırma sorusu, LSTP'nin öğrencilerin bilişsel ve meta-bilişsel dinleme stratejilerini kullanımını artırıp artıramayacağını araştırmaktır. Umut vadeden bir pilot çalışmadan sonra, birincil çalışma, temellendirilmiş teori metodolojisini kullanan 10 katılımcıyı içeriyordu. Veriler ön ve son testler, öğrenci görüşmeleri, öğretim oturumlarının video kayıtları ve haftalık öğrenci günlükleri aracılığıyla toplandı. Bulgular, öğrencilerin bilişsel ve meta-bilişsel stratejileri anlama ve uygulama becerilerini önemli ölçüde geliştirdiklerini, LSTP'nin dinleme becerilerini güçlendirmek için daha fazla strateji kullanımını teşvik ettiğini ortaya koydu. Program ayrıca katılımcıların bildirimsel, işlemsel ve koşullu bilgi konusundaki farkındalıklarını artırdı. Bu çalışma, yapılandırılmış strateji eğitiminin öğrencilerin etkili dinleme becerileri geliştirmelerine, özerkliği teşvik etmelerine ve dil yeterliliğini artırmalarına yardımcı olabileceğini öne sürerek İngilizce dil eğitimcileri ve müfredat tasarımcıları için pratik çıkarımlara sahiptir. Özellikle ileri düzey öğrenciler için yararlı olmakla birlikte, yaklaşım karmaşık dinleme görevleriyle karşı karşıya kalan orta düzey öğrencilere de fayda sağlayabilir. Genel olarak, bu bulgular daha kapsamlı bir dil öğrenme ortamını destekler ve öğrencilere çeşitli bağlamlarda aktarılabilir stratejiler sağlar.

### Makale Bilgisi

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Dinleme Stratejileri, Bilişsel Stratejiler, Metabilişsel Stratejiler, Strateji Eğitimi.

### Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş: 18 Ocak 2025

Düzeltilme: 5 Mart 2025

Kabul: 20 Mart 2025

**Makale Türü:** Araştırma Makalesi

## Geniş Özet

### Giriş

Yabancı dil öğreniminde dinleme becerisi, dil ediniminin temel taşlarından biri olarak kabul edilmekte; özellikle ileri düzey öğrenciler için bu becerinin stratejik olarak geliştirilmesi önem arz etmektedir. Bu doğrultuda yapılan çalışmalarda, dinleme becerisinin bilişsel ve metabilişsel stratejiler yoluyla geliştirilebileceği belirtilmektedir. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki ileri düzey İngilizce öğrenen bireylerin dinleme becerilerini geliştirmek amacıyla yapılandırılmış bir Bilişsel ve Metabilişsel Dinleme Stratejisi Eğitim Programı'nın (LSTP) geliştirilmesini ve bu programın katılımcıların strateji kullanımına etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Literatürde dinleme stratejisi eğitimine yönelik sınırlı sayıda kapsamlı çalışma bulunması, bu araştırmayı özgün kılmaktadır.

### Yöntem

Araştırma nitel desende, temellendirilmiş kuram yaklaşımı doğrultusunda tasarlanmış ve veriler çeşitli tekniklerle toplanmıştır. Katılımcılar, Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesinin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda öğrenim gören ve ileri düzeyde İngilizce bilgisine sahip 10 birinci sınıf öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Altı hafta süren eğitim programı, Oxford'un (1990) sekiz aşamalı strateji eğitimi modeli temel alınarak yapılandırılmıştır. Veri toplama araçları arasında ön ve son testler, yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, haftalık öğrenci günlükleri ve derslerin video kayıtları yer almaktadır. Elde edilen nitel veriler MAXQDA yazılımı ve uyarılmış hatırlama tekniği ile analiz edilmiştir. Bu analiz sürecinde katılımcıların hem beyan ettikleri hem de gözlemlenen strateji kullanımları detaylı biçimde karşılaştırılmıştır.

### Sonuçlar

Araştırma bulguları, LSTP'nin öğrencilerin bilişsel ve metabilişsel dinleme stratejilerini anlamaları ve etkili biçimde kullanmaları üzerinde olumlu etkileri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Katılımcılar, özellikle izleme, değerlendirme, problem tanımlama ve çıkarım yapma gibi metabilişsel stratejileri yeni öğrendiklerini belirtmiş; öte yandan planlama, çeviri ve not alma gibi stratejileri daha bilinçli şekilde kullanmaya başladıklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Ayrıca ön-test ve son-test sonuçları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı fark bulunmuş, programın dinleme başarısını artırdığı tespit edilmiştir. Uyarılmış hatırlama analizleri ise öğrencilerin çoğunlukla not alma, çeviri yapma ve dinleme öncesinde planlama stratejilerini fiilen kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Katılımcıların dinleme süreçlerine ilişkin farkındalıklarının artması, özerkliklerinin desteklenmesi ve genel dil yeterliklerinin gelişmesi bakımından programın etkili olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

Bu doğrultuda, İngilizce öğretimi programlarına bilişsel ve metabilişsel strateji eğitimlerinin yapılandırılmış biçimde entegrasyonu önerilmektedir. Ayrıca, bu tür programların sadece ileri düzeydeki değil orta düzeydeki öğrenciler için de karmaşık dinleme görevleriyle başa çıkmalarını kolaylaştırabileceği vurgulanmaktadır.

## **Introduction**

In language learning environments, it is crucial for learners to recognize their learning styles, as strategies and skills interact in a process where language learning is autonomous (Ponton et al., 2005). As such, the ability to enhance listening, evaluate and identify the most effective strategies, and replace ineffective ones are essential skills that foreign language learners must acquire (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). Zimmerman (2011) emphasizes that learners actively engage in, maintain, and modify their cognition, attitude, and behaviour to achieve their learning goals based on their strategies.

The concept of teaching less proficient learners the techniques used by more proficient learners has contributed to the preference for explicit strategy training over implicit or embedded training in language instruction (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987). Despite prior research focusing on explicit strategy training (Chen, 2005; Chien & Wei, 1998), these studies provide limited insights into the effects of listening strategy training, particularly regarding the enhancement of listening skills through explicit instruction in the context of Turkish learners and advanced English learners. This study investigates the impact of a listening strategy training program on the cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies of advanced English learners. Furthermore, a key objective of the study is to analyse the cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies employed by learners after implementing the Listening Strategy Training Program (LSTP), particularly examining the discrepancy between students' self-perception and their actual strategy use, as learners tend to overestimate their metacognitive performance (Haendel et al., 2020).

This study mainly aimed to investigate whether the listening strategy training programme have an impact on the use of cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies of advanced learners of English. In order to shed a deeper light on the issue, the following sub questions were adopted to be answered through this research study:

**RQ1:** Which listening strategies are developed by the participants after the implementation of listening strategy training?

**RQ2:** Does listening strategy training have an impact on the listening achievement of learners?

**RQ3:** What are the most common cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies which are claimed to be employed by the participants?

**RQ4:** What are the most common cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies which are actually used by the participants?

## **Language Learning Strategies**

The primary challenge associated with listening as a skill lies in the perception that teaching how to listen is inherently difficult (Chen, 2019; Schmidt, 2016). Previous research has often viewed listening as a skill that develops naturally without much formal instruction (McAndrews, 2021). Consequently, offering specific listening instruction and devising innovative methods to enhance listening performance has been seen as a complex task (Ivone & Renandya, 2019).

Recent studies have shifted their focus to identifying the variables that influence the strategies learners employ. Yeldham (2021) posits that while lower-level learners gain more from interactive courses, higher-level learners derive greater benefit from strategy training. Therefore, one of the most crucial variables in strategy selection is the learner's proficiency level (Kobayashi, 2018; Vafae & Suzuki, 2020). Another key variable, as demonstrated by Li and Qin (2006), is that learners' strategy choices in listening may differ based on their individual learning styles. Additionally, research supports the importance of using self-reports and questionnaires in language learning strategy studies (Jarvis et al., 2020). The participant profile in this study aligns with the recommendations of various scholars (Kobayashi, 2018; Vafae & Suzuki, 2020; Yeldham, 2021) since the participants are advanced learners. By selecting participants from a higher proficiency level, the LSTP is expected to yield more significant results.

While the aims and methodologies of language learning strategy research have varied based on the educational demands of their respective eras, these studies primarily strive to standardize language learning strategies and arrive at more generalizable findings. Consequently, proficiency level and learner characteristics can serve as reliable indicators of the strategies that learners tend to select.

## **Listening strategies in EFL**

Language learning strategies are categorized in various ways, with specific classifications for core language skills such as reading and listening. However, in earlier studies, listening strategies received relatively little attention due to the

perception of listening as a passive skill in language learning (Vandergrift, 2004). Another contributing factor was the assumption that listening is typically acquired automatically through communication exercises (Mendelsohn, 1984). In response to these categorization efforts, Vandergrift (1997) proposed a widely accepted framework for listening strategies, which considers all learner groups and educational settings. This comprehensive framework includes three main categories of listening comprehension strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective. Cognitive strategies pertain to the specific steps learners take to manipulate language learning materials, while metacognitive strategies involve the processes of reflecting on one's own learning, planning for learning, and evaluating learning outcomes. Vandergrift's taxonomy, originally developed through an empirical study with French language learners, has also been applied in numerous English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts (e.g., Golchi, 2012; Ridgway, 2000).

This study primarily relies on Oxford's (1990) taxonomy of language learning strategies, as it is more recent and adaptable compared to other frameworks that could have been applied. Oxford's taxonomy is versatile, applicable across various learning environments and skills, and useful for addressing issues that might influence listening performance as well as learners' strategy use in other skills. Furthermore, as a foundational framework, Oxford's taxonomy has shaped the thinking of subsequent researchers, including Vandergrift (1997). According to Vandergrift, metacognitive strategies encompass planning, monitoring, evaluating, and problem identification, whereas cognitive strategies include techniques such as translation, grouping, note-taking, summarizing, and elaboration. The instructional phase of this study is grounded in Oxford's (1990) language learning strategy taxonomy and Vandergrift's (1997) listening strategy taxonomy, the latter of which was largely inspired by Oxford's work.

As previous research suggests, the grouping of listening strategies and the exploration of taxonomies have become increasingly prevalent. While much of the existing literature on listening strategies emphasizes the variables affecting strategy preferences and the development of taxonomies, this study seeks to design an explicit strategy training program aimed at enhancing the listening skills of advanced language learners.

### **Language learning strategy instruction models**

Several models of strategy instruction exist. The first is the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), which integrates academic knowledge with linguistic skills and strategy instruction. This model employs strategy training as a tool for promoting the development of procedural knowledge, relying on cognitive skills. The second model, Cohen and Weaver's (2006) Styles and Strategy-Based Instruction (SSBI), emphasizes tailoring strategy instruction to learners' individual styles. SSBI rejects a one-size-fits-all approach, recognizing that different students require different types of strategy instruction based on their unique learning styles. In this study, Oxford's (1990) eight-stage instructional training model was utilized to create an effective listening strategy training program.

Oxford's (1990) model, widely accepted in the field, outlines eight phases for training language learning strategies. It begins by focusing on analyzing learners' needs and characteristics, such as knowledge, proficiency, perceptions, and goals, along with factors like age, gender, and motivation. The second phase involves deciding which strategies will be taught throughout the program. The third phase addresses students' motivation to learn language strategies, while the fourth deals with incorporating strategy instruction into regular language teaching. After this integration, the fifth phase entails developing materials and tasks that align with learners' interests and objectives. The final phases are dedicated to evaluating and reviewing the strategies taught, using methods like think-aloud protocols, interviews, self-assessment, and diaries to track students' strategy use.

In this study, the development of the strategy training program is grounded in Oxford's model, which was selected for its clarity, thoroughness, and suitability for qualitative data collection through diaries, interviews, and video recordings. Oxford's model is particularly well-suited to developing a listening strategy training program because it is detailed and well-structured, allowing for careful organization—especially important given the complexity of listening as a skill. Additionally, compared to other models, Oxford's approach is more student-centered, making it ideal for this study's purposes. It also provides a framework for instructors to address both cognitive and metacognitive strategies within a single training program.

## **Methodology**

### **Research design**

This study employed a research design based on grounded theory, an effective method for utilizing qualitative data and various tools to achieve the study's objectives. Although the investigation of cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies is a debated topic, using diverse perspectives mitigated the limitations of individual data types, enabling the development of an effective listening strategy training program. The main distinction between cognitive and metacognitive strategies, as opposed to socio-affective strategies, lies in their nature. Vandergrift and Cross (2018) argue that socio-affective strategies, which address social and emotional challenges during listening, are best developed in interaction with native speakers, whereas cognitive and metacognitive strategies are typically cultivated in classroom settings. Furthermore, cognitive strategies are more easily observed, while metacognitive strategies involve internal decision-making processes, making them harder to detect. It is also important to highlight the significance of information processing theory (Miller, 1956), which explains how information is acquired, stored, and retrieved. This process involves converting metacognitive knowledge into cognitive knowledge, or in other words, transforming conscious knowledge into unconscious knowledge (Rao, 2012).

The focus on listening as a receptive skill in this study highlights the relevance of comprehension, which aligns more with cognitive and metacognitive strategies than with socio-affective ones, which also require productive skills. Oxford's (1990) classification suggests that cognitive strategies are more direct, while metacognitive strategies are indirect; the LSTP ensured the integration of both types. Accordingly, qualitative data were key to distinguishing between the strategies learners reported using and those they actually employed.

Grounded theory, initially developed by Glasser and Strauss (1967), was designed as an inductive methodology, where hypotheses are generated from results rather than predefined. Strauss and Corbin (1990) later introduced modifications, which allowed conceptual interactions to influence the theoretical framework. As Bryant (2002) notes, grounded theory also provides detailed analytical methods that allow flexibility for emerging issues. In this study, it was primarily used for the collection and analysis of qualitative data.

### **Setting**

The present study was conducted at a state university in the western part of Türkiye in the fall term of 2019-2020. As the purpose of the study was to develop a listening strategy training programme for advanced learners, the English Language Teaching Department was chosen for this purpose since learners placed in this department can already be considered to be at an advanced level, following success in a national university entrance exam dealing with their English language proficiency. For this purpose, a treatment group consisting of 10 participants was set up. The instruction for the study was conducted by an independent lecturer throughout the study. The training programme was implemented as an extra-curricular activity which was followed by semi-structured interview sessions. The data in the interviews were collected by means of various settings to maximize gathering more detailed information about the experiences of participants, both for the development of an effective training programme and to understand the strategy use of the participants.

In the current Turkish educational system, language instruction is primarily focused on centralized written exams that assess grammatical and lexical information along with reading skills without any relevance to listening, speaking and writing skills. Additionally, the university where this study was conducted does not offer a preparatory English language programme. Prior to the study, participants confirmed that they did not receive any specialized training on the use of listening strategies.

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were 10 first-year Turkish-speaking students at a state university in Türkiye, enrolled in a university-level listening course for the first time. These advanced-level learners were accepted into the ELT department after passing the national language test, YDS, which assesses English proficiency as part of the university entrance exam. They were informed that the training was an extracurricular activity with no impact on their final course grades, and their consent was obtained prior to the study.

The primary motivation for participation was that the students, aspiring to become English teachers, saw this as an opportunity to engage in a new program focused on listening skills. Although initially unfamiliar with specific listening strategies, students reported using note-taking, planning, and translation strategies. However, a pre-test and

video recordings revealed that these strategies were neither consciously nor effectively employed. These observations were also confirmed by the researcher's insights during the pre-test. None of the participants had undergone formal language strategy training, though they had some exposure to test-taking strategies for the YDS, which focuses on reading comprehension rather than listening skills. Consequently, it is not surprising that they exhibited some unconscious use of listening strategies before starting the LSTP.

### **Data collection instruments and procedures**

The study was designed as a qualitative study based on grounded theory. For the qualitative data, immediately after implementing the training programme the participants were asked to write a diary about their experiences every week throughout the training. The second tool of the qualitative data was semi-structured interview sessions, which were held after each implementation phase with the students, one by one. The last type of qualitative data collection tool was video recordings of the training sessions, which were very helpful to understand the strategy employment of the learners; these videos were used as an observation tool for the research.

### **Data collection procedure**

The core of the study was the LSTP to be created regarding cognitive and metacognitive strategies in listening. Hence, the programme was conducted for six weeks, and each week the training session lasted for 45 minutes (see Supplementary Material). The training sessions were conducted by an independent lecturer to prevent the researcher-biases in the observation phase.

Each week, immediately after the six training sessions, the students were asked to write their diaries. For the first two weeks the participants were guided about what to write on the diaries and they had some guide questions:

“How did you feel about .... question?

What did you do to find the correct answer for question...?

Did you have any problem/ how did you cope with that problem?

What is the best part of this text and the worst part of the text? and etc.” After the second week the participants learned about writing diaries so they did not need the guiding questions. The participants were not limited with any word count but the data was up to 150 words for each week.

Also, after the course hour and on the same day, appointments were arranged with each student individually, and interviews were conducted. Additionally, all classes were recorded throughout these six weeks.

### **Listening Strategy Training Programme (LTSP)**

The LSTP is based on Oxford's (1990) eight-stage instruction model, which begins with a learner needs analysis and concludes with a review of the instructional process. It also incorporates the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model, commonly used to teach specific structures in EFL (Harmer, 2009). The hybrid training program, spanning six weeks, included both cognitive and metacognitive strategy sessions. The first four weeks focused on metacognitive strategies, providing foundational knowledge on metacognition, while the final two weeks introduced cognitive strategies and clarified the differences between the two.

Each session aimed to bridge theory with practice, guided by Vandergrift's (1997) strategy framework. The metacognitive strategies covered included Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation, Problem Identification, and Inferencing. In the cognitive phase, strategies such as Elaboration, Summarization, Translation, Resourcing, Note-Taking, Grouping, Induction/Deduction, and Substitution were introduced. Each strategy was followed by a targeted listening exercise, structured around pre-, while-, and post-listening stages in line with the LSTP framework.

At the end of each session, students wrote reflective diaries about their experiences applying the strategies of the week. For more details on the specific activities, supplementary materials should be consulted.

### **Data analyses**

Data analyses in this study followed grounded theory steps. Qualitative data collected from semi-structured interviews and diaries were analyzed using Creswell's (2012) framework. Initially, data were transcribed, translated into English, and validated by two independent EFL instructors. Raw data were then examined and coded, with codes grouped into categories that formed related themes.

Additionally, Strauss and Corbin's (1990) qualitative data analysis steps—open coding, axial coding, and selective coding—were employed. Open coding involved generating initial codes, while axial coding identified patterns by comparing categories across cases (Friedman, 2012). Selective coding linked and validated initial codes to other categories. Grounded theory guided the coding and analysis of qualitative data, with MAXQDA (2020) used to assist in coding and grouping data. Amazon Web Services (AWS) was employed for transcription, although qualitative analysis was primarily conducted manually for deeper insights.

Video recordings of the training sessions were also analysed using the stimulated recall technique, which provides insights into participants' cognitive processes and decision-making (Jung & Lee, 2022; Mackey & Gass, 2005). This technique involved reviewing the video recordings with the lecturer, pausing to discuss specific moments and shape notes based on the lecturer's insights regarding students' rationales for selecting particular cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies. Stimulated recall, as noted by Sime (2006), enhances understanding of actual strategy use, minimizing researcher bias and validating video-recording data.

To obtain results that are more generalizable and consistent across different settings and time periods, it is essential to consider reliability and validity in research. Various strategies can enhance validity and reliability in qualitative research (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Orson & Spiers, 2002). Among these, triangulation is one of the most crucial approaches for ensuring validity. Triangulation exists in different forms, including methodological triangulation, which involves employing multiple data collection methods within the same study (Polit & Beck, 2008). Therefore, in qualitative research, researchers can enhance validity by utilizing multiple techniques such as interviews, diaries, observations, or field notes to examine the same phenomenon.

**Ethical Note:** Research and publication ethics were followed. For this research, the ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Date: 14.03.2019, Number: 2019/19).

## Results and Discussion

### Results and discussion for RQ1

RQ1 sought to find an answer to the question of which listening strategies were developed by the participants after the implementation of the listening strategy training programme. The answer was deduced from the qualitative data provided by interviews, diaries and video recordings of the training sessions. The listening strategies developed under the effect of the LSTP were listed as a subcategory of the theme “Benefits of Listening Strategy Development Programme”.

**Table 1.** Results for Research Question 1

Theme: Benefits of LSTP	Codes
Category 1: New strategies	- monitoring strategy - evaluation and problem identification strategy - inferencing strategy - grouping strategy
Category 2: Language proficiency development	- developing listening proficiency - vocabulary knowledge - new structures

As shown in Table 1, Category 1 highlights the strategies introduced through the training program, which participants identified as newly developed. The findings indicate that participants generally held positive attitudes toward the program and were aware of the newly learned strategies, which were thoroughly covered in both theory and practice. Notably, most of the newly learned strategies were metacognitive (e.g., monitoring, evaluation, problem identification, inferencing). One participant specifically acknowledged learning new strategies as a key benefit of the program, stating:

Also, I realised that while listening to English, I was not aware of evaluating my own performance and identifying problems related to my own listening performance. So, without doing this myself, how can I help

my students to improve their listening? With the help of this training, I have learnt to monitor my own performance and infer the problems related to my performance in listening. (P7, Interview Week 6).

Also, observation notes especially towards the end of the data collection process clearly supports the ideas stated in the interviews:

When the students were asked to talk about their experiences during the training, they talked about various benefits of the training. In the first hand, they did not seem to know much about monitoring strategies as they asked many questions related to how to apply the strategy in the activity part exactly. (Video recording notes- Week 5).

In line with these findings, Rost (1990) asserts that explicit strategy instruction enhances learners' ability to recognize and adopt new strategies, reinforcing the effectiveness of strategy training in listening courses. Similarly, Milliner and Dimoski (2021) report that students receiving explicit instruction, whether cognitive or metacognitive, show greater improvement in strategies like problem identification and monitoring. Additionally, Duy and Quan (2021), in their study on listening strategies, compared the strategy use of effective and less effective listeners. Consistent with the present study, they found that monitoring is the primary metacognitive strategy employed by all learners, with planning strategies also proving essential. The results of this study similarly highlight monitoring and problem identification as key strategies learned through the cognitive and metacognitive listening strategy training program.

Echoing these findings, several participants described the program as highly beneficial, particularly in enhancing their language proficiency. Rost (1990) suggests that raising learners' awareness of strategy use through an explicit program leads to greater satisfaction with their language learning experience. One participant expressed this satisfaction by stating:

It was not easy to adopt such a difficult programme for me because I am not good at listening. Until taking these courses, I always believed that listening is a matter of ability. However, with the help of this training, I have learnt that it is a matter of strategy. As a student, if I am aware of my own learning style, I can employ the correct strategy to make myself a better listener. In that sense, this training was a good opportunity for me to learn and internalize the new strategies such as inferencing strategy. Understanding the listening text and making inferences seemed very advanced at the beginning of the session. However, then I realized that the listening activity requires this anyway and our background knowledge helps us a lot. (P.3) (Diary- Week 6).

The participants stated that this programme did not only teach them the listening strategies but also helped them to foster their language proficiency by maintaining about vocabulary knowledge and different structures:

I believe the training programme was very effective. I got a number of important points from the training. In the first hand, of course it was very effective in terms of supplying theoretical knowledge first and then giving us opportunity to practice what we have learnt. However, this was not the only advantage of this programme. I have also learnt some new vocabulary through the listening texts. (Diary- Week 2).

Participants emphasized that the strategy training not only enhanced their listening skills but also proved beneficial in developing other skills, particularly grammar and vocabulary. Similarly, Lam and Wong's (2000) pilot study concluded that explicit strategy instruction not only aids strategy development but also fosters student interaction.

In summary, while participants were already familiar with some strategies, others were entirely new to them. The newly acquired strategies—monitoring, evaluation, problem identification, inferencing, and grouping—were recognized as essential for a listening strategy training program, as highlighted in previous research.

## Results and Discussion for RQ2

This study examined the impact of a listening strategy training program on participants' listening achievement. Pre- and post-test data were analysed using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test in SPSS due to the small sample size ( $N=10$ ). This nonparametric test effectively compared mean scores, highlighting significant differences (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Park, 2008; Singh et al., 2013; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

**Table 2.** *Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-test and Post-test Scores*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The median of differences between pre-test and post-test equals 0.	Related Samples-Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test	.005	Reject the null hypothesis.

Table 2 shows a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores ( $p = .005$ ), indicating that strategy instruction positively affected participants' listening achievement. The median scores ( $MdnPre\text{-}test = 28.2$ ,  $MdnPost\text{-}test = 74.7$ ) support rejecting the null hypothesis of no difference between the tests' median values.

Numerous studies have utilized listening tests and quantitative statistics to explore the impact of strategy training on learners' listening achievement (e.g., K  k, 2018; Stern, 1975). Some research emphasizes the importance of listening strategy training for improving proficiency (e.g., Graham, 2006; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990), while others discuss the influence of additional training factors (Feyten, 1991; Fujiwara, 1990).

## Results and Discussion for RQ3

RQ3 aims to explore students' self-perceptions regarding their use of strategies, a crucial aspect for refining the strategies included in the training program. Participants reported effective use of two metacognitive strategies: planning and monitoring. Notably, most claimed to have learned the monitoring strategy during the program. Participants' reflections on planning strategies, as expressed in diaries and interviews, were consistent across responses:

This week [Week 1], we talked about planning strategies. However, I was already using a planning strategy and I was aware of what I was doing regarding planning before taking this class. For me, it is good to know what is the next step in listening, and knowing the tasks and requirements before starting listening. So, I use planning strategies and I believe I can answer the questions more accurately when I use planning strategies. (P4, Interview Week 1)

Discussing metacognitive strategies, which are often employed subconsciously by listeners, presents challenges (Chamot, 1994). However, it is a sound methodological approach in strategy research to gather learners' perceptions and ideas (Costa, 2001). Sioson (2011) notes that despite potential discrepancies between learners' statements and their actual strategy use, research on metacognitive strategy employment typically relies on learners' self-reports. This section's theme, "strategies claimed by learners," aligns with Sioson's perspective, highlighting the distinction between strategies learners claim to use and those they actually employ. Interviews and diaries were used in this study to categorize strategies into two groups: those claimed by learners and those truly in practice.

Planning strategy is seen as the foundation of strategy use, often functioning as an organizational tool in listening activities (Goh, 2008). Consistent with prior research, planning helps listeners identify key points in listening tasks (Goh & Taib, 2006; Rubin, 1994). Participants in this study similarly identified planning as a metacognitive strategy they could easily adopt. Their justification for using planning strategies aligns with prior research on metacognitive strategy use (Wenden, 1998).

Another categorization addressing this research question pertains to the cognitive strategies purportedly employed effectively by participants. Four principal categories emerged from the participants' interviews and diaries: summarization, translation, note-taking, and grouping strategies:

I have ways to relax myself and be sure that I understand everything I listen to. The best way to do that is using your own concepts and own words by summarizing what you hear. Of course, you cannot utilise summarization in every case, like exams, because it is pretty time-consuming for me. (P2, Interview Week 5).

Translating some parts of the listening text or the tasks help me to understand the issue better. Sometimes, it gets very hard to understand the whole issue without taking some help from Turkish. I feel more relaxed but understanding the listening text and the questions are more important than feeling more relaxed for me. (P8, Interview Week 5).

I and my friends use note-taking a lot, which I really hate. Because when I miss some parts, it is not possible to use the notes of other friends as the notes can be understood by the person who takes it only. However, I like to use my notes in listening courses, they provide a lot of information within a few words. (P1, Diary Week 5).

Previous research indicates that the employment of cognitive listening strategies is influenced by factors such as learning style, task type, and proficiency level (Lui, 2008). Among these strategies, note-taking is identified as a fundamental technique, applicable not only in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or second language (L2) contexts but also in first language (L1) settings across various subjects (Siegel, 2015). Thus, the assertion of utilizing note-taking may arise from learners' needs. Translation is another significant strategy, although it is primarily considered beneficial for lower-level EFL learners (Coşkun, 2010). However, this study posits that advanced learners also prefer the translation strategy. Summarization and grouping strategies are particularly valuable in lecture-style listening activities, which require a high level of English proficiency (Graham & Santos, 2015). In support of this, advanced students in the present study reported effective use of these strategies. One rationale for this may be that summarization enables learners to grasp the overarching themes of longer listening texts without necessarily understanding every individual word or structure (Mendelsohn, 2006).

In conclusion, participants in this study reported using planning and monitoring as metacognitive strategies. Furthermore, summarization, translation, note-taking, and grouping are cognitive strategies believed to be employed by learners, as evidenced by qualitative data gathered from interviews and diaries. Given the discrepancies between participants' claims and actual strategy use, further investigation is warranted to clarify the genuine employment of these strategies among learners.

## Results and discussion for RQ4

It is crucial to note that in research on listening strategies, participants' statements in think-aloud protocols or interviews have often been regarded as indicators of actual strategy use. However, potential discrepancies between claimed and actual strategy employment prompted the addition of another research question. Thus, this study aimed to define actual strategy use as outlined in Research Question 3. To achieve this, video recordings of the training sessions were analysed using the stimulated recall technique. From this analysis, three categories of cognitive and metacognitive strategies employed by participants were identified, as summarized in Table3:

**Table 3. Results for Research Question 3**

<b>Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies (actually in use)</b>	<b>Codes:</b>
Category 1: Note-taking Strategy	-using own notes -written notes -notes to remind the text -taking notes while listening -arranging notes after listening
Category 2: Translation Strategy	-notes in L1 -translating the answers -translating the questions -translating the written notes
Category 3: Planning strategy	-need to see the tasks

- 
- plan their listening
  - preparing for unknown words
  - preparing for unknown structures
- 

It was observed that the participants used three types of strategies. On the first hand, it was distinctly seen that the participants used note-taking in every session, even though the requirement of the activities was not related to using a note-taking strategy. Also, in the observation notes, it was stated that:

This week [the 1st Week], ..... the focus was on planning strategy, in the activity part, the students all took notes and some of the students used extra paper to take notes. At the end of the session, it was observed that the students had made notes which were not related with the activities. (Video recording notes – Week 1)

As understood from the video recording notes, the participants utilized the note-taking strategy very effectively. The rationale to favour note-taking strategy might be listed as easiness to recall the information, understanding what they hear better, and analysing the information better (Soumokil et al., 2021). Moreover, sharing the similar points with the present study, Carrell et al. (2004) categorize note-taking strategy as the most favoured one. Therefore, associating previous research with the result of one of the listening strategies employed by the participants in the present study shows the means and rationale of employing the note-taking strategy.

The next strategy suggested in the data of video recordings as employed by the listeners is the translation strategy. Since the beginning of the grammar translation method in language teaching, it has been questioned whether to include the L1 in language classes or not (Hall & Cook, 2014). In fact, starting from the beginning of the training, the students were highly enthusiastic to use their L1. This may stem from the students being first year students, although they are at an advanced level.

Although it is really time-consuming, the students make use of translation a lot. Because they are advanced level students, they do not tend to translate everything, but they have a tendency to translate the questions and unknown words. (Video recording notes – Week 2)

As understood in the notes for video recordings, the participants need to see the equivalent terms in their own L1 for a better justification. For the feelings and motivation of the learners, translation strategy was covered especially in earlier linguistic studies (Prodromou, 2000). Brooks-Lewis (2009) conducted classroom research on the use of translation and concluded that the use of translation and L1 in ELT classes enhances learning, decreases anxiety, reduces the disadvantage of cultural-bias, and helps learners to be more confident; all of which suggests similar results to the present study.

The last strategy most commonly observed is the planning strategy. Although describing the use of metacognitive strategies is a more challenging issue, the cues and actions of the students during the training sessions caused us to reach this conclusion. In the video recording notes, it was stated that:

The topic of the week was the note-taking strategy and the instructor did not show anything related to the task and wanted the students just to take notes on what they heard. However, the students kept asking if they had any opportunity to see the questions for the listening task beforehand. (Video recording notes – Week 6)

One notion about the use of planning strategies to support all these views was suggested by Golchi (2012), concluding that using some strategies in listening, such as the planning strategy, helps learners to internalize the process and lower anxiety. Moreover, the highest level of awareness in metacognitive strategies are planning and problem-solving strategies while the lowest one is directed attention (Merilia, 2019). Although listeners tend to use cognitive strategies more than metacognitive ones, advanced level of listeners prefer to plan their listening by looking up the dictionaries or asking about the unknown structures. In order to feel relaxed and confident about the listening process, learners make use of some strategies more frequently than others.

As a conclusion, the study suggested that there are three most commonly-used strategies which were observed throughout. Although in previous studies listening is considered as a challenging process to be observed, the actions, behaviours, questions and even facial expressions of the participants were used to reach a result about the listening strategies actually used by learners. The results suggested the categories of note-taking, translation and planning strategies.

### **Conclusion and Implications**

The findings of this study strongly support the implementation of a Listening Strategy Training Program (LSTP) designed for Turkish young adults, particularly EFL undergraduates. Given the program's effectiveness in enhancing learners' listening strategies, it is recommended for advanced university students. The LSTP facilitated the effective use of a range of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, highlighting its significant impact. Notably, the program successfully taught new strategies, including monitoring, evaluation, problem identification, inferencing, and grouping, while reinforcing previously utilized strategies such as planning, translation, and note-taking.

From a pedagogical perspective, integrating LSTP into English language curricula can offer substantial benefits by equipping students with essential listening skills. Research has demonstrated that strategy-based instruction not only improves listening comprehension but also empowers learners to become more autonomous in their learning by equipping them with tools to actively monitor and regulate their progress (Chamot, 2005; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). The LSTP aligns with these principles, as it develops cognitive and metacognitive strategies, thereby fostering awareness and control over listening comprehension processes (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). By supporting students in understanding and utilizing effective strategies, instructors can enhance learners' ability to apply specific techniques that match the demands of various listening tasks, an approach particularly valuable for advanced learners.

For classroom application, educators could embed practical listening exercises and reflective activities from the LSTP into their regular coursework. Studies indicate that integrating strategy instruction within real-world tasks encourages students to transfer strategies learned in the classroom to broader contexts, thus making the skills more applicable and lasting (Field, 2008). Through tasks that incorporate modeling of strategies and reflective discussions, instructors can foster metacognitive awareness, leading to improved listening comprehension and academic outcomes (Graham & Macaro, 2008). Such integration would benefit not only advanced learners but also intermediate students, aiding them in managing the complexities of listening tasks and enabling them to approach these tasks with greater confidence and competence.

The LSTP also underscores the importance of explicit strategy instruction, particularly in teaching students to bridge the gap between perceived and actual strategy use. Findings showed that strategies such as planning, translation, and note-taking were effectively internalized through structured training, suggesting that explicit, systematic instruction can facilitate the development of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies among EFL learners. By incorporating these insights into classroom practice, educators can enhance students' strategic listening skills, equipping them with tools that foster both immediate and long-term improvement in their listening abilities.

Future research could explore the relationship between listening strategies in students' first language and the target language. Experimental studies might compare the training program's effects across different treatment groups, while a delayed post-test could assess its long-term impact on listening achievement. Follow-up interviews could provide further insights into the sustainability of the program's effects on strategy use.

### **Contributions of the Researchers**

All authors contributed to the manuscript equally.

### **Financial Support and Acknowledgment**

The authors declared that this research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors have disclosed no conflict of interest.

### **Kaynakça / References**

- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 216-235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051>
- Bryant, A. (2002). Re-grounding grounded theory. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application (JITTA)*, 4(1), 7. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/jitta/vol4/iss1/7>
- Carrell, P. L., Dunkel, P. A., & Mollaun, P. (2004). The effects of notetaking, lecture length, and topic on a computer-based test of ESL listening comprehension. *Applied Language Learning*, 14(1), 83-105. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/161450/>
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190505000061>
- Chamot, A. U. (1994). A model for learning strategies instruction in the foreign language classroom. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics (GURT) 1994: Educational linguistics, cross-cultural communication, and global interdependence* (pp. 323). Georgetown University Press.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(2), 227-249. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586733>
- Chen, Y. (2005). Barriers to acquiring listening strategies for EFL learners and their pedagogical implications. *TESL-EJ*, 8(4), 2-15. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1068095.pdf>
- Chen, C. W. Y. (2019). Guided listening with listening journals and curated materials: A metacognitive approach. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(2), 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2017.1381104>
- Chien, C. N., & Wei, L. (1998). The strategy use in listening comprehension for EFL learners in Taiwan. *RELJ Journal*, 29(1), 66-91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829802900105>
- Cohen, A. D., & Weaver, S. J. (2006). *Styles and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.
- Costa, A. L. (2001). *Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: London.
- Coşkun, A. (2010). The effect of metacognitive strategy training on the listening performance of beginner students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(1), 35-50. <https://novitasroyal.org/all-volumes-and-issues/?wpdmc=volume-4-issue-1#>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Edwards Brothers.
- Cross, J., & Vandergrift, L. (2018). Metacognitive listening strategies. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0589>
- Duy, V. H., & Quan, N. H. (2021). Vietnamese English-major students' use of listening strategies. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 116-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i6.3955>
- ETS. (2012). *The official guide to TOEFL test* (4th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(2), 173-180. <https://doi.org/10.2307/328825>
- Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Friedman, D. A. (2011). How to collect and analyze qualitative data. *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*, 180-200. Fujiwara, B. (1990). Learner training in listening strategies. *JALT Journal*, 12(2), 203-217. <https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jj-12.2-art3.pdf>
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research. *Nursing research*, 17(4), 364.

- Goh, C., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal*, 60, 222–232. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl002>
- Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC journal*, 39(2), 188-213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092184>
- Golchi, M. M. (2012). Listening anxiety and its relationship with listening strategy use and listening comprehension among Iranian IELTS learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(4), 115. <https://10.0.11.175/assehr.k.200306.034>
- Graham, S. (2006). Listening comprehension: The learners' perspective. *System*, 34(2), 165-182. <https://10.0.3.248/j.system.2005.11.001>
- Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Designing year 12 strategy training in listening and writing: From theory to practice. *The Language Learning Journal*, 35(2), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701599203>
- Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2015). *Strategies for second language listening: Current scenarios and improved pedagogy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2014). Own language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes. *Language Issues: The ESOL Journal*, 25(1), 35-43.
- Harmer, J. (2009). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.
- Ivone, F. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2019). Extensive listening and viewing in ELT. *Teflin Journal*, 30(2), 237-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/237-256>
- Jarvis, A. K. L., & Guan, G. (2020). Academic listening strategy use at an English-medium university. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(3), 8-29.
- Jung, J., & Lee, M. (2022). Second language reading and recall processes under different reading purposes: an eye-tracking, keystroke-logging, and stimulated recall study. *Language Awareness*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2022.2069251>
- Kobayashi, A. (2018). Investigating the effects of metacognitive instruction in listening for EFL learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 310–328. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.4.310>
- Kök, İ. (2018). Relationship between listening comprehension strategy use and listening comprehension proficiency. *International journal of Listening*, 32(3), 163-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2016.1276457>
- Lam, W., & Wong, J. (2000). “The effects of strategy training on developing discussion skills in an ESL classroom”. *ELT Journal*, 54(3), 245-255. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.3.245>
- Li, J. & Qin, X. (2006). Language learning styles and learning strategies of tertiary- level English learners in China. *RELC Journal*, 37(1), 67-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206063475>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McAndrews, M. (2021). The effects of prosody instruction on listening comprehension in an EAP classroom context. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168821990346>
- Mendelsohn, D. J. (1984). There ARE strategies for listening. *TEAL Occasional Papers*, 8(1), 63-76.
- Mendelsohn, D. (2006). Learning how to listen using listening strategies. In E. Uso-Juan & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills* (pp. 75–90). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merilia, S. (2019). Investigating metacognitive listening strategy and listening problems encountered by English learners. *Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32493/ljal.v1i1.2485>
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043158>

- Milliner, B., & Dimoski, B. (2021). The effects of a metacognitive intervention on lower-proficiency EFL learners' listening comprehension and listening self-efficacy. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211004646>
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). "Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), 13-22.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Cambridge University Press.
- Park, G. P. (2008). Differential item functioning on an English listening test across gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264430>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2008). *Nursing Research: Generating And Assessing Evidence For Nursing Practice*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins: London.
- Ponton, M. K., Derrick, M. G., & Carr, P. B. (2005). The relationship between resourcefulness and persistence in adult autonomous learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(2), 116-128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713604271848>
- Prodromou, L. (2000). From mother tongue to other tongue. *TESOL Greece Newsletter*, 6(7), 7-8. <http://www.shareeducation.com.ar/pastissues3/236/1.htm>
- Rao, Z. (2012). Language learning strategies and English proficiency: interpretations from information-processing theory. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(1), 90-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.733886>
- Ridgway, T. (2000). Listening strategies—I beg your pardon? *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 179-185. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.179>
- Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. Longman.
- Rubin, J. (1994). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 199-221. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329010>
- Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Schmidt, A. (2016). Listening journals for extensive and intensive listening practice. *English Teaching Forum* 54(2), 2-11. [https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource\\_files/etf\\_54\\_2\\_pg02-11.pdf](https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/etf_54_2_pg02-11.pdf)
- Siegel, J. (2015). A pedagogic cycle for EFL note-taking. *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 275-286. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ELT/CCV073>
- Sime, D. (2006). What do learners make of teachers' gestures in the language classroom?. , 44(2), 211-230. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2006.009>
- Singh, N. U., Roy, A., & Tripathi, A. K. (2013). *Non parametric tests: Hands on SPSS*. ICAR Research.
- Sioson, I. C. (2011). Language learning strategies, beliefs, and anxiety in academic speaking task. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 7(1), 3-27.
- Soumokil, J. C., Nikijuluw, R. C., & Lekatompessy, F. M. (2021). Students' perception toward the use of note-taking strategy in listening class. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 1(1), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.30598/huele.v1.i1.p17-32>
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner?. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(4), 304-319.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research (2nd ed.)*. SAGE.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 387-409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02362.x>
- Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learn to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000017>
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. M. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Routledge.

- Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study, *Language Learning*, 60(2), 470-497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00559.x>
- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.515>
- Yeldham, M. (2021). Examining the interaction between two process-based L2 listening instruction methods and listener proficiency level: Which form of instruction most benefits which learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(2), 666-712. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3089>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2011). Motivational sources and outcomes of self-regulated learning and performance: Graduate center of city university of new york. In *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 63-78). Routledge