FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

LISTENING METACOGNITION: EXPLORING EFL STUDENTS' LISTENING STRATEGIES THROUGH RETROSPECTIVE REFLECTIVE VERBAL REPORTS

Rezki Nurhidayah Muchtar[1], La Sunra[2], & Muh. Tahir[3*]
[1] Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

*muhammadtahir@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Listening assessment in EFL classrooms often focuses on final comprehension scores while giving limited attention to students' thinking processes during listening activities. Therefore, this study aimed to explore students' metacognitive listening strategies through reflective think-aloud protocols. This study employed a qualitative descriptive design involving 21 students from the Critical Listening class in the English Education Study Program selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through retrospective reflective verbal reports recorded by students after completing their classroom listening tasks. The data were analyzed thematically using the metacognitive framework of planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The findings revealed that students employed various metacognitive strategies during listening activities. In the planning stage, students prepared themselves by reading instructions, predicting topics, and preparing supporting tools before listening. During the monitoring stage, students actively regulated their comprehension by replaying audio, focusing on keywords, taking notes, and guessing meaning from context. Monitoring strategies appeared as the most dominant process, indicating that students relied heavily on real-time strategy regulation to overcome listening difficulties such as fast speech, unfamiliar vocabulary, and different accents. In the evaluating stage, students reflected on their comprehension and identified the effectiveness of the strategies they used. The findings suggest that reflective think-aloud protocols can reveal learners' metacognitive regulation more deeply than conventional score-based listening assessment. This study contributes to EFL listening research by demonstrating how reflective verbal reports can provide insights into learners reported metacognitive strategies and listening difficulties beyond conventional comprehension scores.

Keywords: EFL Learners, Listening Comprehension, Listening Metacognition, Metacognitive Strategies, Reflective Think-Aloud

INTRODUCTION

Listening is one of the most important skills in English language learning because learners are required not only to hear spoken language but also to understand, interpret, and evaluate information. Listening is a fundamental receptive skill that enables learners to understand and interpret spoken information during communication (Yefridelti, 2018). In addition to understanding spoken messages, listening also serves as a means of maintaining

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN**: **2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN**: **2776-8880**

communication and obtaining information (Wakhidah et al., 2019). Therefore, effective listening involves a complex cognitive process that requires learners to actively construct meaning from spoken input.

In academic contexts, listening comprehension requires students to process verbal input while connecting information to prior knowledge and contextual understanding. Through listening, students acquire information and learning content during instructional activities while transforming spoken language into meaningful understanding (Hantuwa et al., 2025). Unlike reading, listening does not allow learners to review information at their own pace because spoken language disappears as soon as it is heard. Therefore, successful listening requires not only linguistic knowledge but also learners' ability to strategically manage their comprehension.

In second language learning, listening comprehension is closely linked to metacognitive awareness. Successful listeners manage their comprehension through planning, monitoring, and evaluation (Goh & Vandergrift, 2021). Metacognition refers to an individual's awareness and control of their own cognitive processes (Flavell, 1979). In listening, metacognition enables students to prepare strategies before listening, monitor their understanding, and evaluate their comprehension after completing a listening task. Self-regulated learning also emphasizes students' ability to independently manage and adjust their learning strategies when encountering difficulties (Zimmerman, 2017). Previous studies have reported that metacognitive strategies are associated with students' listening comprehension and their ability to manage listening difficulties (Huang & Wang, 2023; Sulistyowati et al., 2022).

Reflective activities can provide insight into learners' perspectives on their learning processes by encouraging them to describe and evaluate their strategies and experiences (Panadero, 2017; Schunk & Greene, 2017). One method associated with verbalizing cognitive processes is the think-aloud protocol. However, concurrent think-aloud and retrospective reflective verbal reports are methodologically different. In concurrent think-aloud, participants verbalize their thoughts while performing a task, whereas retrospective reflective verbal reports are produced after the task has been completed. Thus, concurrent think-aloud provides access to thoughts verbalized during task performance, while retrospective reports provide participants recalled and interpreted accounts of their experiences. This distinction is important in listening research because retrospective reports should not be treated as direct evidence of learners' moment-to-moment cognitive processing.

Previous studies have applied verbal-report procedures in language learning research with different purposes. Tang et al. (2025), for example, examined the use of think-aloud protocols in reading research to identify students' reading strategies. Arabi Zanjani et al. (2024) used think-aloud as supplementary evidence in validating a listening mindset questionnaire. Meanwhile, Bulut and Ertem, (2018) investigated listening comprehension strategies through think-aloud protocols and identified differences between successful and less successful listeners. These studies demonstrate the value of verbal reports for examining language learning strategies. However, relatively limited attention has been given

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

to retrospective accounts of EFL university students' metacognitive listening strategies and listening difficulties after completing classroom listening activities.

Previous research has also frequently examined metacognitive awareness through questionnaires, listening test scores, and instructional interventions (Chero, 2023; Fu et al., 2023). Such approaches provide useful information about students' metacognitive awareness and learning outcomes but provide less detailed information about how students describe the strategies they used and the difficulties they experienced in a particular listening task. Therefore, further contextual evidence is needed to understand students reported metacognitive strategy use and listening difficulties in EFL listening classrooms.

Addressing this gap, the present study examines EFL students' self-reported metacognitive listening strategies and perceived listening difficulties through retrospective reflective verbal reports collected after classroom listening activities. Rather than evaluating strategy effectiveness or capturing real-time cognitive processing, the study focuses on how students retrospectively describe their planning, monitoring, and evaluating processes in relation to completed listening tasks. By situating these reflections within a Critical Listening classroom, the study provides contextual insights into students' reported use of metacognitive listening strategies and the challenges they encounter during listening activities.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What metacognitive listening strategies do EFL students report using before, during, and after listening activities?
2. What listening difficulties do EFL students describe in their retrospective reflective verbal reports?

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design to explore students' metacognitive listening strategies through retrospective reflective verbal reports. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because it allows researchers to explore participants' experiences, perspectives, and meanings related to a particular phenomenon (Cresswell, 2018). The study focused on students' reported experiences of planning, monitoring, and evaluating their listening comprehension after completing listening assignments.

Participants

The participants were 21 undergraduate students enrolled in a Critical Listening course in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Makassar. They were in the second semester and ranged in age from 18 to 20 years. The participants were selected through purposive sampling because they had completed classroom listening activities and were able to provide reflections on their listening experiences.

Their English proficiency was considered lower-intermediate to intermediate based on their classroom listening performance and course records provided by the course lecturer, rather than through a standardized proficiency test. The participants had also previously

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

participated in reflective classroom activities, which supported their ability to provide retrospective verbal reports about their listening experiences.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was conducted online through the class WhatsApp group. The researchers did not administer a new listening test because the listening task had already been completed as part of the regular Critical Listening course. All participants completed the same listening materials prepared by the course lecturer as part of the classroom instruction. The materials consisted of various audio texts, including conversations and monologues. During the listening activity, participants were allowed to replay the audio as needed in accordance with the classroom instructions.

Verbalization took place after the listening activity had been completed. Therefore, the procedure used in this study was retrospective reflection rather than concurrent think-aloud verbalization while participants were listening. After completing the listening task, participants were asked to record their reflections about their listening experiences, including the strategies they remembered using and the difficulties they experienced.

The retrospective reflections were guided by eight open-ended questions organized into three metacognitive processes: planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The planning section consisted of two questions: (1) “What do you do before you start listening to the audio?” and (2) “What strategies do you plan to understand audio content?” The monitoring section consisted of two questions: (3) “What do you do when you don't understand a certain part of the audio?” and (4) “Do you change your strategy when you have difficulties? Explain.” The evaluating section consisted of four questions: (5) “How well do you think you understand the content of the audio?” (6) “Which part is the hardest and why?” (7) “Is the strategy you are using effective and why?” and (8) “What would you do differently if you were listening again?” The questions were developed based on the metacognitive listening framework proposed by Goh and Vandergrift (2021).

Participants recorded their reflections individually using a combination of Indonesian and English. This allowed participants to express their experiences in a language they were comfortable using while still using English when appropriate. Each recording lasted approximately five to eight minutes and was submitted through the class WhatsApp group. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim and prepared for thematic analysis.

Instrument

The main instrument used in this study was a retrospective reflective verbal-report guide developed based on the metacognitive listening framework proposed by Goh and Vandergrift (2021), which consists of three metacognitive processes: planning, monitoring, and evaluating.

Before being used with the participants, the reflective guide was reviewed by the research supervisor to ensure that the questions were relevant to the research objectives and understandable to the participants. Several revisions were made based on the supervisor’s feedback, particularly regarding the clarity of the instructions and wording of the questions.

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Trustworthiness

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, the researcher repeatedly reviewed the transcripts and coding results throughout the analysis process to maintain consistency between the data and the identified themes. The researcher also consulted the research supervisor during the analysis process to discuss the coding and interpretation of the findings. These consultations helped refine the interpretation and ensure that the identified themes remained consistent with the metacognitive framework proposed by Goh and Vandergrift (2021).

Ethical Considerations

Before data collection, the participants were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study and the use of their audio recordings for academic purposes. They were informed that participation involved responding to retrospective reflective questions through voice recordings. Participation was voluntary, and the participants agreed to participate before submitting their recordings.

To protect participants' privacy, their real names were not used in the research report. Participant codes were used during transcription, analysis, and reporting. The audio recordings and transcripts were kept confidential and used only for research purposes. Participants were also informed that they could choose not to participate or withdraw from the study without negative consequences.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis based onBraun and Clarke (2021). First, the researcher listened to the audio recordings repeatedly and transcribed the participants' responses verbatim. The transcripts were then read several times to become familiar with the content of the participants' reflections, reported strategies, and listening difficulties.

Following familiarization, the researchers identified meaningful statements related to students' metacognitive strategy use and assigned initial codes to the data. The initial codes were generated from the participants' responses and subsequently organized into three metacognitive categories: planning, monitoring, and evaluating, based on the framework proposed by Goh and Vandergrift (2021). For example, statements concerning preparation before listening, such as reading instructions or preparing a quiet environment, were categorized as planning, whereas statements concerning replaying the audio or focusing on keywords were categorized as monitoring.

Similar codes were then grouped according to recurring patterns in the participants' responses. In addition to the three metacognitive categories, patterns related to listening difficulties were identified because they appeared repeatedly in the participants' reflections. The researcher reviewed the emerging themes against the original transcripts and revised, combined, or simplified codes when necessary to ensure that the themes consistently represented the data.

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Finally, the researcher interpreted the themes in relation to the metacognitive listening framework and relevant previous studies. The analysis focused on students reported metacognitive strategies and listening experiences, rather than treating the retrospective reports as direct evidence of their moment-to-moment cognitive processing during listening. Direct quotations from participants were included to support the identified themes and provide evidence from the participants' own accounts.

RESULTS

This study aimed to explore students' metacognitive listening strategies through reflective think-aloud protocols. Based on the analysis of reflective transcripts from 21 participants, the findings revealed that students applied three main metacognitive processes during listening activities, namely planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The findings also showed that students experienced several listening difficulties during comprehension tasks. Among the three metacognitive stages, monitoring strategies appeared as the most dominant strategies used by the participants during listening activities.

Table 1. Frequency of Metacognitive Strategies reported in participants' retrospective reflective verbal reports

Metacognitive Process	Strategies Identified	Frequency
Planning	Reading instructions before listening	15 students
Planning	Predicting topics or vocabulary	11 students
Planning	Preparing supporting tools and quiet environment	13 students
Monitoring	Replaying audio	18 students
Monitoring	Focusing on keywords	16 students
Monitoring	Taking notes	12 students
Monitoring	Guessing meaning from context	14 students
Evaluating	Reflecting on comprehension results	10 students
Evaluating	Identifying weaknesses and difficulties	9 students

The frequency indicates the number of participants whose retrospective reflections contained an explicit reference to each identified strategy. Because participants could report more than one strategy, the frequencies are not mutually exclusive and therefore do not add up to the total number of participants. The frequencies are used descriptively to show the relative prominence of the reported strategies, rather than as statistical measures.

Planning Strategies

The participants' reflections showed that planning involved preparing themselves before engaging with the listening material. The most frequently reported planning strategy was reading the instructions before listening, followed by preparing supporting tools and a quiet environment and predicting possible topics or vocabulary. These strategies reflected

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

different forms of preparation, including understanding the task, creating suitable listening conditions, and anticipating information that might appear in the audio.

For example, P01 stated, "Before listening to the audio, I usually read the questions first, so I know what to focus on." Another participant, P02, reported, "Sometimes I also predict the possible topics or vocabulary that may appear in the audio." These responses show that participants described preparing for the listening task by identifying what they needed to pay attention to and anticipating possible content before listening.

The participants also reported preparing supporting tools and their listening environment. This included preparing headsets or notes and finding a quiet place to listen. These accounts suggest that participants considered both task-related and environmental preparation as part of their listening experience.

Monitoring Strategies

Monitoring was the most frequently reported metacognitive process in the participants' retrospective reflections. Four monitoring strategies were identified: replaying the audio, focusing on keywords, guessing meaning from context, and taking notes. Replaying the audio was reported most frequently, followed by focusing on keywords and guessing meaning from context.

Several participants described using these strategies when they encountered difficulties understanding the listening material. P05 stated, "I replay the audio or focus on context to guess the meaning." Similarly, P07 explained, "I usually focus on keywords instead of trying to understand every single word." P11 also reported, "When I do not know some vocabulary, I try to understand the meaning from the overall context of the conversation."

The participants' accounts indicate that monitoring was closely associated with dealing with comprehension difficulties. Rather than reporting an attempt to understand every word, some participants described concentrating on keywords or using the surrounding context to construct meaning. Replaying the audio was also frequently mentioned as a way of returning to information that participants considered unclear.

Some participants further described changing or combining strategies when they encountered difficulties. For example, participants reported replaying difficult sections, focusing on keywords, or using contextual information to support their understanding. These accounts suggest that participants perceived monitoring as an important part of dealing with problems encountered in their listening experiences. However, because the data were collected retrospectively, these accounts represent participants' descriptions of their strategy use rather than direct evidence of moment-to-moment cognitive processing during listening.

Evaluating Strategies

The participants' reflections also contained accounts related to evaluation, although these were less frequent and generally less detailed than the monitoring strategies. Two evaluation-related strategies were identified: reflecting on comprehension results and identifying weaknesses and difficulties.

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Some participants evaluated their listening success by considering whether they had understood the main idea and important information. P08 stated, "I think I understand the audio quite well because I can catch the main topic and important points although sometimes, I miss small details." Similarly, P05 explained, "Understanding the general meaning is more important than understanding every sentence perfectly."

These responses indicate that participants commonly evaluated their comprehension in terms of overall understanding rather than complete comprehension of every linguistic detail. Their reflections also showed an awareness that missing some details did not necessarily mean that they had failed to understand the listening material.

However, evaluation was less frequently reported than monitoring. Some participants reflected on weaknesses or difficulties in their listening, but fewer provided detailed explanations about the effectiveness of particular strategies or how they would modify those strategies in future listening activities. Thus, the participants' retrospective accounts provided more extensive descriptions of how they dealt with listening difficulties than of how they evaluated and improved their strategy use.

Listening Difficulties Experienced by Students

In addition to metacognitive strategies, the participants' reflections revealed several difficulties associated with their listening experiences. The most commonly reported difficulties included fast speech, unfamiliar vocabulary, and unfamiliar accents, particularly British accents.

P12 stated, "The most difficult part for me is when the actor or actress speaks quickly." Similarly, P16 explained, "When the speaker speaks quickly and uses British accent, it is difficult for me to understand."

Participants also reported that limited vocabulary made it difficult to understand spoken information and identify specific details. These reflections indicate that both linguistic factors, such as vocabulary knowledge, and characteristics of spoken language, such as speech rate and accent, were perceived as obstacles to comprehension.

The reported difficulties were also related to the strategies described in the monitoring category. For example, participants who experienced problems with fast speech or unfamiliar vocabulary reported replaying the audio, focusing on keywords, or using contextual information to support their understanding. Thus, the participants' accounts suggest a relationship between the difficulties they experienced and the monitoring strategies they reported using to deal with those difficulties.

Overall, the findings show that participants' retrospective reflections contained evidence of planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies, with monitoring being the most frequently reported process. The reflections also identified several listening difficulties, particularly fast speech, unfamiliar vocabulary, and unfamiliar accents. These findings provide insight into how students described their metacognitive strategy use and listening difficulties after completing listening activities, rather than direct evidence of their real-time cognitive processing during listening.

DISCUSSION

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN**: **2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN**: **2776-8880**

The findings show that the students reported using three main metacognitive processes in their listening activities: planning, monitoring, and evaluating. However, these processes did not appear equally in the students' reflections. Monitoring was mentioned more frequently than planning and evaluating, while evaluation received relatively limited attention. This pattern suggests that students tended to reflect more on how they dealt with problems encountered during listening than on how they prepared for the task or assessed their strategy use afterward. This finding is in line with the metacognitive framework of (Goh and Vandergrift (2021), which views planning, monitoring, and evaluating as related aspects of metacognitive regulation in listening.

The relatively high occurrence of monitoring strategies may be related to the listening difficulties experienced by the students. In their reflections, students described using strategies such as replaying the audio, paying attention to keywords, taking notes, slowing down the audio, and using contextual clues when they had difficulty understanding the material. These strategies indicate that students were concerned with maintaining their understanding when they encountered problems during the listening task. Similar findings have been reported in previous studies, which highlight the importance of monitoring and the use of contextual information in supporting listening comprehension (Rukthong & Brunfaut, 2020; Wang & Treffers-Daller, 2017).

The dominance of monitoring in the students' responses may also be connected to the nature of the difficulties they faced. Problems such as unfamiliar vocabulary, fast speech, and unfamiliar accents may have made students more aware of the strategies they used to cope with comprehension problems. As a result, these experiences may have been easier for students to recall and describe in their reflections than their planning or evaluation processes. However, this finding should be interpreted carefully. The higher frequency of monitoring does not necessarily mean that monitoring was the most frequent cognitive process that actually occurred during listening. Rather, it shows that monitoring was the aspect most frequently reported by students in their retrospective reflections.

The findings concerning evaluation also deserve attention. Although some students reflected on their understanding after completing the listening task, their explanations were generally less detailed than those related to monitoring. Their evaluations tended to focus on whether they understood the main idea or whether they encountered particular difficulties, such as unfamiliar vocabulary, rapid speech, or accent differences. Fewer reflections clearly explained why a particular strategy was successful or what strategy should be changed for future listening tasks. This may indicate that students were more accustomed to judging their overall understanding than to systematically reflecting on the effectiveness of their listening strategies. This finding supports the view of (Goh and Vandergrift (2021) that evaluation involves not only determining whether comprehension has been achieved but also considering the effectiveness of strategies and possible improvements.

The limited attention given to evaluation may also be related to the students' classroom learning experiences. When listening activities mainly focus on completing questions or obtaining correct answers, students may have fewer opportunities to discuss how they approached the task and how they could improve their strategies in future activities.Graham

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

and Santos (2015) similarly emphasized the challenges involved in developing learners' awareness of their listening processes when classroom practices focus mainly on performance. Therefore, the relatively limited evaluation found in this study may point to the need for greater attention to reflective evaluation in EFL listening instruction.

Another important point concerns the use of retrospective reflective verbal reports in this study. The students' reports provided useful information about the strategies they remembered using and the difficulties they associated with the listening activities. In this respect, retrospective reflection can help researchers understand how learners themselves describe their listening experiences. Nevertheless, these reports should not be treated as direct evidence of what students were thinking at each moment during the listening process. Since the verbal reports were produced after the listening activity, they may have been influenced by students' memory and subsequent interpretation of their experiences. Therefore, the findings should be understood as evidence of students reported metacognitive strategy use, rather than direct observation of their real-time cognitive processing.

This distinction is also important for interpreting the contribution of the study. The findings do not establish that retrospective verbal reports can directly capture learners' moment-to-moment metacognitive processes. Instead, they provide contextual evidence of how EFL students describe their use of listening strategies and the difficulties they experienced after completing a listening task. This offers a useful perspective for understanding students' perceptions of their own metacognitive strategy use while also acknowledging the limitations of retrospective data.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings suggest that students may benefit from more opportunities to reflect systematically on their listening strategies. Teachers can encourage learners not only to identify the strategies they used but also to consider why they used them, whether those strategies helped them understand the listening material, and what they could do differently in a future task. Such activities may help students become more aware of the evaluative aspect of metacognitive listening, which appeared less developed in the present data.

Overall, the findings suggest that monitoring was the most prominent metacognitive process reported by the students, while evaluation was comparatively less elaborated. The results provide contextual insight into how EFL students retrospectively describe their listening strategies and difficulties. At the same time, the retrospective nature of the data means that the findings should be interpreted as students' accounts of their metacognitive experiences rather than as direct evidence of cognitive processes occurring in real time.

CONCLUSION

This study explored EFL students' metacognitive listening strategies through retrospective reflective verbal reports. The findings showed that students reported using planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies in their listening activities, with monitoring being the most frequently reported process. Students commonly described strategies such as replaying the audio, focusing on keywords, taking notes, and using contextual clues when

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

reflecting on their listening difficulties. Evaluation, in comparison, was less elaborated in the students' reflections.

The findings provide contextual insight into how EFL students describe their metacognitive strategy use and listening difficulties after completing listening tasks. The retrospective verbal reports were useful for capturing students' reflections on the strategies they remembered using, but they should not be interpreted as direct evidence of their real-time cognitive processing during listening. This distinction is important when interpreting the role of retrospective verbal reports in research on listening metacognition.

Pedagogically, the findings suggest that listening instruction can provide students with more opportunities to reflect on the strategies they use, the difficulties they encounter, and how they might improve their listening performance. Such reflective activities may also encourage greater attention to the evaluative aspect of metacognitive listening, which was less evident in the present findings.

This study was limited to 21 students from one class at a single institution, and the data relied primarily on students' retrospective self-reports. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted within the context of the participants and learning setting rather than generalized to broader EFL populations. Future research could include participants from different contexts and combine retrospective verbal reports with other sources of evidence, such as interviews, classroom observations, or stimulated recall, to develop a more comprehensive understanding of learners' listening processes.

REFERENCES

Arabi Zanjani, S. B., Tasnimi, M., & Azad, M. (2024). Developing and validating a listening mindset questionnaire through Think-Aloud Protocol. *The Iranian Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jndd.3.3.11

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). (2021). Thematic analysis. Analysing qualitative data in psychology. *London: Sage Publications Ltd, 128-47.*

Bulut, B., & Ertem, İ. S. (2018). A Think-Aloud Study: Listening Comprehension Strategies Used by Primary School Students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *6*(5). https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i5.3050

Chero, C. A. C. (2023). The Impact of Metacognitive Instruction on EFL Low-level Learners' Listening Performance and Metacognitive Awareness. *International Journal of Instruction*, *16*(2). https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16217a

Cresswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). In *SAGE Publications*.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). 52.Metacognition and Monitoring (Flavell 1979). *American Psychologist*, *34*(10).

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Fu, Y., Wang, M., Min, S., Zhou, S., & Pan, X. (2023). Exploring the relationship between metacognitive awareness and Chinese EFL learners' listening skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1148610

Goh, C. C. M., & Vandergrift, L. (2021). Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action. In *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition in Action*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429287749

Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2015). Strategies for second language listening: Current scenarios and improved pedagogy. In *Strategies for Second Language Listening: Current Scenarios and Improved Pedagogy*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137410528

Hantuwa, W., Irawati, W. O., & Meiarni, I. (2025). Hambatan Dan Faktor-Faktor Dalam Proses Menyimak Serta Upaya Mengatasinya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Merdeka Belajar*, *2*(2), 49–60.

Huang, L., & Wang, D. (2023). Teacher Support, Academic Self-Efficacy, Student Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Emergency Online Learning. *Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13090704

Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 8, Number APR). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422

Rukthong, A., & Brunfaut, T. (2020). Is anybody listening? The nature of second language listening in integrated listening-to-summarize tasks. *Language Testing*, *37*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219871470

Schunk, D. H., & Greene, J. A. (2017). Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance, Second Edition. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance, Second Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315697048

Sulistyowati, T., Mujiyanto, J., Rukmini, D., & Hartono, R. (2022). Strategy Metacognisi pada Pembelajaran Kelas Menyimak untuk Mempersiapkan Siswa Sebagai Pembelajar yang Mandiri. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana*, *2022*.

Tang, K., Noordin, N., & Ismail, L. (2025). Evaluating the think-aloud method for English reading: a systematic review. In *Cogent Education* (Vol. 12, Number 1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2497150

Wakhidah, R., Maftuh, Moh. F., & Maaliah, E. (2019). Pengembangan Aplikasi Listening Test Berbasis Android. *Journal of Applied Informatics and Computing*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.30871/jaic.v3i2.1181

Wang, Y., & Treffers-Daller, J. (2017). Explaining listening comprehension among L2 learners of English: The contribution of general language proficiency, vocabulary knowledge and metacognitive awareness. *System*, *65*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.013

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Copyright © The Author(s)
Vol. 7, No. 4, October 2026
***e*-ISSN**: **2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN**: **2776-8880**

Yefridelti, Y. (2018). Improving Student Listening Ability Through Audio-Visual Application At Smpn 2 Painan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.36057/jips.v2i2.271

Zimmerman, B. J. (2017). Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview Changing Conceptions of Individual Differences. *Online) Journal*, *homepage*, 1543–421. http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=htip20%0Ahttp://www.tandfonline.com/loi/htip20%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2